OFFICIAL REPORT

OF THE

DEBATES

OF THE

HOUSE OF COMMONS

OF THE

DOMINION OF CANADA

SECOND SESSION—THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

9-10 GEORGE V, 1919

IN FIVE VOLUMES

Volume I: Pages 1-1028 Volume II: Pages 1029-2096
" III: " 2097-3192 " IV: " 3193-3996
Volume V: 3997-4702

VOLUME CXXXIV

COMPRISING THE PERIOD FROM THE TWENTIETH DAY OF FEBRUARY TO THE THIRTY-FIRST DAY OF MARCH, 1919, INCLUSIVE



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

A—1

DOMINION OF CANADA

HOUSE OF COMMONS

DEBATES

OFFICIAL REPORT

MEMBERS OF THE GOVERNMENT

OF THE

RIGHT HONOURABLE SIR ROBERT LAIRD BORDEN

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

AT THE OPENING OF THE

SECOND SESSION OF THE THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT

1919

THE CABINET

First Minister, Secretary of State for External Affairs	Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, P.C., G.C.M.G., K.C., LL.D.
Minister of Trade and Commerce	Rt. Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, P.C., G.C.M.G., B.A., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. Francis Cochrane.
Minister of Finance	Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G., B.A.,
Minister of Justice, and Attorney General	Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty, K.C., D.C.L., LL.D.
Minister of Railways and Canals	Hon. John Dowsley Reid, M.D.
Minister of Overseas Military Forces from Canada in the United Kingdom	Hon. Sir Albert Edward Kemp, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment	Hon. Sir James Alexander Lougheed, K.C.M.G., K.C.
Secretary of State and Minister of Mines	Hon. Martin Burrell.
Postmaster General	Hon. Pierre Edouard Blondin.
Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs	Hon. Arthur Meighen, K.C., B.A.
Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service	Hon. Charles Colquhoun Ballantyne.
Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue	Hon. Arthur Lewis Sifton.
Minister of Immigration and Colonization	Hon. James Alexander Calder.
President of the Privy Council	Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell, K.C.
Minister of Militia and Defence	Major-General Hon. Sydney Chilton Mewburn.
Minister of Agriculture	*Hon. Thomas Alexander Crerar.
Minister of Public Works	Hon. Frank Broadstreet Carvell, K.C.
Minister without Portfolio	Hon. Alexander Kenneth Maclean, K.C.
Minister of Labour	Hon. Gideon Decker Robertson.
Solicitor General	Hon. Hugh Guthrie, K.C.
Parliamentary Secretary for the Department of Militia and Defence	Lieut-Colonel Hugh Clark.
Parliamentary Secretary for External Affairs	F. H. Keefer, K.C.
Parliamentary Secretary for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment	Vacant.

* Resigned office June 4.

HOUSE OF COMMONS

Speaker.....Hon. EDGAR N. RHODES, K.C., B.A., LL.B.

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees..GEORGE H. BOIVIN, K.C., B.A.

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

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

Editor of Debates.....THOMAS P. OWENS.

Associate Editor of Debates.....A. C. CAMPBELL.

Official Reporters of Debates :—

English : George Simpson, Robert C. Dunbar, F. W. S. Galbraith, Earl C. Young, H. E. Oliver, W. H. Dickson, Frederick Berryman, T. S. Hubbard.

French : J. O. Marceau, Marcel Gabard.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES :

Messieurs : Ballantyne, Burnham, Chabot, Devlin, Elkin, Foster (Sir George), Kay, Lemieux, McKenzie, McLeod, Marcil (Bonaventure), Munson, Nickle and Richardson.

Chairman : R. L. Richardson.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS

Second Session——Thirteenth Parliament.

1919

ALLAN, GEORGE WILLIAM—Winnipeg, S. Riding.
AMES, SIR HERBERT BROWN, Kt.—St. Antoine.
ANDERSON, ROBERT KING—Halton.
ANDREWS, GEORGE WILLIAM—Winnipeg Centre.
ARCHAMBAULT, JOSEPH—Chambly and Vercheres.
ARGUE, IRA EUGENE—Swift Current.
ARMSTRONG, JOHN A. MACDONALD—York, N. Riding.
ARMSTRONG, JOSEPH EMMANUEL—Lambton, E. Riding.
ARTHURS, JAMES—Parry Sound.

BALDWIN, WILLIS KEITH—Stanstead.
BALLANTYNE, Hon. CHARLES COLQUHOUN—St. Lawrence-St. George.
BALL, ROBERT JAMES—Grey, Southeast Riding.
BELAND, Hon. HENRI SEVERIN—Beauce.
BEST, JOHN—Dufferin.
BLAIR, WILLIAM JOHN—Battle River.
BLAKE, MATTHEW ROBERT—Winnipeg, N. Riding.
BOIVIN, GEORGE HENRY—Shefford.
BOLTON, FERRIS—Lisgar.
BONNELL, SAUL—Kootenay, E. Riding.
BORDEN, Rt. Hon. SIR ROBERT LAIRD, G.C.M.G.—King's (N.S.).
BOURASSA, JOSEPH BOUTIN—Levis.
BOWMAN, JAMES—Huron, N. Riding.
BOYCE, GEORGE—Carleton.
BOYER, GUSTAVE—Vaudreuil-Soulanges.
BOYS, WILLIAM ALVES—Simcoe, S. Riding.
BRIEN, JOHN WESLEY—Essex, S. Riding.
BRISTOL, EDMUND—Toronto Centre.
BROUILLARD, JOSEPH OVIDE—Drummond and Arthabaska.
BUCHANAN, WILLIAM ASBURY—Lethbridge.
BUREAU, JACQUES—Three Rivers and St. Maurice.
BURNHAM, JOHN HAMPDEN—Peterborough, W. Riding.
BURRELL, Hon. MARTIN—Yale.
BUTTS, ROBERT H.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.

CAHILL, FRANK S.—Pontiac.
CALDER, Hon. JAMES ALEXANDER—Moosejaw.
CAMPBELL, J. A.—Nelson.
CANNON, LUCIEN—Dorchester.
CARDIN, PIERRE JOSEPH ARTHUR—Richelieu.
CARVELL, Hon. FRANK BROADSTREET—Victoria and Carleton.
CASGRAIN, PIERRE FRANCOIS—Charlevoix-Montmorency.
CASSELMAN, ORREN D.—Dundas.
CHABOT, JOHN LEO—Ottawa.
CHAPLIN, JAMES DEW—Lincoln.
CHARLTON, WILLIAM ANDREW—Norfolk.
CHARTERS, SAMUEL—Peel.
CHISHOLM, ALEXANDER W.—Inverness.
CLARK, HUGH—Bruce, N. Riding.
CLARK, MICHAEL—Red Deer.
CLARKE, WILLIAM A.—Wellington, N. Riding.
CLEMENTS, HERBERT SYLVESTER—Comox-Alberni.
COCHRANE, Hon. FRANCIS—Timiskaming.
COCKSHUTT, WILLIAM FOSTER—Brantford.
COOPER, RICHARD CLIVE—Vancouver, S. Riding.
COPP, ARTHUR BLISS—Westmorland.
COWAN, WALTER DAVY—Regina.
CRERAR, Hon. THOMAS ALEXANDER—Marquette.
CRONYN, HUME—London.
CROTHERS, Hon. THOMAS WILSON—Elgin, W. Riding.
CROWE, SANFORD JOHNSTON—Burrard.
CRUISE, ROBERT—Dauphin.
CURRIE, JOHN ALISTER—Simcoe, N. Riding.

d'ANJOU, JOSEPH EMILE STANISLAS EMMANUEL—Rimouski.
DAVIDSON, AVARD LONGLEY—Digby and Annapolis.
DAVIS, FRED LANGDON—Neepawa.
DECHENE, AIME MIVILLE—Montmagny.
DELISLE, MICHEL SIMEON—Portneuf.
DEMERS, MARIE JOSEPH—St. Johns and Iberville.
DENIS, JEAN J.—Joliette.
DESAULNIERS, ARTHUR L.—Champlain.

DESLAURIERS, HERMAS—St. Mary.
DEVLIN, EMMANUEL B.—Wright.
DOHERTY, Hon. CHARLES JOSEPH—St. Ann.
DOUGLAS, JAMES McCRIE—Strathcona.
DOUGLAS, JOHN C.—Cape Breton South and Richmond.
DUFF, WILLIAM—Lunenburg.
DUTREMBLAY, PAMPHILE REAL—Laurier-Outremont.

EDWARDS, JOHN WESLEY—Frontenac.
ELKIN, STANLEY EDWARD—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
ETHIER, JOSEPH ARTHUR CALIXTE—Laval-Two Mountains.
EULER, WILLIAM D.—Waterloo, N. Riding.

FAFARD, J. FERNAND—L'Islet.
FIELDING, Hon. WILLIAM STEVENS—Shelburne and Queen's.
FINLEY, ALBERT ERNEST—Souris.
FONTAINE, JOSEPH ELOI—Hull.
FORTIER, HYACINTHE ADELARD—Labelle.
FOSTER, Rt. Hon. SIR GEORGE EULAS, G.C.M.G.—Toronto, N. Riding.
FOSTER, THOMAS—York, E. Riding.
FOURNIER, C. A.—Bellechasse.
FRASER, EVAN E.—Welland.
FRIPP, ALFRED ERNEST—Ottawa.
FULTON, FREDERICK JOHN—Cariboo.

GAUTHIER, LOUIS JOSEPH—St. Hyacinthe-Rouville
GAUVREAU, CHARLES ARTHUR—Temiscouata.
GERVAIS, THEODORE—Berthier.
GLADU, JOSEPH ERNEST OSCAR—Yamaska.
GLASS, SAMUEL FRANCIS—Middlesex, E. Riding.
GREEN, ROBERT FRANCIS—Kootenay, W. Riding.
GRIESBACH, WILLIAM ANTROBUS—Edmonton, W. Riding.
GUTHRIE, HON. HUGH—Wellington, S. Riding.

HALLADAY, HOWARD H.—Bow River.
HAROLD, JOHN—Brant.
HARRISON, CHARLES ROBERT—Nipissing.
HARTT, THOMAS A.—Charlotte.
HAY, THOMAS—Selkirk.
HENDERS, RICHARD COE—Macdonald.
HEPBURN, WILLIAM BERNARD RICKART—Prince Edward.
HOCKEN, HORATIO CLARENCE—Toronto, W. Riding.
HUGHES, Hon. SIR SAM, K.C.B.—Victoria.
HUNT, AYLMER BYRON—Compton.

JACOBS, SAMUEL WILLIAM—George Etienne Cartier.
JOHNSTON, J. FRED—Last Mountain.

KAY, WILLIAM FREDERIC—Missisquoi.
KEEFER, FRANCIS HENRY—Port Arthur and Kenora.
KEMP, Hon. SIR EDWARD, K.C.M.G.—Toronto East.
KENNEDY, WILLIAM COSTELLO—Essex, N. Riding.
KNOX, ANDREW—Prince Albert.
LAFORTUNE, DAVID ARTHUR—Jacques Cartier.

LALOR, FRANCIS RAMSEY—Haldimand.
LANCTOT, ROCH—Laprairie and Napierville.
LANG, NORMAN—Humboldt.
LAPOINTE, ERNEST—Kamouraska.
LAPOINTE, LOUIS AUDET—St. James.
LAVIGUEUR, HENRI E.—Quebec County.
LEDUC, J. ALFRED—Westmount-St. Henry
LEGER, AUGUSTE THEOPHILE—Kent (N.B.)
LEMIEUX, Hon. RODOLPHE—Maisonneuve, Gaspe.
LESAGE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Hochelaga.
LOGGIE, WILLIAMSTEWART—Northumberland (N.B)
LONG, CHARLES EDWIN—North Battleford.

MACKIE, HENRY ARTHUR—Edmonton, E. Riding.
MACKIE, HERBERT J.—Renfrew, N. Riding.
MACLEAN, Hon. A. K.—Halifax.
MACLEAN, WILLIAM FINDLAY—York, S. Riding.
MACNUTT, THOMAS—Saltcoats.
MCCOIG, ARCHIBALD BLAKE—Kent, (Ont.)
MCCREA, FRANCIS N.—Sherbrooke.
MCCURDY, FLEMING BLANCHARD—Colchester.
MCGIBBON, PETER—Muskoka.
MCGIBBON, PETER ROBT.—Argenteuil.
MCGREGOR, ALEXANDER—Pictou.
MCINTOSH, JOHN CHARLES—Nanaimo.
MCISAAC, JAMES—Kings, (P.E.I.)
MCKENZIE, DANIEL D.—Cape Breton North and Victoria.
MCLEAN, HUGH HAVELOCK—Royal.
MCLEOD, HARRY FULTON—York-Sunbury.
MCMASTER, ANDREW ROSS—Brome.
MCQUARRIE, WILLIAM GARLAND—New Westminster.
MAHARG, JOHN A.—Maple Creek.
MANION, ROBERT JAMES—Ft. William and Rainy River.
MARCIL, Hon. CHARLES—Bonaventure.
MARCILE, JOSEPH EDMOND—Bagot.
MARSHALL, DAVID—Elgin, E. Riding.
MARTIN, PETER FRANCIS—Halifax.
MAYRAND, HORMISDAS—Maskinonge.
MEIGHEN, Hon. ARTHUR—Portage la Prairie.
MERNER, JONATHAN JOSEPH—Huron, S. Riding.
MEWBURN, Hon. SYDNEY CHILTON—Hamilton, E. Riding.
MICHAUD, PIUS—Restigouche and Madawaska.
MIDDLEBRO, WILLIAM SORA—Grey, N. Riding.
MOLLOY, JOHN PATRICK—Provencher.
MORPHY, H. B.—Perth, N. Riding.
MOWAT, HERBERT MACDONALD—Parkdale.
MUNSON, CHARLES ARTHUR—Northumberland, (Ont.)
MURPHY, Hon. CHARLES—Russell.
MYERS, EDWARD THOMAS WORDON—Kindersley.

NESBITT, EDWARD WALTER—Oxford, N. Riding.
NICHOLSON, DONALD—Queen's, (P.E.I.)
NICHOLSON, GEORGE BRECKEN—Algoma, E. Riding.
NICKLE, WILLIAM FOLGER—Kingston.

PACAUD, LUCIEN TURCOTTE—Megantic.
PAPINEAU, LOUIS JOSEPH—Beauharnois.
PARDEE, FREDERICK FORSYTH—Lambton, W. Riding.
PARENT, GEORGE—Quebec, W. Riding.
PAUL, WILLIAM JAMES—Lennox and Addington.

PECK, CYRUS WESLEY—Skeena.
PEDLOW, ISAAC ELLIS—Renfrew, S. Riding.
PELLETIER, FRANCOIS JEAN—Matane.
PORTER, EDWARD GUSS—Hastings, W. Riding.
POWER, CHARLES GAVAN—Quebec, S. Riding.
PREVOST, JULES EDOUARD—Terrebonne.
PROULX, EDMOND—Prescott.

*READ, JOSEPH—Prince, P.E.I.
REDMAN, DANIEL LEE—Calgary, E. Riding.
REID, Hon. JOHN DOWSLEY—Grenville.
REID, JOHN FLAWS—Mackenzie.
RHODES, Hon. EDGAR N.—Cumberland.
RICHARDSON, ROBERT LORN—Springfield.
ROBB, JAMES ALEXANDER—Chateauguay-Huntingdon.
ROSS, DUNCAN CAMPBELL—Middlesex, W. Riding.
ROWELL, Hon. NEWTON WESLEY—Durham.
SAVARD, EDMOND—Chicoutimi-Saguenay.
SCOTT, FRANK STEWART—Waterloo, S. Riding.
SEGUIN, PAUL ARTHUR—L'Assomption-Montcalm.
SEXSMITH, JOHN ALBERT—Peterborough, E. Riding.
SHAW, HUGH MURRAY—Macleod.
SHEARD, CHARLES—Toronto, S. Riding.
SIFTON, Hon. ARTHUR LEWIS—Medicine Hat.
SIMPSON, THOMAS EDWARD—Algoma, W. Riding.
SINCLAIR, JOHN H.—Antigonish and Guysborough.
SINCLAIR, JOHN EWEN—Queen's, P.E.I.
SMITH, WILLIAM—Ontario, S. Riding.
SPINNEY, EDGAR KEITH—Yarmouth and Clare.
STACEY, FRANK BAINARD—†Westminster District.
STEELE, MICHAEL—Perth, S. Riding.
STEVENS, HENRY HERBERT—Vancouver, Centre.
STEWART, JOHN A.—Lanark.
STEWART, THOMAS JOSEPH—Hamilton, W. Riding.
SUTHERLAND, DONALD—Oxford, S. Riding.

THOMPSON, ALFRED—Yukon.
THOMPSON, RICHARD FREDERICK—Weyburn.
THOMPSON, THOMAS HENRY—Hastings, E. Riding.
THOMSON, LEVI—Qu'Appelle.
TOBIN, EDMUND WILLIAM—Richmond and Wolfe.
TOLMIE, SIMON FRASER—Victoria City.
TRAHAN, ARTHUR—Nicolet.
TREMAIN, HADLEY BROWN—Hants.
TRUAX, REUBEN E.—Bruce, S. Riding.
TUDHOPE, JAMES BROCKETT—Simcoe, E. Riding.
TURGEON, ONESIPHORE—Gloucester.
TWEEDIE, THOMAS MITCHELL MARCH—Calgary, W. Riding.

VERVILLE, ALPHONSE—St. Denis.
VIEN, THOMAS—Lotbiniere.

WALLACE, THOMAS GEORGE—York, W. Riding.
WHIDDEN, HOWARD PRIMROSE—Brandon.
WHITE, WILLIAM HENRY—Victoria, Alta.
WHITE, Hon. SIR THOMAS, K.C.M.G.—Leeds.
WIGMORE RUPERT WILSON—St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert.
WILSON, GORDON CROOKS—Wentworth.
WILSON, JAMES ROBERT—Saskatoon.
WRIGHT, H. O.—Battleford.

*Deceased, April 6.
†Name changed to Fraser Valley. See Index: Representation Act Amendment.

ALPHABETICAL LIST

OF THE

Constituencies of the House of Commons

Second Session—Thirteenth Parliament.

1919

ALGOMA, EAST—George Brecken Nicholson.
ALGOMA, WEST—Thomas Edward Simpson.
ANTIGONISH AND GUYSBOROUGH—John H. Sinclair.
ARGENTEUIL—P. Robert McGibbon.
ASSINIBOIA—

BAGOT—Joseph Edmond Marcile.
BATTLEFORD—Henry Oswald Wright.
BATTLE RIVER—William John Blair.
BEAUCE—Hon. Henri Sévérin Béland,
BEAUHARNOIS—Louis Joseph Papineau.
BELLECHASSE—C. A. Fournier.
BERTHIER—Theodore Gervais.
BONAVENTURE—Hon. Charles Marcil.
BOW RIVER—Howard Haden Halladay.
BRANDON—Howard Primrose Whidden.
BRANT—John Harold.
BRANTFORD—William Foster Cockshutt.
BROME—Andrew Ross McMaster.
BRUCE, NORTH—Hugh Clark.
BRUCE, SOUTH—Reuben E. Truax.
BURRARD—Sanford Johnston Crowe.

CALGARY, EAST—Daniel Lee Redman.
CALGARY, WEST—Thomas Mitchell March Tweedie
CAPE BRETON NORTH AND VICTORIA—Daniel D. McKenzie.
CAPE BRETON SOUTH AND RICHMOND—John C. Douglas, Robert H. Butts.
CARIBOO—Frederick John Fulton.
CARLETON—George Boyce.
CHAMBLY AND VERCHERES—Joseph Archambault.
CHAMPLAIN—Arthur L. Desaulniers.
CHARLEVOIX-MONTMORENCY—Pierre Francois Casgrain.
CHARLOTTE—Thomas A. Hartt.
CHATEAUGUAY-HUNTINGDON—James Alexander Robb.
CHICOUTIMI-SAGUENAY—Edmond Savard.
COLCHESTER—Fleming Blanchard McCurdy.
COMOX-ALBERNI—Herbert Sylvester Clements.
COMPTON—Aylmer Byron Hunt.
CUMBERLAND—Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes

DAUPHIN—Robert Cruise.
DIGBY AND ANNAPOLIS—Avard Longley Davidson.
DORCHESTER—Lucien Cannon.
DRUMMOND AND ARTHABASKA—Joseph Ovide Brouillard.
DUFFERIN—John Best.
DUNDAS—Orren D. Casselman.
DURHAM—Hon. Newton Wesley Rowell.

EDMONTON, EAST—Henry Arthur Mackie.
EDMONTON, WEST—William Antrobus Griesback.
ELGIN, E. RIDING—David Marshall.
ELGIN, W. RIDING—Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers.
ESSEX, N. RIDING—William Costello Kennedy.
ESSEX, S. RIDING—John Wesley Brien.

FORT WILLIAM AND RAINY RIVER—Robert James Manion.
FRONTENAC—John Wesley Edwards.

GASPE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
GEORGE ETIENNE CARTIER—Samuel William Jacobs.
GLENGARRY AND STORMONT—
GLOUCESTER—Onesiphore Turgeon.
GRENVILLE—Hon. John Dowsley Reid.
GREY, N. RIDING—William Sora Middlebro.
GREY, SOUTHEAST RIDING—Robert James Ball.
HALDIMAND—Francis Ramsay Lalor.
HALIFAX—Hon. A. K. Maclean, Peter Francis Martin.

HALTON—Robert King Anderson.
HAMILTON, E. RIDING—Hon. Sydney Chilton Mewburn.
HAMILTON, W. RIDING—Thomas Joseph Stewart.
HANTS—Hadley Brown Tremain.
HASTINGS, E. RIDING—Thomas Henry Thompson.
HASTINGS, W. RIDING—Edward Guss Porter.
HOCHELAGA—Joseph Edmond Lesage.
HULL—Joseph Eloi Fontaine.
HUMBOLDT—Norman Lang.
HURON, N. RIDING—James Bowman.
HURON, S. RIDING—Jonathan Joseph Merner.

INVERNESS—Alexander W. Chisholm.

JACQUES CARTIER—David Arthur Lafortune.
JOLIETTE—Jean J. Denis.

KAMOURASKA—Ernest Lapointe.
KENT, N.B.—Auguste T. Leger.
KENT, ONT.—Archibald Blake McCoig.
KINDERSLEY—Edward Thomas Wordon Myers.
KING'S, N.S.—Rt. Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, G.C.M.G.
KING'S, P.E.I.—James McIsaac.
KINGSTON—William Folger Nickle.
KOOTENAY, E. RIDING—Saul Bonnell.
KOOTENAY, W. RIDING—Robert Francis Green.

LABELLE—Hyacinthe Adelard Fortier.
LAMBTON, E. RIDING—Joseph Emmanuel Armstrong.
LAMBTON, W. RIDING—Frederick Forsyth Pardee.
LANARK—John A. Stewart.
LAPRAIRIE AND NAPIERVILLE—Roch Lanctôt.
L'ASSOMPTION-MONTCALM.—Paul Arthur Séguin.
LAST MOUNTAIN—John Frederick Johnston.
LAURIER-OUTREMONT—Pamphile Real Tremblay.
LAVAL-TWO MOUNTAINS—Joseph Arthur Calixte Ethier.
LEEDS—Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.
LENNOX AND ADDINGTON—William James Paul.
LETHBRIDGE—William Asbury Buchanan.
LEVIS—Joseph Boutin Bourassa.
LINCOLN—James Dew Chaplin.
LISGAR—Ferris Bolton.
L'ISLET—J. Fernand Fafard.
LONDON—Hume Cronyn.
LOTBINIERE—Thomas Vien.
LUNENBURG—William Duff.

MACDONALD—Richard Coe Henders.
MACKENZIE—John Flaws Reid.
MACLEOD—Hugh Murray Shaw.
MAISONNEUVE—Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux.
MAPLE CREEK—John Archibald Maharg.
MARÔUETTE—Hon. Thomas Alexander Crerar.
MASKINONGÉ—Hormidas Mayrand.
MATANE—François Jean Pelletier.
MEDICINE HAT—Hon. Arthur Lewis Sifton.
MEGANTIC—Lucien Turcotte Pacaud.
MIDDLESEX, E. RIDING—Samuel Francis Glass.
MIDDLESEX, W. RIDING—Duncan Campbell Ross.
MISSISQUOI—William Frederic Kay.
MONTMAGNY—Aimé Miville Déchène.
MOOSEJAW—Hon. James Alexander Calder.
MUSKOKA—Peter McGibbon.

NANAIMO—John Charles McIntosh.
NEEPAWA—Fred Langdon Davis.
NELSON—J. A. Campbell.
NEW WESTMINSTER—William Garland McQuarrie.
NICOLET—Arthur Trahan.
NIPISSING—Charles Robert Harrison.
NORFOLK—William Andrew Charlton.
NORTH BATTLEFORD—Charles Edwin Long.
NORTHUMBERLAND, N.B.—William S. Loggie.
NORTHUMBERLAND, ONT.—Charles Arthur Munson.

*Deceased, April 6.

ONTARIO, N. RIDING—
ONTARIO, S. RIDING—William Smith.
OTTAWA—Alfred Ernest Fripp, John Leo Chabot.
OXFORD, N. RIDING—Edward Walter Nesbitt.
OXFORD, S. RIDING—Donald Sutherland.

PARKDALE—Herbert Macdonald Mowat.
PARRY SOUND—James Arthurs.
PEEL—Samuel Charters.
PERTH, N. RIDING—Hugh Boulton Morphy.
PERTH, S. RIDING—Michael Steele.
PETERBOROUGH, E. RIDING—John Albert Sexsmith.
PETERBOROUGH, W. RIDING—John Hampden Burnham.
PICTOU—Alexander McGregor.
PONTIAC—Frank S. Cahill.
PORTAGE LA PRAIRIE—Hon. Arthur Meighen.
PORT ARTHUR AND KENORA—Francis Henry Keefer.
PORTNEUF—Michel Siméon Delisle.
PRESCOTT—Edmond Proulx.
PRINCE ALBERT—Andrew Knox.
PRINCE EDWARD—William Bernard Rickart Hepburn.
PRINCE, P.E.I.—*Joseph Read.

PROVENCHER—John Patrick Molloy.

QU'APPELLE—Levi Thomson.
QUEBEC COUNTY—Henri E. Lavigueur.
QUEBEC, EAST—
QUEBEC, SOUTH—Charles Gavan Power.
QUEBEC, WEST—George Parent.
QUEEN'S, P.E.I.—Donald Nicholson, John Ewen Sinclair.

RED DEER—Michael Clark.
REGINA—Walter Davy Cowan.
RENFREW, N. RIDING—Herbert John Mackie.
RENFREW, S. RIDING—Isaac Ellis Pedlow.
RESTIGOUCHE AND MADAWASKA—Pius Michaud.
RICHELIEU—Pierre Joseph Arthur Cardin.
RICHMOND AND WOLFE—Edmund William Tobin.
RIMOUSKI—Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel d'Anjou.
ROYAL—Hugh Havelock McLean.
RUSSELL—Hon. Charles Murphy.

ST. ANN—Hon. Charles Joseph Doherty.
ST. ANTOINE—Sir Herbert Brown Ames, Kt.
ST. DENIS—Alphonse Verville.
ST. HYACINTHE-ROUVILLE—Louis Joseph Gauthier.
ST. JAMES—Louis Audet Lapointe.
ST. JOHN CITY AND COUNTIES OF ST. JOHN AND ALBERT—Stanley Edward Elkin, Rupert Wilson Wigmore.
ST. JOHNS AND IBERVILLE—Marie Joseph Demers.
ST. LAWRENCE AND ST. GEORGE—Hon. Charles Colquhoun Ballantyne.
ST. MARY—Hermas Deslauriers.
SALTCOATS—Thomas MacNutt.
SASKATOON—James Robert Wilson.
SELKIRK—Thomas Hay.
SHEFFORD—George Henry Boivin.

SHELBURNE AND QUEEN'S—Hon. William Stevens Fielding.
SHERBROOKE—Francis N. McCrea.
SIMCOE, E. RIDING—James Brockett Tudhope.
SIMCOE, N. RIDING—John Allister Currie.
SIMCOE, S. RIDING—William Alves Boys.
SKEENA—Cyrus Wesley Peck.
SOURIS—Albert Ernest Finley.
SPRINGFIELD—Robert Lorne Richardson.
STANSTEAD—Willis Keith Baldwin.
STRATHCONA—James McCrie Douglas.
SWIFT CURRENT—Ira Eugene Argue.

TÉMISCOUATA—Charles Arthur Gauvreau.
TERREBONNE—Jules-Edouard Prevost.
THREE RIVERS AND ST. MAURICE—Jacques Bureau.
TIMISKAMING—Hon. Francis Cochrane.
TORONTO, CENTRE—Edmund Bristol.
TORONTO, EAST—Hon. Sir Edward Kemp, K.C.M.G.
TORONTO, NORTH—Rt. Hon. Sir George Eulas Foster, G.C.M.G.
TORONTO, SOUTH—Charles Sheard.
TORONTO, WEST—Horatio Clarence Hocken.

VANCOUVER, CENTRE—Henry Herbert Stevens.
VANCOUVER, SOUTH—Richard Clive Cooper.
VAUDREUIL-SOULANGES—Gustave Boyer.
VICTORIA, ALTA.—William Henry White.
VICTORIA, ONT.—Hon. Sir Sam Hughes, K.C.B.
VICTORIA AND CARLETON, N.B.—Hon. Frank Broadstreet Carvell.
VICTORIA CITY, B.C.—Simon Fraser Tolmie.

WATERLOO, N. RIDING—William D. Euler.
WATERLOO, S. RIDING—Frank Stewart Scott.
WELLAND—Evan E. Fraser.
WELLINGTON, N. RIDING—William Aurelius Clarke.
WELLINGTON, S. RIDING—Hon. Hugh Guthrie.
WENTWORTH—Gordon Crooks Wilson.
*WESTMINSTER DISTRICT—Frank B. Stacey.
WESTMORLAND—Arthur Bliss Copp.
WESTMOUNT-ST. HENRY—Joseph Alfred Leduc.
WEYBURN—Richard Frederick Thompson.
WINNIPEG, CENTRE—George William Andrews.
WINNIPEG, NORTH—Matthew Robert Blake.
WINNIPEG, SOUTH—George William Allan.
WRIGHT—Emmanuel B. Devlin.

YALE—Hon. Martin Burrell.
YAMASKA—Joseph Ernest Oscar Gladu.
YARMOUTH AND CLARE—Edgar Keith Spinney.
YORK, E. RIDING—Thomas Foster.
YORK, N. RIDING—John Alexander Macdonald Armstrong.
YORK, S. RIDING—William Findlay Maclean.
YORK, W. RIDING—Thomas George Wallace.
YORK-SUNBURY—Harry Fulton McLeod.
YUKON—Alfred Thompson.

*Name changed to Fraser Valley. See Index: Representation Act Amendment.

CANADA

House of Commons Debates

OFFICIAL REPORT

Thursday, February 20, 1919.

The Parliament which had been prorogued from time to time to the 20th day of February, 1919, met this day at Ottawa, for the dispatch of business.

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

Mr. Speaker read a communication from Lt.-Col. the Hon. Harold Henderson, Governor General's Secretary, announcing that His Excellency the Governor General would proceed to the Senate Chamber at 3 p.m. on this day, for the purpose of formally opening the session of the Dominion Parliament.

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

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

Accordingly the House went up to the Senate Chamber.

And the House being returned to the Commons Chamber:

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

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

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

Since the last session of Parliament events have transpired of the highest consequence to the Empire and to Canada. After withstanding with steadfast valour repeated assaults pressed with the utmost vigour and determination, the Allied Forces, taking the offensive in all theatres of action, advanced to decisive and overwhelming victory. Upon terms of practically unconditional surrender on the part of the enemy, armistices were arranged and are now in effect, under which extensive strategic territories have been evacuated, guns, munitions and other war material and supplies surrendered on a vast scale, and the greater part of the hostile fleets delivered up to the Allies. A Conference is now being held at Paris to determine the conditions upon which peace will be concluded. As the decisions of this Conference will be of vital importance to Canada as well as to other parts of the Empire, it is being attended by the Right Honourable the Prime Minister, accompanied by others of my advisers.

In the notable victories leading to the glorious issue accomplished by the arms of the Allies, none of the forces engaged bore a more valorous or heroic part than those of Canada, whose achievements throughout the entire war have won imperishable renown for their country. It is most gratifying to be able to state that, in the final and decisive stages of the mighty struggle, our divisions in the field were maintained at over-strength, and equipped in the highest degree with all the requirements of modern warfare. The appreciation and gratitude of the nation cannot be too earnestly and sincerely expressed to the gallant members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, whose sacrifices, sufferings and heroism have played so effectual a part in vindicating the cause of world-liberty and civilization.

Prior to the armistice, plans and preparations had been made for the return, demobilization and re-establishment in civil life, after the close of the war, of our soldiers with their dependents overseas. These are now in operation, and while this great undertaking presents, owing to after-war conditions, many difficulties and complications, it is confidently expected that it will be accomplished speedily and satisfactorily.

Immediately upon the conclusion of the armistice, which necessarily involved the cessation of operations in the manufacture of munitions and in other essential war industries, steps were taken by my advisers to facilitate the readjustment of business, and to provide employment. Orders in Council embodying the measures adopted will be laid before you without delay.

A Bill relating to the franchise, with such provisions as are necessary having regard to existing conditions, and providing among other things for effectually enabling women to vote, and conferring upon them the privilege of sitting in Parliament, will be submitted for your consideration.

Your attention will also be invited to Bills providing for aid in the construction of highways; for assisting returned soldiers in establishing themselves upon the land, and for promoting desirable immigration and farm settlement.

REVISED EDITION

Bills will also be submitted for the promotion of vocational education; for the creation of a Department of Public Health; for promoting better housing conditions throughout the Dominion by loans made for the purpose to the several Provincial Governments, and for the validation by Parliament of Orders in Council prohibiting the importation and manufacture of intoxicating beverages, and the transportation thereof into any community where their sale is contrary to law. Other necessary legislation dealing with matters, including pensions to soldiers and their dependents, now regulated by Orders in Council, will be laid before you. Further important measures, designed to promote the welfare and prosperity of the people in the new era of reconstruction, social as well as material, upon which the world has entered, will be recommended to your consideration.

After more than four years of war, and notwithstanding the sudden dislocation brought about by the armistice, Canada's industrial, commercial and financial stability has been well maintained. It is the expectation that in addition to business arising from the resumption of public and private undertakings in Canada which were suspended by the war, and needed improvements and betterments throughout the Dominion, Canada will obtain substantial participation in the expansion of export trade following the conclusion of the war, and the liberation of commerce from the restraints which have existed during its continuance. Steps have been taken by my advisers to promote and facilitate such participation.

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

The accounts of the last and the estimates for the next fiscal year will be submitted to you without delay, and you will be asked to make the necessary financial provision for meeting the remaining expenditures arising out of the war and connected with demobilization; also for the establishment of credits for the financing of purchases of our agricultural, industrial and other products.

Honourable Gentlemen of the Senate:

Gentlemen of the House of Commons:

It is appropriate that we should acknowledge our thankfulness to Divine Providence for the successful issue of the terrible struggle in which for so long a period our armies have been engaged, and for the restoration of peace to the world. Through the long conflict, with its dire vicissitudes and varying fortunes, our people never allowed themselves to doubt that victory would finally crown our cause, which was that of truth and justice. The deeply loyal and earnest co-operation of the Overseas Dominions and Dependencies with the Mother Country must more firmly cement for all time those ties which bind the Empire in indissoluble union. The spirit born of common sacrifice, suffering and heroic endeavour will also, it is confidently hoped, permanently unite the Allies by the bonds of a great memory and tradition, and effectually promote the formation of a League of Nations which will ensure for all time the peace of the world.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, it was ordered that the Speech of His Excellency the Governor General to both Houses of Parliament be taken into consideration on Tuesday next, and that this order have precedence over all other business except the introduction of Bills until disposed of.

[Mr. Speaker.]

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend from Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb) will give me the names of members on that side of the House for a special committee to select under Rule 10 the Select Standing Committees of this House, I will make the motion in that regard on Tuesday next.

Mr. ROBB: Certainly.

OATHS OF OFFICE.

Bill No. 1, respecting the Administration of Oaths of Office, introduced and read the first time.—Sir Thomas White.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

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

REPUBLIC OF COSTA RICA—CONGRATULATION ON TRIUMPH OF ALLIED ARMS.

Mr. Speaker submitted a communication conveying to the Clerk of the House of Commons a resolution adopted by the Constitutional Congress of the Republic of Costa Rica, setting forth the joy of the people of Cost Rica upon the termination of the war and the triumph of the Allied arms.

DEATH OF RIGHT HON. SIR WILFRID LAURIER, G.C.M.G.

A STATE FUNERAL ORDERED ON THE MOTION OF SIR THOMAS WHITE, ACTING PRIME MINISTER,

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, we meet today under the shadow of a great loss and a deep and widespread personal sorrow. The Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, senior member of this House, has passed away, and the entire nation mourns his death. It is my intention later to ask the adjournment of the House until Tuesday next, out of respect to and in honour of his memory. Upon that occasion opportunity will be afforded me and other members of the House who may so wish, to refer in terms more extended than would be fitting at this time to the sad event and to the long and illustrious career of the deceased statesman in the public life of Canada. In the meantime the Government, desirous of paying every appropriate mark of respect, has arranged, with the consent of the family, for a State funeral, which will take place on Saturday morning in accordance with the public announcement which has been made. From eight o'clock this evening the remains will lie in state in this Chamber, when all

will have the opportunity of looking upon his face for the last time.

Viewing his vacant desk, with its drapery of mourning, and bearing the floral tokens of affection, it is hard for us to realize that we shall never again see him rise in his place in this House, and that we shall hear his voice no more.

In order that the House may approve and participate in the action which the Government has taken, I beg to move:

That it be resolved that in the opinion of this House the mortal remains of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, G.C.M.G., should be publicly interred, and that this House will concur in giving to the ceremony a fitting degree of solemnity and importance.

Mr. JAMES ALEXANDER ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon, Chief Whip of the Opposition) Mr. Speaker: Having in mind that on Tuesday next opportunity will be given to pay tribute to the memory of our late distinguished leader, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I will leave until then and to others better qualified than I am to speak for this side of the House. Representing temporarily His Majesty's loyal Opposition, I desire to thank the Acting Prime Minister and the Government for their kindness and consideration. In every way the Government has manifested a desire to anticipate our wishes in honouring the memory of him who was our leader and, in the truest sense, our companion and our counsel.

In a few minutes all that remains of the honoured Liberal Chieftain and Canadian statesman will lie in this Chamber in state, honoured in death, as he was in life, by all classes and creeds of the Canadian nation. How appropriate at this moment are the words written on the occasion of the death of another distinguished British statesman:

Now is hushed the voice of party,
Grit and Tory both are one,
Joined to praise that wondrous statesman,
Now his noble work is done.

Motion of Sir Thomas White agreed to.

THE LATE LIEUT.-COL. SAM SHARPE, D.S.O.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, since the last session of Parliament another of our members has passed away. I refer to that gallant soldier, Lieut.-Col. Sam Sharpe, D.S.O. He was elected upon three successive occasions by the people of North Ontario as their representative in this House. Early in his career he had become connected with the Canadian militia and, when the war broke out, he was major of the 34th battalion. After experiencing some difficulty in qualifying as medically fit for active service, Major Sharpe undertook to raise the 116th First Ontario County regiment, with which he went overseas in July, 1916. He was deservedly popular with the rank and file as well as with his brother officers, for all of whom he displayed an almost fatherly regard. He served with great distinction at the front being mentioned in dispatches and winning the coveted Distinguished Service Order. In civil life he was held in high esteem among his associates at the Bar and a wide circle of private acquaintances. He was a member who took a valuable part in the discussions in this House and in the work of important committees. His public career was full of promise and I am sure that every member of this House will join in deploring his untimely death and offering assurance of our deep and cordial sympathy to the widow and other members of his family circle.

Mr. ROBB (Chief Whip of the Opposition): Temporarily representing, and speaking for, His Majesty's loyal Opposition, I desire to join in paying our tribute of respect to the memory of our deceased friend and colleague, the late Lieut.-Col. Sam Sharpe who as a member of this House had a host of friends. The late Col. Sharpe, as has been so well said by the hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) was a most useful member of this House, and one who was remarkable for the industry which he displayed in the performance of his parliamentary duties. Upon the outbreak of war, at the call of his country, he left these legislative halls, unsheathed his sword and went forth to do battle in the cause of freedom and justice.

We, upon this side, deplore his untimely end. We join with the Acting Prime Minister in the expression of admiration for his gallant conduct, and in offering our sympathy to Mrs. Sharpe and the members of his family.

WELCOME TO THE HON. DR. BELAND.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I have spoken of the losses sustained by the House in the death of two of its members. I now turn to the restoration to this House of a member long known and well liked. I refer to the hon. member for Beauce (Mr. Beland) formerly Postmaster General of Canada. We welcome him back almost as from the tomb; from the living death of

German imprisonment. He was made to bear, vicariously, the deep resentment borne by the Hun, on account of the notable part taken by Canada in the prosecution of this war.

Who, of all who knew him, in the session preceding the war; gentle, kindly, popular as he was with all the members of the House, could have imagined that fate had in store for him such strange adventures and such tragic experiences. The story of his visit to Belgium, of his internment as a political prisoner by the Germans and of the oppressive and calculatedly brutal treatment to which he was subjected is known to all the members of this House and, indeed, to all the people of Canada. I assure him that we greatly rejoiced at the news of his liberation, and wholeheartedly we welcome him back to his seat in this House.

Mr. ROBB (Chief Whip of the Opposition): Mr. Speaker, may we join with the Acting Prime Minister and his followers on the Government side of the House in offering a welcome home to our good friend, the hon. member for Beauce, formerly Postmaster General. His four years captivity in a German prison may have brought wrinkles to his brow and sorrow to his heart but the genial, kindly, Dr. Beland remains and we join with our friends opposite in welcoming him back to this House.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL TUESDAY NEXT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mr. Speaker, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Reid:

That when this House adjourns this day, it shall, out of respect to the memory of the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, stand adjourned till Tuesday next the 24th inst.

Motion agreed to.

DISMISSAL OF ELECTION PETITION.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that I have received from the Honourable Mr. Justice Walsh and the Honourable Mr. Justice Simmons, two of the Judges selected for the trial of Election Petitions, pursuant to "The Dominion Controverted Elections Act," a report relating to the Election for the Electoral District of Bow River, by which the said Election Petition was dismissed.

VACANCY.

Mr. SPEAKER: I have the honour to inform the House that, during the recess, I received a communication notifying me of a vacancy having occurred in the representation of Ontario North, by the decease of Samuel Simpson Sharpe, Esq.

I accordingly issued my warrant to the Clerk of the Crown in Chancery to make out a new Writ of Election for the said Electoral District.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 3.55 p.m.

Tuesday, February 25, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

DEPUTY SERJEANT-AT-ARMS.

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

INTERNAL ECONOMY COMMISSION.

Mr. SPEAKER: I beg to present a communication from His Excellency the Governor-General approving of a Minute of the Privy Council appointing Hon. Martin Burrell, Secretary of State; Hon. John Dowsley Reid, Minister of Railways and Canals; Hon. J. A. Calder, Minister of Immigration and Colonization; and Hon. A. L. Sifton, Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue, to act with the Speaker of the House of Commons as commissioners for the purpose, and under the provisions, of the eleventh chapter, Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, entitled, "An Act Respecting The House of Commons."

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

That a special committee be appointed to prepare and report with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House under Rule 10, said Committee to be composed of Messrs. Reid (Grenville), McKenzie, Carvell, Calder, Middlebro, McCoig and Robb, and that that portion of Rule 10 limiting the number of members of the said Committee be suspended in relation thereto.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION ACT (1914) AMENDMENT.

Mr. FRANK B. STACEY (Westminister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 2, to amend the Representation Act (1914).

He said: This is not a matter of very great national importance, but it is of considerable interest to British Columbia, and very greatly concerns one constituency in that province. When introducing this Bill a year ago I pointed out that considerable confusion had arisen owing to the title of the electoral constituency in question which it is proposed to change, which confusion still obtains. The purpose of the Bill is to change the name of the electoral district of Westminster to the electoral district of Fraser Valley. The change is eminently fitting, inasmuch as it is not only a geographical designation, but of historical significance.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY BELT ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Belt Act.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The purpose of this Bill is to carry into effect a principle that is already in operation as regards other Dominion lands, enabling the Crown to convey to a deceased entrant.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

YUKON ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 4, to amend the Yukon Act. He said: The first purpose of this Bill is to amend the Yukon Act by permitting the Yukon Council to consist of three instead of twelve members, thereby reducing the cost of administration. There are other clauses in the Bill of a minor character, but that is its main object.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

DEATH OF RIGHT HON. SIR WILFRID LAURIER, G.C.M.G.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker; I rise to refer to that sad occurrence, the sudden and lamented death of Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier which has cast a pall over the proceedings attending the opening of this session of Parliament, touched the hearts of all his fellow members, and created a profound and melancholy impression throughout the entire Canadian community. In years Sir Wilfrid Laurier had considerably exceeded the allotted span, yet such was the vigour of his mind, the animation of his appearance, the freshness of his interest in affairs, the charm and vivacity of his manner, and above all the great and conspicuous place which he had so long occupied in the minds and affections of his countrymen, that we had almost come to look upon him as immune from the vicissitudes of human infirmity, and, in a measure exempt from the conditions of our common mortality. For this reason the news of his departure has come with a sense of shock as well as of grief to all.

His death removes a most distinguished and commanding personality from the stage of Canadian public life. How considerable a part he played, we may realize when we reflect that he was actively engaged in national affairs at a period before many of us were born, that he was for almost half a century a legislative representative of the people, and for forty-five years a member of this House. He has been leader of the Liberal party for over thirty years, of which he was for fifteen years Prime Minister of Canada. During his long career he has been identified with all the great political controversies since the period of Confederation. His fame has carried far beyond the boundaries of Canada, and in Britain, France and United States, as well as in other countries, the name of Sir Wilfrid Laurier has long been known, respected and admired as one of the outstanding statesmen of the age.

With such a career, with such titles to distinction, we of this House, who, next to his own immediate family and intimate personal circle, knew him best, may well upon this occasion, with profit to ourselves and in appreciation of him, examine as to the nature of the political principles to which he subscribed, his characteristics as a statesman, the personal qualities and attributes of the man himself, and the sources of the great power and influence which he exercised within and without the halls of Parliament. I am deeply conscious that there are many within sound of my voice who through longer association and acquaintance with him are much better qualified for this task than myself. Particularly do I wish that the head of the Government, the Prime Minister of Canada, Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, could be here to bear eloquent tribute to his great political opponent and warm personal friend.

It is not my intention to refer to the various controversies in which Sir Wilfrid Laurier during his long career was so ac-

tively engaged. Those controversies divided and some of them still divide the people and public men of this country. That is the natural and inevitable result of opposing views, opinions and convictions strongly and honourably held in a self-governing community such as ours. It is not my purpose to attempt to pass judgment upon the attitude of the dead leader towards these great questions. Even if it would be fitting and proper to do so, which it is not, we are too close to the events to make any contemporary opinion conclusive. The ultimate place and fame of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, will, like that of other statesmen, be determined by the impartial and dispassionate judgment of history.

What were the foundations of this man's political creed, the principles which guided his political action? Without pretending to be exhaustive, two or three outstanding facts emerge. Firstly, the man was strongly attached and devoted to the ideals of freedom and liberty, personal, civil and religious. He believed in freedom of opinion, liberty in its expression,—that is to say, free speech, freedom of conscience—that is to say, religious liberty. That these were his views may be gathered not only from his own speeches but from the names of those whom he most admired, Fox, Gladstone, Bright, Lincoln. These names were often on his lips and he had diligently studied their careers and utterances.

From this starting point of attachment to these ideals of liberty and freedom, to which I think most in this country and all in this House now subscribe, he was led to greatly admire the British political system and the security and guarantees for liberty which it embodies and affords. Owing to the influences surrounding him in that troubled period Sir Wilfrid Laurier, then but a young man, appears not to have realized, at least in its fulness, the vision of Confederation. It is, however, to his great and lasting credit that once it was accomplished he accepted the new conditions with whole-heartedness, and in his subsequent career did much in collaboration with other political leaders to develop its structure, interpret its meaning and mould it to the purposes for which it was designed.

He became a strong Federationist, a great admirer, exponent and champion of the Confederation pact and no question interested him quite so much as one relating to or affecting the Constitution. He was a great constitutionalist, an ardent upholder of the principles of free government with all that it involves. As nearly all questions arising out of our constitution have long since been settled and acquiesced in by all political parties it seemed to me at times that in his character of constitutionalist and in his continued interest in the constitution he was the dignified and solitary survivor of that great group of statesmen, giants in their day, who after prolonged and fiery discussion and controversy laid broad and deep the constitutional foundation of Canada's national life. In this connection, and as again emphasizing the part played by Sir Wilfrid Laurier in Canadian affairs and the length of years spanned by his career, let us recall that he was minister in the government of Alexander Mackenzie, served as lieutenant to Edward Blake, succeeded him as leader of the Liberal party, and became the opponent of Sir John A. Macdonald, with whom he contended politically for many years.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier was an intense and ardent Canadian. He was a firm believer in Canada and its destiny, which he did much to mould. Particularly did he desire to harmonize the various nationalities of Canada with their conflicting ideals and aspirations. National unity he regarded as of paramount importance in a country of mixed races and diverse creeds such as Canada. He was regardful of the rights of minorities and a strong advocate of tolerance towards the opinions and convictions of others upon all questions whether civil racial or religious. He was a believer in democracy but there was always in him a moderating and restraining influence, a pragmatical respect for experience and for the past which disinclined him to sudden or violent change and exercised a steadying influence in the determination of his policies.

For the British constitution and for the autonomy, freedom and security which it affords to all within the range of its beneficent sway, he had the greatest regard and admiration. In my last conversation with him he spoke in terms of highest eulogy of British administration in Egypt and said that he would have no fear for the mandatory system proposed at the Peace Conference if it would be carried out in accordance with the British mode of government in protectorates.

I am glad that he lived to see the end of the war and the triumph of the Allies—particularly Britain and France.

Coming now to the man himself and the sources of his personal power, we find less difficulty in reaching conclusions. He was endowed by nature with a singularly graceful, picturesque and commanding personal-

ity, a stately bearing, a most gracious manner and rare charm of disposition. He had high intellectual culture and much personal kindliness of heart. The combination made him a great gentleman, whose distinction and individuality wrought an indelible impression upon all with whom he was brought in contact. While conciliatory and always a believer in persuasion rather than in compulsion he had a firm will and strong tenacity of his settled views, opinions and policies. This gave him strength which always of itself attracts. He had in marked degree that mystic quality, that innate attribute called personal magnetism or personality which is really the totality of excellences, physical, mental and moral, in its fortunate possessor.

His power of command over men was great. He was a natural leader because of his ascendency in the realm of intellect and of will. When all we can say has been said, there still remains an indefinable, elusive and baffling something which we cannot express, but which gave him an amazing power in attracting and retaining the affection and devotion of his followers and adherents. It was this which caused him to be likened in the minds of many to Sir John A. Macdonald, who had the same notable faculty in supreme degree.

A further and great source of his power lay in his extraordinary gifts as an orator. As a speaker either in the House or on the public platform he took the highest rank. His oratorical achievements were greatly promoted and enforced by his individual characteristics and qualities, for it is an undoubted fact that much of the success of speech depends upon personality.

His style was simple, direct, lucid. It had been modelled upon the best examples of English prose, and had been fashioned and moulded by his study of the classics, which is the best school for literary form. Some of his speeches in this House were notable illustrations of the supreme art of the orator. Those upon the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, the Rt. Hon. Mr. Gladstone and Her Majesty Queen Victoria are among the finest in the history of panegyrical literature.

In the House, where he was a most assiduous attendant and an eager listener, he was always courteous and considerate of the views of opponents and was by them all personally liked and respected.

Such, in most imperfect outline, was Sir Wilfrid Laurier and the principles and ideals for which he stood. He was idolized among the French Canadian portion of our population as their great exemplar and representative on the floor of Parliament and as Prime Minister of Canada for so long a period. They were naturally and justly proud of his high intellectual qualities and the force and strength of his character, his political sagacity and his success as a statesman. But apart from those of his own race he had devoted followers and admirers without number throughout the other provinces of Canada. His private life was simple and blameless, and he leaves behind him a career unsullied by self-seeking or love of gain. To state that he had defects, that he made mistakes at times, is only to say that he was human and what he himself would be the first to admit and acknowledge.

We mourn his loss. We feel that a great gap has been created in this House, that a powerful link with the past has been snapped and broken beyond repair. The spirit of the age has altered since the days when Sir Wilfrid Laurier was in his political prime. Times change and men change with them—in appearance, manner, methods, characteristics.

We desire to express our most heartfelt sympathy to that most worthy helpmate, the light of whose life has gone out in the loss of him who was for more than fifty years of happy wedded life her constant comrade as well as husband, counseller and protector. We pray that she may be granted strength to bear the heavy bereavement which has come upon her.

As for our dead friend and fellow member, he has joined the great majority, the unnumbered shadowy hosts of the dead. We shall see his face and hear his voice in these halls no more. He has left these scenes and these voices, and it will be indeed long before we shall look upon his like again.

His life was gentle; and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world: This was a man.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, the task that falls to my lot on this occasion is a very serious one and one that I fully realize my personal inability to fulfil as it ought to be fulfilled and discharged. Speaking for the moment on behalf of the gentlemen who sit on this side of the House, and speaking, as I believe, for the late Right Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier's personal friends and admirers throughout this Canada of ours, I wish in the first place, if I may be permitted, most sincerely to thank the Acting Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Thomas White) for the magnificent tribute which

he has paid to the great worth of the illustrious dead. The tribute is so full, so comprehensive, so complete, so just, that indeed very little is left to be added to it. It would rather spoil the effect of what has been said so well and moulded so completely to try to add very much to it. Nevertheless, Mr. Speaker, it comes home to me, as the desk-mate of our late revered leader, and for so many years his friend, that we should from this side of the House join with the hon. leader of the Government in saying something about our departed friend. I stand, Mr. Speaker, by the vacant chair, a chair that will never so worthily be filled in this House or in any other Canadian House within my lifetime and perhaps not within the lifetime of the youngest man here. The leadership of the Opposition and of the Liberal party will some day be filled, but it is no disparagement to whoever may fill that position to say that we have not the mould, nor the man to fill the place of the departed Chieftain of the Liberal party.

As to the love and affection which the people of this country had for him, may I remind you, Mr. Speaker, and my hon. friends, of that great pattern of human love that has been held out to us and which we used to read in our school books and in the Sacred Book itself about David and Jonathan of old; held out to us as the greatest human evidence of love between two men. When David and Jonathan were parting, Jonathan, his brother-in-law, took him fervently by the hand and said: David, I will never see your face again; we are parting now and forever; but to-morrow you will be missed, for your seat will be empty.

The great dead is missed in this House to-day, because his seat is empty and it can never be filled. His place in this House is empty, his place in his home is empty, but his memory shall never fade. We, as his friends, have reason to be thankful, and we are thankful, that his great worth has been appreciated by the people of Canada and presented to this House today in such a magnificent manner by the hon. gentleman who is leading the Government.

I am sorry that the duty of paying this tribute to the departed statesman has not fallen upon some one more capable than I. One cannot help thinking on an occasion of this kind of the masterly eulogies which our late leader has pronounced, and one is apt to say, with the poet: "O, for the touch of a vanished hand, and the sound of a voice that is still!"

The acting leader of the Government has pointed to the many things Sir Wilfrid Laurier has done for the development of this nation, and it is no disparagment to others to say that in bringing this country of ours up to the full measure of nationhood, in bringing it vividly to the attention of the Mother Country and of the home Government, in securing for it as a nation and as a dominion the high position we hold in the commercial and political world, none has done so much as Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Canada has risen to her rightful place as a nation within the great Empire to which we belong. The position which Sir Wilfrid Laurier took at the time of the diamond jubilee of her late Majesty Queen Victoria, and again at the coronation of King Edward VII and of King George V and at the various imperial conferences of the great statesmen of the Empire, did more to bring Canada before the world and to secure for us the position which we now occupy than anything hitherto done by any other Canadian. We have therefore much to be thankful for, both for his life, and for the memories he has left behind not only in Canada but throughout the Empire.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier rose to the very highest position in the gift of the people of this country. As he had often himself said, he was a democrat to the hilt. He was capable of realizing and anticipating every feeling of the people, and almost of every individual in the community, for he had gone through the various stages of life within Canada, and he could see what was necessary for the true welfare of his native land, of which he was so proud. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I repeat, occupied the very highest position in the gift of this country, and I submit that had he lived in any other country of the civilized world he would have occupied a similarly high position. Had he lived in the great republic to the south, with its hundred millions of people, he would have shared in the hearts of the people of that country a place with Washington, Lincoln and Grant. Had he lived in France, the home of his ancestors, I submit that he would have been President of France. Had he lived in our own beloved Mother Country of Great Britain and Ireland, I have no doubt, and I have often heard said, that he would have occupied a similar position to that held by Lord Chatham, John Bright, Gladstone and Disraeli. It has often been stated by men in this Chamber, and not by those in sympathy with him politically, that if Sir Wilfrid

Laurier had lived in Great Britain, nothing could have prevented him from becoming its Prime Minister. So we have reason to believe that his talents, although afforded plenty of scope in Canada, did not reach the full limit of their possibilities here, and that he was fully capable of performing higher and more exacting duties if fate had placed those duties as his task.

I think it is sometimes justifiable to use the language of others when it exactly expresses one's own sentiments, and what I am about to quote I would adopt as the language of this side of the House as well as adopting the sentiments so ably expressed by the Minister of Finance. This newspaper was not a supporter of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and therefore I quote from it with the greater freedom. It says:

Another Link with the Glorious Days of Canada's Making is Broken by Laurier's Death.

In the passing of Sir Wilfrid Laurier yet another link with the spacious days of Canada's making has gone. There are great names in Canadian history—Baldwin and LaFontaine, Brown, Galt and Tupper, Blake, Macdonald and Laurier, and rightly indeed does the London Daily Chronicle, in its tribute to the dead statesman, say:—

"Laurier's name will be permanently associated with some of the most important phases in the development of the British Commonwealth. Not only will Canada always rank him among the great builders of her nationhood, but he will hold his niche in the temple of world history."

Apart altogether from the political views which he held, and advocated, the testimony is universal that Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the truest sense was a great man. He belonged to the Empire, and for many years he was the most considerable figure in Greater Britain. A French Canadian with unquestioned devotion to that race and its traditions, he yet accepted as his task the establishment of a better understanding and a closer union of the two races of the Dominion, and though it was a task which has not yet been completed, Sir Wilfrid had the satisfaction of achieving a marked advance. No need of Canada has been greater and none has lain nearer to the statesman's heart than the removal of discord between the different races and tongues and creeds which comprise the Canadian Confederacy. To have attempted a task of such magnitude and hedged with tremendous and critical difficulties, is in itself an eloquent testimony to his essential greatness.

Former political opponents are one to-day in voicing their ungrudging admiration and unqualified recognition of his undoubtedly great gifts. Though not blind to his political failings and to views which they believed to be detrimental to Canada's truest welfare, yet as one man they express the highest regard for Sir Wilfrid's strict personal probity, his untarnished character and the years of strenuous and devoted service to the Dominion.

As an orator Sir Wilfrid Laurier occupied a unique position. As one writer in the English press has said—'He was gifted with unusual personal advantages. His appearance alone was worth a handsome fortune. His figure, lithe and straight as a larch; his face unwrinkled; his glance clear and searching, made up a personality that wielded a strange fascination for his hearers. He spoke as well in English as he did in French—his mother-tongue. Among the many gems of Sir Wilfrid's oratory, the following, delivered in Paris in 1897, is considered one of his finest utterances—a speech touched with a prophetic fire:

The citation from the speech referred to by this writer, I quote:

"It may be that here in France the memories of the ancient struggles between France and England have lost nothing of their bitterness, but as for us, Canadians of whatever origin, the days we hold glorious are the days when the the colours of France and of England, the tricolour and the Cross of St. George, waved together in triumph on the banks of Alma, the heights of Inkerman, the ramparts of Sebastopol. Times change; other alliances are made, but may it be permitted to a son of France, who is at the same time a British subject, to salute those glorious days with a regret which will perhaps find an echo in every generous mind on either side of the Channel."

This quotation which I have taken the liberty to read, conveys to you, Sir, and to the House, my own views, and perhaps puts them better and more concisely than I myself could. Let me conclude by saying that we appreciate what has been done in the country, and what is now being done, to honour the memory of the great departed chieftain. We acknowledge, with thankfulness, what has been done by the Government in honoring his mortal remains, and we are thankful for the tribute that has been paid to his memory by the leader of the Government to-day. We on this side of the House, and his friends generally, particularly those of his own party, might say, as has been said by a wise man of old, " Our Father, our Father, the chariots of liberalism and the horsemen thereof," and may I say, with one of old, to my friends and the public at large, " Know ye not that this day there has fallen in Canada a prince and a great man."

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve and Gaspé): Mr. Speaker, the Shadow of Death has stalked through this Chamber; a chair stands vacant. As we gaze upon the flowers strewn about us, which, by the morrow, will have withered away, more deeply than ever do we understand the baffling brevity of this life's span, the specious vanity of each and every thing. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is no more.

The mellow voice which for so long enthralled this assembly and stirred the enthusiasm of all who heard it, is silent.

The trumpet's silver voice is still
The warder silent on the hill.

The last survivor of a great generation, he whose imposing stature, whose eagle eye and whose white plume recalled those noblemen of the eighteenth century, such as we meet them still in medallions of olden times, is sleeping his last sleep.

An illustrious ancestor has passed away. Let us incline our heads with respect in the presence of this grave: its closing writes 'finis' to a whole epoch of our history.

Death is a law and not a punishment. No one better understood this profound truth than the eminent statesman whose loss we mourn. He had long since made his preparations for the voyage from Time into Eternity. Without bitterness the old gladiator saw himself disarmed as he was about to descend once more into the arena. His spirit passed gently, serenely, as though 'midst the darkening shadows of life's falling night the Faith of his forefathers had already revealed the gleam of dawn, presage of Eternal Day.

Speaking here in the name of my colleagues of the old French province who counted him her most distinguished son, and whose idol he became, it does the heart good to recall that throughout his entire career he was ever faithful to his origin and to the finest traditions of his race.

"I love," he was wont to say, "I love France who gave us birth, I love England who gave us liberty, but the first place in my heart belongs to Canada, my country, my native land."

This striking formula was, if I may speak thus, the Ideal, the Polar Star which guided his public life. Affectionate gratitude towards the nation, resplendent among all nations—whose sons we have the honour to be— the splendour of whose glory lights up the highest summits; unswerving loyalty towards that great and generous nation who inherited the administrative genius of the Romans and of whom Tennyson could say that hers was the classic land of liberty. But, first and foremost, Laurier was a Canadian. To his French inheritance he owed his golden tongue, his keen intellectual vision, the boldness and the grandeur of his conceptions. To his contact with the great English school, the school of Burke, Fox, Pitt, O'Connell, Gladstone, he owed his deep practical knowledge of British institutions and it may be said without exaggeration that it was by assimilating the teachings of these parliamentary leaders that Sir Wilfrid Laurier made for himself a lasting niche in the Hall of Fame.

At the time when he stepped through the threshold of Parliament, the memory of the great Papineau still hovered over the country. And the image of Lafontaine, whose profound wisdom had saved many rights from the wreckage of a storm-tossed sea, was becoming greater as time went by.

In those days Cartier and Dorion represented the two different channels of opinion in our province. The one, dashing, impetuous, disdained all obstacles; the other, calm, of proverbial integrity, possessing a mind of very high attainments, trusted to time to dispel hoary prejudice. If it be true that, in a certain way, Laurier was the disciple of Dorion, events made him the fortunate successor, rather the direct heir, of Lafontaine's policy—the policy which strives to soothe all hurts, the better to build on a solid foundation; the policy of conciliation for the sake of unity; the policy of the golden mean; the best, the true, the sole policy which can obtain in our country.

Sprung from a vanquished people, but a people who, in their turn had themselves made the conquest of Liberty, his dream was to unite the two races on the only rational basis: equality of rights, mutual respect and tolerance. His political vision moved him to seal anew the pact entered into by Lafontaine and Baldwin in days gone by and so bring fresh strength to the work of the Fathers of Confederation.

Was this majestic vision too ambitious? History, that impartial judge of men and events, will say whether or not he brought it to realization, but what we of his time may uphold from this moment is his untiring perseverance, his steadfast courage, his invincible faith in the ideal he set out to attain from the very start of his career. However, he was too well versed in psychology not to realize the difficulties which beset his path.

In 1887, hardly a year after that historical debate when, at one flight, he had risen to the greatest heights of parliamentary eloquence, when the English-speaking press had acclaimed him as the "silver-tongued orator," the Liberal party, helpless after the retirement of Edward Blake, was casting about for a leader. The French Liberals formed a minority in this party, as they formed a minority in the country. Let it be said to the honour of the English Liberals, it was Edward Blake, it was Sir Richard Cartwright, it was David Mills, who selected the leader, and the unanimous choice fell upon Wilfrid Laurier. What was the answer of the young member for Quebec East? Ah, Mr. Speaker, our great countryman, despite his marvellous endowments, did not covet the honour

offered him. He well knew the burden he was assuming; already he could catch a glimpse of the obstacles which lay in wait for him, and the answer of this man who, beneath a stolid exterior hid very deep emotions, his answer was a sob.

Thus, unable to escape the earnest entreaties of his English-speaking friends, he undertook to lead the Liberal party, determined to steer the ship of state towards progress and liberty, to bind together, by conciliation in both word and deed, the heterogeneous elements which go to make up Canada. He had often said that the national sentiment of a country is worth no more than the pride which it inspires in its sons. He knew this country was overflowing with strength and vigour, full of activity, of ambition.

He loved its distant childhood; its history, every page of which he knew; its legends; its fertile, majestic natural beauty; he loved this country especially for its ethnic duality which showed him the children of the two greatest races of Europe, henceforth fellow-wayfarers towards a common destiny in the boundless spaces of the New World.

By healing the wounds of days gone by and rallying all for the development of our immense resources, he opened a new era, he anticipated the day when he could declare in the presence of his Sovereign: "Sir, Canada is a nation. The nineteenth century belonged to the United States; but the twentieth century will witness the expansion of Canada."

The 23rd of June, 1896, was a memorable date in our political annals. The member for Quebec East had just been borne into power by a majority of the electorate. He became Prime Minister of a Dominion which had been guided by the genius of Macdonald. The old Tory chieftain had passed from the stage some five years before and the memory of his bewitching magnetism bordered on the legendary. People anxiously wondered if the orator from Quebec would reveal himself a statesman of sterling worth. Would he have the necessary firmness? Could he grapple with our intricate problems? Would he prove himself an experienced helmsman and steer the ship safely through shallow shoals, flinging into the teeth of the gale, to ride at anchor in the port beyond? My answer to all these apprehensions, already distant and, mayhap, forgotten, is that which John Morley made, one day, regarding Gladstone. The occasion was the unveiling of the statue erected in honour of the Grand Old Man, but a step or two from Lincoln's Inn. "The stalwarts of finance, of the city, looked with misgiving upon the idealism of Gladstone and smiled at his supposed incompetence in matters of money and business. I wonder added Morley—and I still see him, his finger pointing to the monument—I wonder, whether after Gladstone's long and brilliant career, the Bank of England itself would not feel honoured by the presence and strengthened by the counsel of the orator?"

As I have just said, it is only in the cold, calm light of impartial history that the part played by men in the great events of their time, can be duly appreciated. But I think I am within the mark in stating now that in Laurier's optimism, in his power of assimilation, in his incessant and untiring toil, in his boundless faith in the future of our country, may be seen and reflected the powerful impulsion given to Canada from 1896 to 1911, her wonderful ascent towards economic progress, her marvellous development. How often have I not heard him whenever grappling with some difficult problem repeating the lines penned by André Chénier, the great French poet:

"L'illusion féconde habite dans mon sein,
J'ai les ailes de l'espérance!"
"In my bosom dwells fruitful Illusion
On the wings of hope I soar!"

He had to the fullest extent mastered the sense of the Constitution; he had an insight into its jurisprudence and genius, and he loved it.

He ever advocated adherence to the federal pact, in its integrity. To his mind, any change, any departure or new orientation involved a danger. He was an apostle of Autonomy, like Blake and Mowat.

His political creed borrowed its inspiration from British liberalism. He believed in progress grounded on order; he believed in the advent of democracy through evolution, not through revolution, but never did he allow himself to be carried away by his love of liberty beyond those two limits laid down by conscience and human reason, that is to say, rights and duties.

From a national standpoint, none of the two great ethnical elements of the country was to predominate or to be domineered. Equal justice, equal rights for all such, was his motto. He deprecated isolation, because as he said, for an ethnical group to isolate itself is tantamount to stagnating in inferiority. Let me add that he always advocated harmonious relations between religions and liberty, by means of a loyal alliance. In a country like ours so hard to govern, and owing to the fact that the

opinions and creeds of the various ethnical groups have to be taken into consideration—a policy of exclusiveness is not properly speaking, a policy, but a blunder which must prove fatal to minorities. Love of justice and of freedom, tolerance, loyalty grounded upon autonomy, patriotism, such his ideals. And with what mastery did he expound them! Those who will read his speeches in which the scholar always controls the tribune, checks his outbursts, chastens his language, will no doubt find in them the lustre of fancy coupled with the magic of style but they will first of all discover loftiness of thought combined with an unerring judgment, and the intuition of the right course to steer through the windings of Canadian politics. And this constitutes a lofty ideal, and it was this ideal which fashioned Laurier into the great Canadian that he was. But in appreciating his career, it is on his firm and dignified attitude in the relations of Canada and the Mother Country that our attention must be focussed.

None more than Laurier admired the majestic institutions of the British Empire, where liberty wrought this miracle of a Gavan Duffy, a Wilfrid Laurier, a Louis Botha, respectively governing Australia, Canada, Africa, with intense loyalty and devotedness to the interests of the Crown.

In this connection may I be allowed to add that after the Transvaal war, Sir Wilfrid Laurier was consulted in turn by Campbell Bannerman and by General Botha as to the contemplated South African Union and that both these statesmen benefited by his vast experience. I shall never forget the words uttered in my presence at Cape Town, in November, 1910, by the Boer General: "In South Africa, two names are particularly dear to us, that of Campbell-Bannerman and that of Wilfrid Laurier. To those two men we owe an eternal debt of gratitude."

At the several Imperial conferences which he attended—and we all know what a brilliant role he played in them—Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whose fiscal policy had tickled the pride of the Mother Country, had nevertheless to withstand the new wave which was just then beginning to roll from London into the Dominions. This brilliant dream of a vast Empire, whose centre of action would be Westminster, could, forsooth, seduce the leaders of British politics, but Laurier was a Canadian first and last. Our country having disentangled itself from the bonds of Colonialism, had gradually conquered its political freedom, through the extension of the principle of autonomy. Knowing the exact extent of our rights and duties, he boldly and sincerely proclaimed the principle of Imperial unity based upon local liberties.

That virile attitude was to him, no doubt, the source of disappointments. But the old Premier was too much of a philosopher not to realize that impulses cannot play the part of reason, and that popularity is a poor substitute for arguments.

Were I called upon to define the outstanding qualities of Sir Wilfrid Laurier as a statesman, I would say that his moderation was a driving power in itself, his gift of expression a shining light, and that, with this master of oratory, sound judgment and common sense, outweighed his very eloquence.

His worthy manner of living, his thorough honesty, his perfect equanimity through the worst ordeals, his devouring intellectual activity, his unimpeachable righteousness, his home life imbued with such charm and beauty, his loyalty to friends, his discreet charity, but, above all, his eloquence exerted in behalf of the downtrodden, all these recall in many respects some distinctive characteristics of Gladstone and Lincoln.

We shall no longer have before our eyes those refined and aristocratic features of Laurier, whose most amiable smile went to the plebian, the needy, the humble, the lowly and the feeble; but his memory made immortal in works of bronze and marble will pass on to coming generations as one of the greatest embodiments of virtue in public and private life, as one of the finest products of human-kind in the last century.

We, his followers, his admirers, find solace in the thought that he died in the way he had wished to die. As the Norman knights of old, it was clothed in his armour that he appeared before the Supreme Judge. Death, the soother of all suffering, was to him like the declining hours of a beautiful day.

Before closing his eyes to things terrestrial, he had the supreme joy of seeing the Allies victorious. Enamoured of freedom and justice, he witnessed the downfall in Europe of autocracy and its instrument, militarism, and the founding on their ruins of the League of Nations.

As of yore at Inkerman and at Sebastopol, he saw our two great mother countries clasping hands and joining their forces on the battle-field, and our sons rushing with a light heart to meet together a glorious

death and take their full share of sacrifice and victory.

Yes, he was granted that supreme consolation of seeing France, France which was branded as frivolous, because she was cheerful, standing before the whole world as an example of endurance and fortitude, and show herself to the oppressed what she had ever been, the shield of civilization, the champion of right. He beheld England, that country deemed cold and self-seeking, set out all her sails, spend lavishly of her wealth, call to arms all her children to rescue the world from oppression.

The alliance of these two great powers, sealed by the purest of blood, was especially dear to his heart. To him it appeared like the rainbow which breaks through the clouds, and which is described in the Holy Writ as a messenger of peace, a presage of better days to all men of good will.

Oh Laurier! should there remain something to be done towards the fulfilment of that triumph of harmony and good will which you have so persistently striven to bring about, then those younger Canadians whose teacher you were will in turn take up the work and carry it to its full completion. They will pride themselves in following in your footsteps along the rugged and endless path of duty which you have opened and pointed out to them.

And now, with this last farewell, allow us to mingle the expression of our deep sense of gratitude. We are thankful to you, Laurier, for having ever remained worthy of the part entrusted to you by Providence, since from the palaces of our sovereigns and from the most humble farm house, from the towering cathedral as well as from the smallest country church, there ascends towards heaven the same hymn of gratitude.

We say Farewell and we thank you. We thank you for having thus gathered around you your own people, the descendants of those Canadians of old, the last to give up the fight in that last battle, who, with souls anguished by defeat, escorted the Marquis of Montcalm from the gates of Old Quebec to the Château Saint-Louis, on the night following the battle on the Plains of Abraham. We thank you for having lifted them up to you and invited them to share your glory.

We say Farewell and we thank you. We thank you for the shining memento which you bequeathed to the historian at large. Its brilliancy will not fade. It will be a guiding light which the tempest-beaten mariner will look to. It will be as a pillar of fire which will guide, on their march towards the promised land of a better Dominion, all sections of the Canadian people, reconciled at last to one another and linked together by the bonds of an "Union sacrée."

Farewell. Close to your resting place, amid maples and poplars, adorned by the coming spring with luxuriant foliage, we shall, many of us, congregate to pray in the tongue of your ancestors. The field wherein you lie, whose tender embrace you received, will be light to you. For it is part of that native land whose history is three centuries old and whose motherly womb will some day cover our meanness with its vastness and shroud our nothingness with its perennity. Adieu!

THE GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY MOVED BY MR. REDMAN, SECONDED BY MR. MANION.

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

Mr. DANIEL LEE REDMAN (Calgary East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to move the address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I wish to tender to the Honourable, the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), my humble thanks for the honour which he has conferred upon me and upon the constituency which I have the honour to represent, a constituency which, in enlistment and other war efforts, has made an enviable record. I had the honour to serve for a short period in a small way in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, I have been for some time in association with returned soldiers and their organizations, and I have no doubt that, in choosing me to move this important address, the Government wished to do honour to our soldiers generally. In their behalf, if it is not presumption on my part to speak for those splendid Canadians, I wish to express gratitude and appreciation.

I can assure you, Sir, that I enter upon this task with a keen sense of my temerity, and I ask for the kind indulgence of you, Sir, and of this House, in listening to the brief remarks which I intend to make. Great honour has been conferred on this Dominion in giving to us as our Governor General the head of a House which, for centuries, has taken a leading part in ruling our great empire.

His Excellency, the Duke of Devonshire, can be well assured of the high estimation in which he is held by the Canadian people, and of their deep appreciation of the painstaking and able manner in which he performs the arduous and important duties which devolve upon him.

I must pause here, as indeed this nation has paused, to pay my humble tribute to the great man who has died. I can add very little to the eloquent tributes which have been paid by honourable members on both sides of the House. As a new member of this House, I consider it a very great privilege to have witnessed the closing years of his great and illustrious career. His memory will always remain as an inspiration to those who love Canada.

In each of the last four years Parliament has been opened under the cloud of a great war. A war entailing enormous effort, unlimited sacrifice and great sorrow, and requiring the undivided attention of the nation to the exclusion of all other national problems.

To-day, the cloud has lifted and we stand on the threshold of an assured and, I believe, a lasting era of peace. Our great epoch of struggle and sacrifice is ended. A glorious, a victorious peace has crowned the efforts of our Empire and its allies. The armistice has been signed on our own terms. The enemy is utterly demoralized. The menace of militarism and autocracy has been crushed, we trust forever, and democracy and representative institutions have been preserved to humanity.

The British empire, of which Canada has the increasing honour of being an important member, has played an outstanding part in this war. Her matchless navy made victory a certainty. The splendid tenacity of her army made defeat an impossibility. Her lofty aims and unbending adherence to the principles of fair play and international justice attracted numerous nations to the side of the allies.

The British Empire has been preserved to itself and to humanity. Hundreds of millions of human beings are assured that they may continue to live safely under its beneficent laws. Its ideals, its institutions, have been preserved, and will continue for the good of the world, we hope, for many centuries to come.

The co-operation of the British Empire and the United States of America in this war should result in the happiest relations between these two great Anglo-Saxon nations—relations which shall not only be beneficial to these two nations, but which should enable them, acting in unison, to exert an excellent influence in world affairs.

Representatives of each of the Allies are now assembled at Paris to settle the immediate differences between all belligerents, and to plan, as far as may be possible, to make war impossible in the future. Great conferences have been held in the past with these two objects in view, notably the Assembly at Vienna in 1814-15, and the Conference at Berlin in 1878. But progress has been made since those memorable days. The right of peoples to choose their own form of Government has been recognized. The horror of war is greater to-day than ever in the past. This Conference is attempting to settle the differences of nations on such a basis as will remove possible causes of war, and it regards the prevention of future wars as its most important problem. This Dominion has been recognized as a nation entitled as such to representation in any league of nations which may be formed. The presence of the right honourable the Prime Minister of Canada, Sir Robert Borden, with several of his ministers at this conference is most fitting, having regard to the great sacrifice which the Canadian people made in the war, and Canada's international duty as a nation among the nations of the world. The Prime Minister has distinguished himself at that conference. He has been entrusted with important and difficult work, and he is reflecting great honour on this Dominion.

The people of Canada may, now that the tremendous burden of effort and sacrifice, imposed on them by the war, has been removed, pause to review with pride the excellent record which they have made under the leadership of the Prime Minister and his cabinet. Only through untiring efforts and sacrifice can the character of an individual or a nation be strengthened and achieve greatness. Canada, in this war, has made and proven itself a great nation. The achievements and sacrifices of its soldiers and sailors have, and of right do, overshadow all its other efforts. Over 600,000 of its manhood enrolled in its service; over 200,000 casualties have been sustained; over 55,000 have given up their lives in its behalf. Canada has raised for war purposes, from its own people, under the able direction of the Minister of Finance, in excess of the fabulous sum of $1,300,000,000. Canada has manufactured and sold to the Allies over one billion dollars worth of munitions, being in excess of one-fourth of all the munitions used by Great Britain and the

United States in the war. Agricultural products of enormous values have been sold to the Allies. Its business and economic fabric is stronger and on a larger scale than ever before in its history. Its people generally during the period of the war submerged petty prejudices, personal ambition and their own convenience, and devoted their energies to war work, notably in connection with Red Cross, Patriotic Fund and kindred efforts. The women of Canada bore a great and inspiring part in the struggle. The stoical patriotism with which they sent their sons to war; the suspense and bereavements which they suffered, the splendid influence which they exercised over our soldiers cannot be too highly commended. They took the places in business of thousands of men who went overseas and added to our economic capacity.

5 pm.

But our main inspiration was given by our soldiers overseas. How nobly have they upheld our honour thousands of miles across the sea; their discipline, their resource, their initiative, their irresistible dash in attack, their stubborn tenacity against heavy odds, has made Canada a name to conjure with. Not only have they upheld our traditions but, far surpassing them, they have established for us new and loftier standards; new and more illustrious traditions. They have made a magnificent reputation for our country on those hard-fought fields where, before the eyes of all the world, manhood is tested and reputations are irrevocably lost or made to endure throughout eternity. Those who risked all, and especially that 55,000 who gave all, have left us a great heritage, but have also left us great responsibilities and great duties. Let us, as Canadians, now look well to the duties which lie immediately before us so that we may not be untrue to those who have sacrificed so much for this country, and so that the principles and ideals for which they died may become actual institutions in this country, to be enjoyed by the people of Canada and posterity, for whom we, at this crisis, are trustees.

But while it is pleasant to pause and reflect upon the achievements of the last four years, so pressing and so vital are the problems which immediately confront us that we must face them now and devote to them all the ingenuity and concentration which we possess, looking backward only for the purpose of obtaining inspiration. And surely the adaptability and ingenuity shown, and the success achieved, by our soldiers, our statesmen, our manufacturers, our workmen, our farmers and our people generally during the period of the war should make us confident of successfully solving them. Let us then undertake these problems patriotically and unselfishly, inspired by the lessons of sacrifice which we have received from our army overseas.

During the war we had the stimulus of a common enemy, the excitement and the fever of battle. This has now been removed. In order to attain the concentration and efficiency the present situation demands, we must have something to take its place. What is undoubtedly required is a high sense of patriotism, a strong concept of public duty and responsibility on the part of all our people, and such a desire to work for the common good as shall overshadow all party prejudice, all class struggles, all personal selfishness and unworthy personal motives. Consider the example which has been given us by our army overseas. There a Conservative was supported by a Liberal,—a millionaire stood side by side with a labourer; there were no class distinctions no party differences; each was willing to sacrifice himself for the other; all were willing to sacrifice themselves for Canada. The problems before us to-day are equally great and vital. Let us face them confidently, strengthened by our economic success during the war, and unselfishly inspired by the splendid traditions given us by our Army.

The Government has had the problems of reconstruction under its consideration for many months. The uncertainty of the date of peace has added to the difficulty of the work. I venture to say, however, that no country was better prepared to meet these problems than Canada.

It is gratifying to note that the Government intends to present a bill to establish a department of Public Health. It is essential that we should preserve and foster our greatest resource, the vital energy of our people, which nature, by the vigour of our beneficent climate, gives them in such abundance. During the recent great struggle there has been a greater mortality among children in Canada from purely preventible diseases than the number of our casualties in the war which enables us to appreciate the necessity of legislation of this character.

The proposed Better Housing Bill will be acceptable to the entire country. Anyone who has wandered through the tenements of great cities cannot fail to be impressed with the absolute necessity of government assistance and supervision. Happily in this new country we are able

to institute this measure more in the nature of a preventative for the future, than as a corrective of present conditions.

The Government is to be congratulated in presenting a Bill to assist in vocational and technical education. This is a move in the right direction and a work which will assist materially to the earning power of our people.

A measure will be presented to encourage better highways. Such a measure is essential to improve living conditions in rural localities, and to assist agriculturists and others to market their products without unnecessary cost and inconvenience.

The new Franchise Bill, providing as it does for more effectually enabling women to vote, and conferring upon them the privilege of sitting in Parliament, is a happy measure. The splendid work done by women during the war has entitled them to every power and privilege of citizenship, and has assured this country that their advice and assistance in legislation will be of inestimable benefit.

The Bill to be presented, dealing with desirable immigration, is vital to our national life. It is inconceivable that we should allow further immigration of enemy aliens. From my knowledge of the feelings of our soldiers, I can assure this House that the direst consequences will ensue unless some such measure is enacted. With the sentiments of the soldiers, I heartily concur. We must keep this country British, let our growth be fast or slow. While our soldiers have been beating back the Germans from our front in France, they do not propose that any one shall open the back door admitting them into this country.

All the measures enumerated tend to the creation of better and fairer living conditions for all classes in Canada, and the Government is to be congratulated in moving unfalteringly in this direction.

It is essential that we face squarely the feeling of unrest that prevails throughout the world, a spirit of change which eludes constituted authority, and crosses frontiers at will. I believe we can look at this phenomenon optimistically. We must believe that the curve of human evolution is an ascending curve. We should, instead of defending ancient institutions, turn our efforts towards guiding the new spirit, and be alert to do everything practical to improve economic living conditions for all classes. It seems to me that reconstruction must not stop when we have reached our pre-war basis of stability, but the lessons and inspirations of the war must be capitalized, and our people must receive the benefits to which their sacrifices during the last four years have entitled them.

Unfortunately a creed has risen in Russia which has become an actual menace to civilization. It aims at destroying all industry, all representative institutions, and to substitute autocratic and non-productive rule by a single class. In my opinion, Sir, the new creed is just as dangerous as the one that we have been combatting during the last four years. Canada is happily practically free from this evil, but we should be prepared, should it raise its head in our country, to stamp it out even more ruthlessly and thoroughly than we crushed German autocracy, because it is equally autocratic, and is absolutely opposed to civilization and our representative institutions. Our returning soldiers have already given evidence that they are fundamentally opposed to this doctrine, and can be relied upon for any assistance which might be required if this menace should ever arise in this country.

The most immediate problem which confronts our Government is the demobilization of the returning soldier and his absorption into civil life. This, while an arduous duty, should be, and I am sure is, a pleasant one. A grateful country will wish to do everything reasonably possible to assist its soldiers. I think I can say with considerable assurance that all the returned soldier desires, is to receive such assistance and encouragement as shall enable him to take his place in our economic and social life, freed, as far as possible, from any loss or handicap which his service overseas may have imposed upon him. That I think is not asking a great deal, that much the returned soldier expects. Otherwise I am sure it is his desire to be as good a citizen in peace as he was a patriot in war. The Government has grappled vigourously with this problem. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment has, in my opinion, done its work exceedingly well. The various regulations are constantly improving and the administration of the work is gradually becoming more efficient. However we must take the most punctilious care to see that the soldier is fairly treated, and that he has an opportunity to enter, unhandicapped, into our economic life. Nothing less will satisfy the people of Canada.

It must be remembered that our soldiers are changing from a life under a simplified administration, where necessary changes are made instantly in a general order, and results obtained, to life under our compli-

cated and sometimes unnecessarily slow civilian system, where what he may desire and indeed, what he may be absolutely entitled to, cannot be obtained without endless delay. Possibly the influence of the returning soldier, trained in a speedy, simplified, clarified form of administration, may have a salutary effect on some of our government departments, and on our system of life generally.

Every precaution should be taken so that needless and harassing delays should not be imposed on our returning soldiers, who are anxious to get adjusted into civilian life as quickly as possible. Our soldiers should not be hampered and irritated by red tape and unnecessary rules. These are purely matters of procedure, but are equally important in their results with questions of principle or legal rights.

The immediate and pressing question is that of employment. Canada owes an absolute duty to its soldiers to furnish them with employment as soon as they are ready for it. All problems centre about this one. Among our half million soldiers are men capable of filling every position under the control of any government. Every opening in every government service, be it military or civil, should be filled by a returned soldier. Provision must be made, and in the Government's building programme is being made to furnish additional employment. Each lesser governing body should have a similar policy and programme, and each employer of labour should, if he is worthy of citizenship, make every possible provision to employ soldiers. Many civilians employed in the place of soldiers should, if necessary, be dismissed.

In this I feel that I am not stating the case too strongly but am simply enunciating the principle that our soldiers have an absolute right to be absorbed into our economic life, and to have an opportunity to be respected and useful citizens, without any handicap on account of service overseas. This principle cannot be too clearly understood by the people of Canada.

The Government is to be congratulated on the recent Order in Council dealing with land settlement. Our great resource is our undeveloped agricultural land. We wish this land developed by patriotic Canadians, not by the people of other lands who are not in sympathy with our national ideals, and I hope that any scheme presented by the Government to make available our western lands will made adequate reservation for not only our soldiers, but the soldiers of other parts of the British Empire. In Western Canada, especially, there are hundreds, if not thousands, of returned soldiers ready for the development of the Government's scheme, and I hope that it will be proceeded with with all possible speed.

The Government will present a Bill improving and consolidating the Orders in Council dealing with pensions. Many laudable improvements were made in the recent Order in Council passed in January last, and doubtless additional improvements will be included in the coming Bill.

I feel that this Government should be congratulated on the splendid manner in which they directed the energies of the people during the last four years of war and on grappling so vigorously with the problems arising in this period of reconstruction But no Government alone could successfully solve either the problems of the war or the problems which are at present before us. During the four years of war they had the co-operation and assistance of all the people of Canada, and I believe that they may rely on similar support and assistance now.

I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the House for your courteous attention and for the patience with which you have listened to my remarks.

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Mr. Speaker, the duty has devolved upon me, though I fear that I shall all too feebly perform that duty, of supporting my hon. colleague from Calgary East (Mr. D. L. Redman), who has moved the presentation of an Address in reply to the speech of His Excellency the Governor General.

I should first like to congratulate the previous speaker on the very eloquent and able manner in which he performed his task. Then I wish to thank the Acting Prime Minister and the Government on behalf of my constituents in the district of Fort William and Rainy River for the signal honour which has been conferred upon them in the choosing of their representative to second the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne.

Sir, it has been the general custom in past Parliaments of Canada since Confederation, though not the invariable custom, that the seconding of this motion be given in the French language. This custom has however, been deviated from on quite a few occasions, the most recent being in the Parliament of 1906 when the Address was moved by Mr. W. E. Knowles, representing West Assini-

boia, and seconded by Mr. Wm. Chisholm, representing Antigonish. Previously the custom had not been deviated from since 1896, when Mr. Powell of Westmorland moved the Address and Mr. McGillivray of North Ontario seconded it. Nevertheless, I greatly regret that owing to my limited knowledge of French I cannot permit myself to mutilate the beautiful language of Moliere and Racine in a laboured attempt to live up to tradition. I express these regrets in all sincerity, for I should greatly have desired, as a compliment to the French-speaking members of this House, and also as a small offering in the cause of unity, to have performed this duty in French. I hope that the wish may be accepted for the deed, for I am deeply convinced that the establishment of a real entente cordiale in this country should be the desire of all true lovers of Canada. The man, Sir, whether he be a French-speaking Canadian or an English-speaking Canadian, whether he be a Catholic or a Protestant, who wilfully fosters antagonisms of race and creed in this country is neither a true friend nor a loyal citizen of the land we love.

This brings me to say a few words regarding the late lamented leader of the Opposition, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, one whose greatest desire was the promoting of harmony between the two races in Canada. After the eloquent tributes paid here to-day to his memory I feel that anyting said by me will be almost superfluous. I think I may say that I had the honour of being a friend of his for some years, but for many more years I had the honour of being an admirer and a follower of his. My command of the English language is too poor for me to express adequately my deep feelings of sympathy for his widow, and my regrets that Canada has lost so distinguished a son. What we say of him here to-day will not long be remembered, but his great statesmanship cannot soon be forgotten. Intellectually, socially, morally, and politically, his was a personality that might well serve as an ideal for the ambitious youth of our land for generations to come. Because of his matchless qualities of heart and mind, Canada has lost in him one of her most illustrious leaders. It is my privilege to-day to join that vast multitude of Canadian people of all religions, nationalities and political creeds who are bowing their heads in reverence to the memory of a departed but still beloved leader.

As set forth so simply in the speech of His Excellency, Canada has much to be grateful for to-day. During the last session of this Parliament there were anxious days when the hordes of Attila seemed to be sweeping all before them, and victory for us seemed at least in the dim and distant future. But suddenly, to both our amazement and our joy, the tide of battle turned, due no doubt in great part to the unified command under Marshall Foch, the valorous armies of the Allies swept the enemy toward the Rhine, and almost before the realization could dawn fully upon our minds, the war had been won. That military genius, Napoleon, on one occasion made an epigram to the effect that the gods fight on the side of the stronger armies; but, Sir, over long periods of time the God of truth and justice usually takes sides, as He did in this case, and sees that the cause of right, not might, is victorious.

The armies of the Allies had for over four years withstood tremendous losses; they had sustained immense reverses; they had encountered the cruel atrocities, poison gases, and unfair tactics of their barbarian opponents, yet they always came up smiling with their faces toward the foe, until at last overwhelming victory crowned their courage, their tenacity, their cheerfulness. And among all those noble armies of the Allies no corps has gained greater renown, no men have brought greater glory or fame to the land of their birth, than the Canadian corps has brought to Canada. Their achievements are inscribed on the most glorious pages of the history of mankind. It is not necessary that I should enumerate the many battles fought and won by the Canadians. It is sufficient to say that, on every occasion on which they were called upon to accomplish a task, even when opposed to overwhelming numbers of the flower of the Prussian army, the citizen soldiers of Canada were victorious. They have placed Canada proudly among the nations of the world, and that should be the epitaph of those of them who lie out there in Flanders fields. It is due to their valour that to-day at that august body, the Peace Conference at Paris, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden sits in equality, as he should sit, with the representatives of the other nations of the Empire and of the world. It is due to them, Sir, that to-day Canada and the other Dominions have taken the position of being nations within the Empire, nations absolutely independent in every detail, bound together alone by the ties of sentiment, by common aspirations and ideals. And that is the surest and most lasting foundation upon which the Empire can be built.

These men who have performed all these wonderful deeds for Canada are now returning in tens of thousands to our shores to display to us in peace the same noble virtues that they have exhibited in war. Now that they are coming back to become once more a part of our civil life, it is our bounden duty to do everything possible to aid them in becoming citizens of peace, and I am glad to see that the Government is doing a great deal with this object in view. For example, the increase of the post-discharge pay up to six months is admirable, as this gives the men an opportunity of resting their nervous systems after the exhaustion due to the turmoil and excitement of battle, and much other legislation already passed has objects akin to this and so deserves praise. I believe that in these matters the Government has done as well as any Government elected by the people of Canada could have done. There has been a great deal of criticism in many quarters, much of it destructive criticism, a great deal of it unjust, some of it, perhaps, just. But so long, Mr. Speaker, as the governments of this world are made up of human beings, mistakes are occasionally inevitable, and so criticism will sometimes be just. The governments of the next world are, no doubt, perfect, but even the most learned of theologians can give no absolute proofs to that effect.

Mr. Speaker, as the Speech from the Throne speaks of the accomplishments of Canada as a whole in the war, let us look for one minute at what this little country of Canada, little in population although large in area, has done. This country, Sir, which for over one hundred years has known nothing of war, and which has been celebrating in history, song, and story, so-called battles in which a few platoons on either side were the extent of the armies. Here we have a country which, in 1914, had lived in peace and fraternity with its great neighbour to the South for over a century, and which considered a militia force of 3,000 men and a few Mounted Police quite sufficient defence for all possible contingencies, and yet this country of less than eight million people, in the four years and three months of war, performed the following almost unbelievable feats of patriotism, the figures given being in round numbers, but being approximately correct:

Canada enlisted, voluntarily, 465,000 men, under the Military Service Act 85,000 men. Add to this Reservists, and a few others, and we have a total of nearly 600,000 men, of whom nearly 418,000 proceeded overseas. Our casualties were over 200,000, and our deaths unhappily almost 60,000.

Honours granted to the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, including Victoria Crosses, Distinguished Service Orders, Military Crosses, Distinguished Conduct Medals, Military Medals and a few foreign decorations, number about 12,000, and over 3,000 more were mentioned in despatches.

In shipbuilding, including ships built to the order of the Imperial Munitions Board and other private contracts, we built 103 ships, with a dead weight carrying capacity of 367,000 tons. We built for the Imperial Government over 700 small armed trawlers and drifters of various types; for the French Government over 40 armed trawlers, and coastal patrol motor boats. Why, Sir, in my own inland port city of Fort William, 1,500 miles from the Atlantic coast, up there on the shores of Lake Superior, which were explored 200 years ago by French voyageurs and coureurs des bois, we built for the native land of those Frenchmen 12 armed trawlers, which sailed down the lakes and rivers of what was originally New France, on their way to the shores of Old France. What a historical romance for the pen of a Parker!

In financing our record is as good. To think, Mr. Speaker, that this new pioneer country raised, in domestic loans from its people, the enormous sum of nearly $1,500,000,000, or about $200 per head for every man, woman and child in the country, and yet, at the conclusion of the war our savings deposits were approximately $400,000,000 in excess of those of August, 1914. We established credits of over $700,000,000 on behalf of the Imperial Government.

The Imperial Munitions Board placed orders to the extent of $1,200,000,000, the bulk of which was spent on goods which had never before been made in Canada, such as shells, cartridge cases, fuses, and aeroplanes. Why, Mr. Speaker, the vast majority of the people of Canada had never heard an artillery shell explode, or seen an aeroplane, let alone manufacture them.

Then, Sir, on top of all this, the people gave voluntarily to the Patriotic and Red Cross Funds, Belgian and Serbian Relief Funds, Y.M.C.A. and Knights of Columbus Hut Funds, contributions amounting to a grand total of some $95,000,000.

This is just an outline, the details of which I have left unmentioned, but take into account only these things I have spoken of, and I think you will agree with me, Mr. Speaker, that this is a record that we

may look at in open-eyed amazement, and ponder over with unbounded pride.

It is announced in the speech of His Excellency that the Government is going to carry out many needed public works thus providing employment for the returned soldiers and for those who served in the civil army at home. The Government is to be congratulated upon this, for it is a necessary measure. But the Government can, in its public works, supply only a small portion of the ranks of labour with employment. It must get the co-operation of the provincial legislatures, the municipalities, and the private corporations of the country. For with the huge number of returning men, and the other huge numbers of men thrown out of work, from munition and other factories, the labour market is likely to be glutted with men. The employment bureaux which the Government has aided in establishing will help the situation; but with the prices of the necessaries of life still high, and the labour demand lessening, the situation demands all that the Government can do. To-day in Russia Bolshevism reigns supreme, in Germany conditions are chaotic, and in Great Britain labour troubles are more pronounced than ever in the past. These upheavals are all more or less due to the same cause. And if we are to avoid having our beloved country here become a victim to the same appalling conditions it will be necessary that provincial and municipal governments, corporations, and even individuals, co-operate in assisting the Dominion Government not only to supply work, but to aid in eliminating profiteering, thus helping to control the prices of the necessaries of life.

Fortunately this Canada of ours is blessed by Providence with almost unlimited natural resources, the development of which will aid in re-establishing our country on a pre-war basis. Now that the war is over, raw materials will rule the world of commerce, and Canada possesses these raw materials in abundance. We have millions of acres of fertile land, we have eighteen million horse-power of potential electric energy in the waterfalls of Canada, we have fisheries on all sides, pulpwood in abundance, and minerals of all varieties. Most of these mineral resources are being gradually developed. Our output of silver, nickle, gold, and coal is large. There are large quantities of products from our blast furnaces and steel plants, the only regrettable fact being that our blast furnaces and steel plants use nearly altogether imported iron ore. Iron and steel, Sir, are the basis of all industry; they are the basic elements of commercial progress. If you will look over the development of any of the great commercial countries of the world—England, France, Germany, or the United States—you will find that their trade development was directly in proportion to their production of pig iron and steel. Among our natural resources I believe that we have hundreds of millions of tons of iron ore in Canada, scattered from the Atlantic to the Pacific, the development of which, when that development does take place, will be another great step toward our commercial prosperity.

It is pleasing to note in the speech from the Throne that the Soldiers' Land Settlement scheme is being whipped into shape. It is gratifying to know that the Government intends to obtain all necessary lands adjacent to the railways to satisfy the longing of any of our soldiers who wish to go back to the land. And that is as it should be, for it would be cruel if the men who risked their lives in the cause of civilization should be denied the opportunity of going upon the land, because, through the mistaken policies of past governments, the needed lands were held idle in the hands of speculators and corporations; and that, Sir, in a country like Canada, which has twice the area of the whole of Europe, leaving out Russia, and yet has a population of only 8 million, as compared with Europe's 300 million.

For we must remember that the real heroes of this war are not that gallant soldier, Sir Arthur Currie, and his staff officers, not the officers commanding battalions, companies, or batteries, not the medical officers, but the common private soldiers who fearlessly went over the top facing death in all its forms that you and I and our children, and our children's children, might continue to enjoy the blessings of liberty. If I were a sculptor, Mr. Speaker, and were asked to carve a marble masterpiece emplematic of the real heroism of the war, I would erect a statue of a common soldier and the woman that he loved, standing side by side and hand in hand, and looking out upon the world with eyes that knew no fear.

I cannot pass on without offering to the women of our land some slight acknowledgement of the patience, fortitude, and nobility of mind which they have displayed during the war. Perhaps I can offer no higher or more sincere compliment than to say that the wives, mothers, sisters, and

sweethearts of our fighting men are more than worthy to take their places by the side of their mates, their sons, and their brothers in accepting the gratitude of the civilized world. Under these circumstances the proposal in the Speech from the Throne that women are shortly to be admitted as members of parliament can hardly be open to criticism.

As a medical man the proposal to establish a federal department of public health appeals to me, and has appeared for many years something to be desired. Material prosperity either of a man or of a nation is of little avail if the health be not guarded. All the arguments appear to me to be favourable to this project. As a Canadian, the idea that all future immigration be on a selective basis also seems greatly to be desired. In the past the methods of attracting immigrants to our shores have been all too loose, and so to-day many undesirables are numbered among Canadian citizens. It appears to me that in the future we should especially encourage to our country immigrants from the British Isles and from the United States, that great republic to the south of us whose people have studied the same history as we, speak the same mother tongue as the majority of us, and who respect the same free and democratic institutions as Canadians do.

Mr. Speaker, before I conclude my remarks I wish to congratulate the Government upon a good deal of constructive legislation which has been put into force, such as the increased post discharge pay for the soldiers, the free transportation given to the soldiers' wives and dependents home to Canada, upon the fact that constructive plans are to be put into execution in needed public expenditures; this, of course, depending upon those works being justly and fairly distributed for the benefit of Canada. The congratulations of the whole country are due to the Minister of Finance because of the great response given by the people of the country in reply to his appeals for loans.

The three paramount duties devolving upon the people of Canada at the present moment, in addition to paying homage to our heroes who lie out there under little wooden crosses in France and Flanders, are, first, to repatriate in a proper manner the heroes who are living. History has told us that in past wars heroes and their heroic deeds are soon forgotten. Canada must belie history. Second, to see that governments, corporations, and individuals cooperate in putting Canada back to a peace footing,—a peace footing from an industrial and labour standpoint, and from a cost-of-living standpoint. And, third, that we foster in this country a united Canadian national spirit. Probably, Mr. Speaker, the greatest of these three is the last, for to-day, owing to the diverse nationalities and religions of our people, and owing to the great breadth and extent of our country, antagonisms of race and creed, diversity of views of east and west, are combining against national progress. A house divided against itself cannot stand. Representing as I do a constituency midway between the east and west, let me extend a hand to each. The essence of democracy is compromise for the good of the whole, for the greatest good to the greatest number. Let all endeavour to do away with race and creed antagonisms; let the demands of the west be tempered by the rights of the east, and let the extremists of the east remember that the west deserves justice; let labour and capital bear in mind that they are interdependent, not antagonistic, and let them rather cooperate than do battle; and, finally, let us see that our returning heroes are given justice in every way, are given their reward for the high courage, tenacity, and nobility of character which they have displayed on the battlefield. But at the same time let the returning soldier remember that the vast majority of those who did not go to the front performed worthy and needed services here at home, and not having abdicated their rights as Canadian citizens, also have some claims upon the country.

Sir, if these precepts are acknowledged and practised we will without doubt in the years to come build up on the northern half of this continent a great Canadian nation.

If in this country we sow the seeds of disunion, dissension, and intolerance, we will reap defeat; but if, on the other hand, we sow the seeds of unity, confidence, and enlightenment, we shall garner the fruits of a happy, prosperous, and united nation. Only by following the nobler of these two courses, Sir, can we justify the acts of those great Canadians of fifty years ago, the Fathers of Confederation. I have the honour, Mr. Speaker, to support the motion for the Address.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): Mr. Speaker, this being my first

appearance before this House as the leader of the Opposition for the time being, I think it is only proper that I should explain briefly my position. Those of you who read the newspapers, and you all read the newspapers, I suppose, saw what was done yesterday—that by a unanimous vote I was asked for the time being to lead the Opposition in this House until a proper opportunity is given in the most democratic way possible for the Liberals of all Canada to choose their leader. Until that is done, I am by the request of my friends the recognized leader of the Opposition in this House and responsible for the sayings and doings of that body to some extent. I do not think it is out of place for me to thank my friends on this side of the House for the great honour they have conferred on me. I fully appreciate it, and can only promise that whatever ability I possess will be placed at their disposal, and in a proper way at the disposal of the House. I am now getting to be an old member. I have always had the greatest regard for this institution, which is the highest institution in our country, and I trust that in the future and particularly while I occupy this position of responsibility, I shall so demean myself as to do credit and respect to this institution of which we are all so proud. If there was one characteristic which more than another distinguished the great leader into whose shoes I have stepped it was his great respect for Parliament, for the rules of this House and for everything that went to the upbuilding and maintaining of the best parliamentary traditions. As his successor for the time being, I hope that as far as my capacity will permit me, I shall follow in his footsteps. I feel assured of the sympathy and respect of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. I hope I shall do justice to the position which I occupy, and shall conduct myself in such a way as to command the sympathy and respect of hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House as well.

Let me, Mr. Speaker, at once address my hearty and earnest congratulations to the two young hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address. I am particularly proud of the way in which they have acquitted themselves. Their speeches were not too long, but they covered the ground very well; they were full of good material, and well expressed. We are glad to recognize that each of these young men is full of promise for the future. It is a great thing to know that coming up behind us, who are beginning to get old, are young men offering such talent and promise to the service of this country. The part of the speech which particularly attracted my attention was the reference to the returned soldier. These two gentlemen, as I understand it, are themselves returned soldiers. Let me say for the Opposition and for the people generally, that we have in our hearts a very warm spot and the greatest respect for every returned soldier of this country. They have done great things for us, for which we are proud and glad and thankful. I hope we shall not be remiss in our duty to show a proper appreciation of what they have done for us by looking after their interest in a proper and becoming manner. These two young gentlemen were bold enough to rather find fault with the way in which things were done. They may not have meant that, but I, as an ordinary plain blunt person sitting on this side of the House and watching the performance rather closely, reached the conclusion that they were not quite satisfied with the way in which the Government was moving, and rather suggested that a little speed should be put on, if that could possibly be done. To my hon. young friends, who no doubt are alert to their own interests and to the interests of the country, and full of youthful animation and ambition, let me say—not by way of discouragement at all, but by way of helping them along,—that if they have any stimulant to stir up this Government to do something within the life of any man that is living to-day I shall be very glad indeed if they will apply it. We on this side of the House, in our own mild way, have been coaxing them along; we have been offering them every inducement and every promise that we can offer, consistent with our position in opposition, but they do not seem to take our bait. But our good friends are returned soldiers, and possibly the Government had better beware lest some of the means which soldiers use to produce results may be used in their case. There is a warning given to them to-day, and I trust that something will be forthcoming before very long.

I do not wish on this, the first occasion of my addressing the House as leader of the Opposition, to be unduly critical, but the Government has thought proper to place in the Address the subject of dealing with returned soldiers. We heard of the Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department last winter. We were very hopeful that something would come of it, but so far I have not been able to hear of any particular establishment, except, forsooth, the salary of the minister—I suppose that is

established. We have in this House a distinguished young member from the Province of Nova Scotia, full of business and enthusiasm, and a capable man. Because of his enthusiasm, his business tact and ability he was chosen to be a very material part of that establishment. Yet I find, to my astonishment, that he does not remain there. He would be the last man in the world to unduly find fault with this Government. He has been wedded to them as closely as human being could possibly be. He was willing to bear their sins of omission and commission, and to be, if necessary, the scapegoat for them on many an occasion. But matters have come to such a pass that he has written a letter to the public press of our province, announcing his resignation from that institution because nothing was done. Mr. Speaker, now is the time and the place for us to make a mild inquiry, how it comes, when we have an establishment of this kind, instituted at the request of the Government, backed up by Parliament, supported by all the necessary money and means and services and support, that the man who, I believe, was next in importance to the minister, has had to resign because nothing was being done.

I call this to the attention of the young gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address so that they, having the advantage of being supporters of the Government, may make inquiry and find out where the weak spot is, try to brace it up and see that the proper things are being done in the interest of the returned soldier. The returned soldier is not expecting anybody to unduly look after him. I remember our good old friend from Dundas, Mr. Broder, whose memory we all revere and who is much missed by the House, speaking once upon a time about the farmers. He said: The farmers of Ontario do not want anybody to take off their clothes and put them to bed, they are able to look after themselves; all they want is a square deal and fair play. I believe that the returned soldier who has come home in such a physical condition that he is able to look after himself, does not require, and does not want, anybody to take off his clothes and put him to bed; all he wants is a square deal. Of course, there are others who have been mutilated and maimed in the war to such an extent that we must look after them carefully and tenderly and to whom greater attention must necessarily be given than to those who came through safe and well and in regard to whom we thank God that they escaped the fate of the others. Without following this subject any longer, I will merely say that I trust and hope that the Government have at last reached a conclusion as to what they are really going to do and that something substantial will be done. I might remind my enthusiastic young friends again that there is one divine attribute in connection with this Government and that has reference to the question of time. To them one day is as a thousand years and a thousand years as one day. They must not lose sight of that fact. Further, they have a good many lawyers among them, and keen lawyers too, and they have always taken care that time is not of the essence of any contract they enter into.

As far as making provisions for the country generally, the soldiers and others, is concerned, the great thing for us as a Parliament, and for the people whom we represent, is that we should try and make Canada a good, comfortable country to live in; that we should so marshal our forces that the best results shall be obtained; that we should so utilize our opportunities that our people may become productive. One of the great curses of over protection in this country has been too much crowding of people into our cities and towns and the neglecting of our farms. We have too many people in the factories and in the towns and too few people producing in the country the food that is necessary for those who are crowding into the towns.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman wish to reduce the number of factories?

Mr. McKENZIE: If there are too many factories—yes, certainly. I am not in a position to speak as to that, but I am saying to my hon. friend (Mr. Burnham) that what has been happening in our part of the country is that people have been rushing to factories, steel works and all that sort of thing, and neglecting the farm entirely. I am not blaming any Government particularly for that but I am simply saying that that is the condition that exists and that the party in power will, to the best of their ability, have to deal with it. If there is anything that can be done to make the farm more productive than it is, to induce young men to stay upon the farm, and the people who come into this country as immigrants to go upon the farm instead of crowding into the factories and towns, if such a condition can be brought about that at least two blades of grass shall grow where only one grows now, we shall be moving in the direction of greater

production and of reduction in the cost of living. That is what I have had in mind all the time. There is no great benefit in a man being able to get $5, or $6, a day when everything that he buys for the support of his family is three times more expensive than it was when he was getting $2 or $3 a day. What I want to impress upon the Government is that if there is anything they can do to make this a cheap, free and comfortable country to live in, and to carry on our industries as they have been going along in years gone by, that is a consummation greatly to be desired.

I want to say something about the glorious achievements of our soldiers. The part played by our gallant Canadian soldiers in this great war is something that should not be lost sight of. This is the first time really that Canadians have had a wide opportunity of distinguishing themselves in this way. Canadians have distinguished themselves in other walks of life. They have been great theologians, doctors and lawyers, and they have played an important part in the industrial world. It has only been in this war that they have had the opportunity of proving themselves great upon the field of battle. They have distinguished themselves in such a way as to render glorious for all time to come the history of Canada in connection with this war. I thank and congratulate our boys, our generals and our officers upon their achievements in this great struggle. I want, on behalf of the Canadian people, and as far as I can do so, to thank our Allies for the position that they have taken and the splendid victory that they have achieved, for justice, right and humanity. I wish also to thank our neighbours to the south, our great American friends, for the position which they have taken and the marvellous help they have given us in connection with the great victory we have won.

I hope that the hon. gentlemen who have spoken so well and so eloquently this afternoon will continue to stir up our friends of the Government and to see if there are no means that they can be induced to take to establish some sort of machinery that will produce something else than Orders in Council. Of those they have been producing a surfeit. I would say to my hon. friend from West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) that that is one factory that I am willing to stop.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few things with respect to the subjects dealt with in the Speech. The first thing that caught my eye was the reference to a Franchise Act. In this country we are all interested in the franchise. Every man wishes to be enfranchised, and the desire of every province is that everybody who is entitled to exercise the franchise in this country should be given that privilege. It is a new and striking revival, it is a hopeful sign, that this Government is talking of extending the franchise to anybody. Formerly the policy seemed to be the contraction of the franchise and the disfranchisement of as many as could possibly be struck off the lists. But now that sunshine and prosperity are ahead of us the Government is willing for a season—for a season, I say—to give us the franchise again. I would point out to the Acting Prime Minister and to the Government generally, that not one cent of money should be unnecessarily expended in this country at the present time. We had one experience with a Dominion Franchise Act during the years from 1885 to 1898, when there were revising barristers to carry out the Act. In every province of the Dominion, I believe, there were two sets of voters' lists: one list prepared by the revising barristers in question for the election of members to the House of Commons at the expenditure of hundreds and thousands of dollars, and another set of lists for the election of members to the various provincial legislatures and to the municipal councils in the different towns and cities. That I think was an unnecessary waste. However, in 1898 the Dominion Franchise Act was repealed, and we reverted to the old system of one voters' list for the election of members to the Federal, the provincial and municipal bodies. I submit that if it is the intention of the Government, through the medium of the promised Franchise Act, to reintroduce the expensive method of preparing voters' lists which prevailed in years gone by, it is making a mistake, because it will mean not only the expenditure of a large amount of money but the imposition of unnecessary labour and worry upon the people in getting their names, not on one, but on two lists, and of fighting battles to get those two lists into shape, whereas there should only be one. If my advice is any good to the Government I suggest there is one course whereby duplication of lists and machinery can be avoided. In the province of Nova Scotia we have a very simple way of preparing these lists. In the cities of Halifax and Sydney, and in other towns of that pro-

vince, there are registrars to whom any one, who wishes to have his name placed upon the voters' list makes application. In every place there are what is known as "revisers" through whom names are placed on the list. These revising boards are composed of men appointed by the municipal councils, which in turn are elected by the people, so that the appointment of these revisers is really in the hands of the electors themselves. Now, if the Government is not satisfied with the work of these boards, if it thinks that the appointment of these boards to revise the lists is too much in the hands of one party, whichever party may be in power, I would suggest that a mixed board be chosen composed of members representing equally the Dominion and local authorities, and let that board compile the voters' list and avoid the duplication of which I have complained. We have such a body in the educational boards in the province of Nova Scotia, and it is working very well. On the Educational Board there are three gentlemen representing the municipal council —for example, take the town of North Sydney where I live—and two other gentlemen appointed by the Government. The Government grant is watched particularly by the Government representatives, and the educational affairs of the town are especially looked after by those appointed by the town council. I submit, Sir, that if any difficulty or danger is apprehended in connection with voters' lists—and there should be none so far as I know—the difficulty will be overcome by a mixed or united board such as I have spoken of, and the enormous expense which would otherwise be incurred would be avoided. There is another phase of the franchise question, and I cannot at all understand why it is introduced. Throughout the Dominion, as far as I know, the franchise has been extended to women with perhaps the solitary exception of the province of Quebec. If such be the case I see no great necessity for duplicating legislation, unless it is intended to provide more complicated machinery for the placing of names on the voters' list than obtains under provincial statute. That, Sir, is all I have to say with respect to the franchise. I maintain, and I say it in all good faith, that in the present condition of the finances of this country, and when there are so many useful and vital objects calling for an expenditure of public money, we should not spend ten cents for any purpose that can be avoided.

As far as the public highways are concerned, there are hon. gentlemen now sitting on the Government side who had a great deal to say in connection with the Road Act which is now contemplated when it was introduced on a former occasion, and I do not think that their passage from this side of the House to that would change their views, speaking constitutionally, upon this question, because there is a constitutional question involved in this matter. Expenditures for highways, as for education, are entirely within the jurisdiction and scope of the provincial legislature—they are under provincial laws and provincial control. If, regardless of the terms of the British North America Act, we are going to encroach upon provincial jurisdiction, where are we going to stop? Until the power regarding this question is taken away from those in whom it is at present vested, I think we should observe the terms and conditions of the constitution and leave to the different provinces the expenditure of moneys on roads. The provincial authorities have road Acts, road inspectors and road machinery, and they have men who are versed in the technique of building roads. If we have money to give away for this purpose, I have no objection to dividing it in a proper way between the different provinces. Perhaps there are only two ways in which that could properly and equitably be done; either according to the mileage of public roads in each province, or on the basis of population. Whichever method would be the most equitable should be adopted, but in any case I would say, if you have money to spare for this purpose give it to the provinces themselves and let it be expended in a constitutional manner. That, Sir, is about the only observation I have to make upon the subject of roads. If Dominion moneys are to be taken and expended by officers of the Government under the control of this House upon the roads of the country, I would strenuously object to it, and I would recall to certain of my hon. friends opposite the stand which they took upon this question on a former occasion, and unless conditions have materially changed, I would invite them to stand by the faith of their fathers, and to adhere to the position which they formerly took.

Now, there is the question of public health. The member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) who, I believe, is a doctor, was enthusiastic in his support of the proposal for a department of Public Health. All I have to say about that is that I am not in favour of duplications; I am not in favour of conflicting

authority between provincial and Dominion institutions. Strangely enough, the provisions of the British North America Act would seem to permit duplication on this point, but up to now the Federal Government has not dealt very much with public health. But a doctor appointed in Ontario by the Dominion Government is no better than a doctor appointed in Ontario by the local government. If you had one set of doctors appointed by the local government to deal with matters affecting public health in a particular province and another set of doctors appointed by the Dominion Government to deal with the same question in the same province, the result would be a conflict of authority and a state of affairs that would not be desirable. Let this Government, if it is going to deal with the matter of public health, take complete control of it. Let public health be under one control; do not have two bodies representing the same people doing the same thing and spending the money twice when spending it once under proper control would bring about better results. I am warning the Government in the most friendly way to avoid this duplication and suggesting that they make arrangements with the provincial authorities whereby this matter shall be taken in hand either by the Dominion or by the provincial authority and dealt with by the one body only.

We are invited in the Address to deal with vocational training. The Government of the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier in 1910 or 1911 appointed a Commission to look into the matter of vocational training and technical education and to see what ought to be done, or whether the Government ought to devote any money to that purpose. A most searching inquiry was made. An able body of men went all over the country and got all the information they could, and Dr. Robertson, the Chairman, made a report to this House recommending the yearly expenditure of a certain amount of money for the purposes of technical education. If there is any difference between technical education and vocational education, the distinction is very fine; either is an education to be given to men in different walks of life in manufacturing and in industry, and what applies to the one applies, as I understand it, to the other. We on this side of the House have established our position in that matter; if moneys are properly expended in technical or vocational education, I imagine that no fault will be found by hon. gentlemen on this side. We hope that speedy action will be taken so that, under the present conditions of reconstruction, our people will be trained to take part in the many activities that we hope to carry on but which we had not been obliged to engage in during the war. I hope that the training our people receive in these educational or technical schools will enable them to secure advantage from following the avenues of trade that will be opened to us by reason of the war or by reason of German trade being, for the present, at all events, cut off.

The Government have to deal at this time with very vexed questions. They have to deal with the soldier question, which has been brought to their notice. They have to deal with the question of capital and labour, which is in a very disturbed condition. I do hope that some action will be taken by the Government that will bring about a better understanding between capital and labour. Since the war began, even before the war began, while this Government were in power, they did not do anything to better the conditions existing between capital and labour in Canada. I trust that they will now be able, through the Department of Labour or in some other way, to create a better feeling between capital and labour in this country than prevails to-day. It is a question that requires education, and a proper understanding. A difference between these two factors in our national life is like a disagreement between the two wheels of a carriage or cart. If one says: I cannot go with you, and the other says: I will stop and you can go without me, the cart will not go. Similarly, it is absolutely impossible to carry on industrial pursuits without co-operation between capital and labour, and for that reason the very best energies of the Government and every agency that can be utilized in that direction should be directed to an intelligent and effective effort to bring about the best possible understanding between those two great factors in our national life. It would be improper for me, as well as a waste of time, to dilate upon the relation between capital and labour, because this body is too intelligent to require any explanation of that on my part. You all know the conditions that are existing in the country, and while the Government may not be able to do very much, they are the representatives of the people, they are charged with responsibility, and they must leave the factory for a day or two and try to do something.

I do not think that there is much else in the Address besides what I have referred

to. It is an old stereotyped complaint to say that there is not much in the Address, but it does not follow that because there is not a great deal in the Address, other measures will not be brought down, and we trust that something substantial and something in the interest of the country will be brought down and carried forward.

Some of my friends sitting behind the treasury benches said to me to-day: "Well, McKenzie, we hope that we will have a short session." I was hoping that that would be possible, but when I see, in looking over the Address, that we have to deal individually with the Orders in Council that have been passed during the last year, all hope of a short session vanishes.

Let me hope that the Government, even at this rather late day in their existence, will see to it that whatever moneys are to be expended are expended properly, economically, and in the best interests of the people. The complaint throughout the country to-day is not that we have expended money on the war—we are pleased and proud to expend money on the war,—but that we have expended money on the war, and on things incidental to it, absolutely recklessly and without proper return. I wish, therefore, to urge upon the Government that any moneys spent after this shall be spent for value. I am not able to go into the details of the expenditure in connection with the war, it is too big and would take too long. But in our part of the country, we had, particularly in connection with the Naval Department, expenditures which were criminally extravagant and useless, and I hope that some day those things will be brought to light and that the Government will be taught a lesson that henceforth hangers-on are to be cut off, and that expenditures for the purpose of pleasing party heelers will never find place or part in the exercise of Government functions in this country. Those are things against which I wish to register my complaint, and I hope that everybody in this House or out of it who has anything to do with the public expenditures will see to it that public moneys are appropriated for public development. There is plenty of room for it.

A moment ago I said that it was desirable to have this a cheap country to live in. By cheapness I do not mean anything that would reduce the standard of living in this country in all its bearings and relations, but I mean a country in which men can live comfortably, and in which the wage that is paid to our workers shall be sufficient for the proper sustenance in comfort of themselves and their families. We have great food resources in this country; we have magnificent fish resources, grain resources, potato resources, and the finest fruit in the world. Yet in many places, those resources, particularly the fisheries, are not developed to their full extent and capacity because of the lack of public facilities for the handling of them, such as railways, wharves, etc., and those facilities ought to be furnished by the proper expenditure of money.

Having said this, and having congratulated ourselves that the war is over and that peace is restored, let me say that for more reasons than one, I, as a leader on this side at the present and as a humble Liberal, am glad that the war is over. I am glad that the war is over because our wandering boys who are here and there throughout this House can now wend their way home to the dear old place which they have left.

In conclusion, let me tell my good friends that the war is over. The light is in the window for you; the latch string is on the outside, and you are all welcome.

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, at the outset I desire to offer my congratulations to my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) and his associates upon the other side of the House upon his selection and appointment as leader of His Majesty's loyal Opposition. The hon. member is an able and experienced parliamentarian and I wish to assure him of my desire to extend to him every courtesy and facility by way of information and to co-operate with him in the despatch of the public business which comes before this House. The hon. member and myself are in a sense in the same position. We are both exercising unaccustomed and temporary duties of leadership. Let me trust that a fellow-feeling will make us wondrous kind.

The hon. member in his remarks has exercised moderation, and in that I shall be glad to emulate his example. I concur most heartily in what he has said by way of compliment to the mover and the seconder of the Address. Seldom have there been heard in this Parliament at any opening two such excellent or thoughtful speeches upon the Address. The remarks of the two members in question and the sentiments which they have expressed come from them with added force and appropriateness because of the notable services which they have rendered at the

front. The tribute which they have so eloquently paid to the courage, sacrifices and achievements of the Canadian Expeditionary Force will be proudly and gladly responded to by the people of this country. From Ypres to Mons, an unbroken series of victories, often against the most desperate odds, attests the valour which has won the unstinted admiration of the world, and which will for all time be the most cherished tradition of the Canadian people.

Mr. Speaker, when this House prorogued in May last, it is not too much to say the destiny of Canada, of the Empire, of the world, and of civilization as we understand it, hung visibly in the balance. The enemy, after his successful attacks with massed and overwhelming forces in March and April, was pressing down the Somme towards the sea. It was clearly his intention to throw the British troops into the Channel,—to roll up the French line upon Paris and, as he thought, to bring the war to an end with one stroke. That was what the German Emperor had in mind when, a few months earlier, he predicted a victory for the German arms and, as he termed it, a good German peace. We all know what kind of peace that would have been. How serious the situation was, how nearly the plan came to realization, may be known to members of this House when I say that, at the time when the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues visited England in early June, Allied strategists were carefully studying the problem involved in a possible evacuation of the channel ports and even the withdrawal of the Allied line to the south of Paris. But in July, by one of the most sudden and extraordinary reversals of fortune in all military history, the change came, and at the second battle of the Marne, under the genius of Marshal Foch, there was established a new turning point in world history, and the Allies in all theatres of action were able to take the offensive.

Then followed in dramatic succession the unconditional surrender of Bulgaria, the collapse of Turkey, the capitulation of Austria-Hungary, and finally, after most desperate and sanguinary fighting, the surrender of Germany on November 11, 1918. Without any desire to boast, we must not fail to bear in mind the mighty part played by the British Empire in this great struggle. It is not too much to say, Mr. Speaker, making all allowance for the efforts of the other Allies, and particularly that of France, whose courage and heroism have been sublime, that the very shield and buckler of world defense against Prussian tyranny and aggression have been the naval and military forces of Great Britain. The casualties, Mr. Speaker, show the degree of participation of the Allies in the closing battles of this war. It was, according to Marshal Foch, the illustrious and magnanimous generalissimo of the allied forces the hammer strokes of the British army, including the Canadian divisions, which broke through the Hindenburg line and brought Germany to her knees, and it will be an eternal source of pride to the people of this country that the first troops to enter Cambrai, which was the great bastion of German defence on the west wore the uniform of Canada. It will also be a source of noble pride to the people of this country that on the last day of the war Canadian troops entered Mons from which the British forces at the beginning of the war had been driven by overwhelming enemy forces. The old saying holds true, that Great Britain always wins the last battle in any war in which she is engaged.

It is a great thing, Mr. Speaker, to be a citizen of the British Empire to-day, and it seems to me that in addition to the pride which this war must give us in our British citizenship there must also be a distinct gain in the sense of Canadian national unity by reason of our achievements in this war, and particularly those of our Canadian expeditionary forces overseas. The heroism, the sufferings, the sacrifices and common endeavours of Great Britain, of Canada, of Australia, of New Zealand, of South Africa, and of India, must also it seems to me bind together for all time, as with links of steel, those component parts of the Empire in loyal, loving, and indissoluble union.

Mr. Speaker, the war is over, and the Peace Conference is engaged in dealing with the most momentous questions which have ever come before a congress of world's statesmen. It would be premature to discuss the conclusions to which that conference should arrive. Suffice it to say that there are seated there the ablest statesmen in the world to-day. Canada is represented by the experience and wisdom of her Prime Minister, the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden, and those of his colleagues who accompany him. The task is, indeed, a heavy one—the settling of the terms of peace, the recasting of the boundaries of European countries, the re-grouping of nationalities, and the establishment of guarantees and securities for that permanent peace of the world which is necessary if civilization is not to be wholly destroyed. There are, however, two observations which I desire to make.

In the first place, it is clear that this was a wholly unnecessary and avoidable war. All the bloodshed might have been spared. All the treasure which was spent, all the prodigious effort which was put forth, might have been devoted to the higher purposes of advancing civilization. All the suffering on land and sea, all the unspeakable anguish of wives, of mothers, and of families, need not have been. What caused this war? Who is responsible for this war? It is clear that responsibility for this war lies with the German people in their lust of dominion, and in the criminal and insane ambition of their Emperor and the military caste surrounding him. And if this is so, must not justice be done? I put forward the view that if those who are responsible for this war are not brought to punishment it will be the greatest failure of retributive justice in the history of mankind. The indictment before an international tribunal of those in authority in Germany and the other countries allied with her, before and during the war, their solemn trial for conspiracy against the liberties of nations, for breach of public law, and for the barbarities and atrocities which have been perpetrated by land and sea, would in my view do more to prevent the possibility of repetition of an attempt at world dominion on the part of any nation than any league of peace that can be devised by the genius or resourcefulness of statesmen.

There is another matter, Mr. Speaker, and that is that Germany and her allies by reason of their responsibility for this war, should be made to pay to the extent that they can pay for the war expenditure to which the Allies have been put, and I am glad to observe that that is the position taken by Great Britain. Canada did not desire to enter this war; we were forced to take part in order to save ourselves and to assist in saving the world. It seems to me therefore that those who are responsible for the war should be made to pay to the extent that they are able to pay for the expenditure to which Canada has been put. There is no sign, so far as I can observe, of repentance on the part of Germany to-day. On the contrary, there seems to be a certain degree of arrogance by reason of the fact that Germany was not invaded. A war indemnity spread over a long period of years would do more than anything else to bring home to the German people the enormity of the offence which they have committed against civilization. That is an argument which I am sure they would understand.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the armistice having been declared, the Government of this country, like the governments of all other countries, was at once confronted with the problem of reconstruction. The Government could not, of course, forecast events. But we had taken concerted measures, to be put into effect immediately after the conclusion of peace. Those measures related to two principal things, demobilization and reconstruction. The problem was a great and difficult one. In one sense it is easier to get from a peace basis to a war basis than from a war basis to a peace

9 p.m.

basis. We have a longer time to get to a war basis from a peace basis than we have to get from a basis of war to a basis of peace after the war. We had four years to mobilize,—four years to organize the industry, the agriculture, the commerce, the trade and finances of the country, upon a war basis. We have had a few weeks to demobilize and reconstruct, so that the country may be once again upon a peace basis. Consider the problem involved in demobilization. We have over 300,000 soldiers overseas, and 50,000 dependents, to be brought home, all naturally desirous of returning to their homes and their dear ones as soon as possible. It has been the policy of the Government, notwithstanding the economic problems involved, to bring those men home just as quickly as possible, in order that they may again meet their friends from whom they have been separated for years. That has been the policy of the Government, and since November, 1918, over 50,000 soldiers have been returned to this country, and some eight or ten thousand of their dependents. In addition, there have been demobilized in Canada, struck from off the strength of units here, some 50,000 additional. So that there have been demobilized, since the conclusion of the armistice, over 100,000 of the troops of Canada, and many thousands of their dependents. Consider the situation,—the scarcity of shipping, troops to be returned, not only to Canada, but to Australia, New Zealand, South Africa and India. There are forces still in all the principal theatres of war. Transport is required for supplies for those forces. There is a great shortage of world shipping. Notwithstanding that, notwithstanding the fact that it is winter, that we have but two ports on our Atlantic coast, that we have limited railway facilities, we have been bringing back our men at the rate of 25,000 to

30,000 a month. In addition to that, many convalescents have been brought back. Many thousands have been treated in our hospitals. The problem is a great one, complicated by after-war conditions, but I submit, Mr. Speaker, to this House and to the country, that it is proceeding quickly and satisfactorily. Then, consider the question of reconstruction. Canada had engaged in munitions and in other war industries some 200,000 men and women. Immediately after the armistice was declared 120,000 or 130,000 of those immediately lost their positions, and became unemployed. They were engaged in munition industries and in other war industries, which necessarily ceased as soon as the war came to an end. The problem for the Government was to find business to replace business represented by the output of the munitions and war industries which had come to an abrupt cessation. In addition to the 120,000 or 130,000 out of employment there were returning, as I have said, some 25,000 or 30,000 soldiers per month. It was winter. The problem which the Government has had to deal with has been to find, so far as possible, employment for all those men and women who lost their positions and for the soldiers who are returning home. That is the problem to which we had to address ourselves. I appeal, Mr. Speaker, to the verdict of results. I do not know of any country to-day, whether it is Great Britain, France, the United States or any other country, that is in a better position, or has less industrial unrest within its borders, than Canada to-day. The hon. gentleman who preceded me referred to the labour situation in Canada, and I desire to say this, not only as showing the efforts which the Government has made, but the attitude and loyalty of labour, that there have been, I believe, less labour disputes in this country since war broke out in 1914 than in any other country in the world. Take the situation in Great Britain to-day, take the situation in Belgium, the situation in France and the situation in the United States—there is great industrial unrest. We have, Mr. Speaker, considerable unemployment in this country, but I believe that when the measures of which I shall now inform the House are in full effect and operation, as they will be within the next few weeks, all the slack of unemployment will be taken up, and that there will within the next two or three months be an actual shortage of labour in many parts of Canada.

[Sir Thomas White.]

What are the measures which the Government have taken in its reconstruction problem. Let me mention a few of them. When the munition industries ceased our steel plants found themselves without a market for their product. We at once took up with the railways of Canada the question of placing orders for steel rails, and within a short time after the conclusion of the armistice, orders had been given by the Government of Canada, on behalf of the Canadian National Railways, on behalf of the Canadian Pacific and on behalf of the Grand Trunk system, for 200,000 tons of steel rails at a cost of $13,000,000, as the Minister of Railways (Hon J. D. Reid) informs me. We took up also with them the question of placing as many orders as they could for rolling stock and locomotives, irrespective of the question of expense, because it was an immediate and urgent matter, having regard to the labour conditions. The Grand Trunk railway and the Canadian Pacific railway are manufacturing their equipment in their own shops. The Government railways have given orders for 2,500 cars and 25 locomotives. That will keep our car equipment industries, with those businesses that are allied and associated with them, very busy. In addition to that, the Government will present to this House within the next few days, estimates providing for an extensive programme of railway betterments and improvements and the construction of branch lines, especially in the West.

To give an idea of the amount of money which will be involved in the programme which I have outlined, it will be sufficient to say that it is estimated that there will be required $35,000,000 for rolling stock and material such as steel rails. In addition to that a sum exceeding $20,000,000 will be needed for railway extensions and more than $10,000,000 for betterments and improvements. The Government lost no time in taking up these important plans which are useful and advantageous from the national standpoint in adding to our national railway plant and equipment and which will, at the same time, provide employment for thousands of men.

In addition to that, Mr. Speaker, the Government provided by an Order in Council, for a loan of $25,000,000 to the provincial governments for the purpose of promoting better housing conditions throughout the Dominion, and this action Parliament will be asked to approve. I am happy to say that the loan will be taken advantage of by all, or nearly all, of the provincial governments.

I have been so advised. It will not only materially improve the living conditions and the health of the people but in carrying out that policy there should be provided work for thousands of those who lost their positions when our munition and war industries came to an end and of our soldiers returning from overseas. In addition to that the Government at once resumed the great public work of the construction of the Welland Canal and the completion of the Trent Valley canal. My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) will tell you, when he addresses the House, of the programme which he has in view and of the preparation of the plans and specifications in anticipation.

Then, in order that Canada may be in a position to participate in the export trade arising out of reconstruction in Europe the Government promptly constituted a Canadian trade mission in London, with its counterpart, a Canadian trade commission in Ottawa. It is necessary to-day, and it will be necessary possibly for some years to come, for Canada to provide credits to a large extent in connection with the business which we shall obtain overseas. In order that our agricultural and manufactured products may be sold, it will be necessary, owing to the condition of exchange between Europe and America, that Canada, like the United States, shall provide credits from which our products shall be purchased. We have actively and continuously taken up the question of furnishing credits for the purchase of our agricultural products, of our wheat, our meats, our cheese and our other products from the field. In addition, we have offered to provide credits whereby France, Belgium and some of the Balkan countries, shall be placed in a position to buy of the products of Canadian agriculture and industry. The figures involved in these transactions are large. I desire to say that I agree with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in his expressions regarding the desirability and the necessity of spending no money wastefully or unnecessarily, but I also desire to say that for the next year, two years, or three years, those in charge of the Government of this country will require resourcefulness and courage to raise whatever money is necessary to establish the credits which will enable this country to market its products. The people will stand behind the Government in that. It is absolutely vital to the continuance of our agricultural and business prosperity.

I have spoken of several of the measures which the Government has taken in order to meet the situation which has arisen owing to the sudden conclusion of the war. The speech from the Throne indicates the further measures, all of a constructive character, which we are taking for the purpose. A Bill is to be presented providing for aid in the construction of highways. I do not know of any more useful or immediately productive public work that could be undertaken by the Government than the improvement of the highways of Canada. This is a country of enormous resources, the greatest being agricultural. The significance and importance of good highways in connection with our farming communities are too well known to this House to make it necessary for me to refer to the matter at any length. A large amount of money will be provided by the Government for the purpose of aiding, by way of subsidies, the several provinces, in the improvement of their highway system. That will not only be beneficial to the country itself, but it will provide a great deal of work for those who need employment.

It will not be necessary for me to speak on the other features of the speech from the Throne—the department of Public Health, to which reference has been made by hon. members who have spoken before; the measures which we shall take in the interest of returned soldiers, and the other policies indicated in the Speech. These matters will all be taken up in due course when they come up before the House for discussion.

My hon. friend has spoken about the Franchise Act. He is evidently of the opinion that there is machinery in all the provinces whereby women are enabled to vote. I think he is in error as to that. In Quebec, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island I believe they do not have that machinery. Further than that, I understand that the measure brought down at the last session of this House was declaratory of the principle and that it does not provide the machinery which will effectually enable women to vote in Dominion elections. There is another reason why a Franchise Bill is necessary at this session. The War Time Elections Act was to last during the war and during the period of demobilization. It should remain upon our statute books until a satisfactory Act takes its place.

Mr. Speaker, I was impressed with what my hon. friend said in regard to the importance of taking our duties in this House with high seriousness. The world has come

through one of the most terrible periods, if not the most terrible, in all its history. There is world-wide disorganization of business and of trade, and much agitation of society. If there ever was a time when it was necessary that the Government, or Parliament and the people, should maintain steadiness, it is now. It is a time for wise, sane, and cool action. The country has done so well during the war that to my mind it is the best earnest for what we shall do to meet present conditions and the future, whatever it may hold for us. Personally, I have the greatest confidence in the resources of this country, and in the intelligence and enterprise of its people. I feel satisfied that Canada's position will be assured, and that when the war is officially at an end, and when trade resumes its natural channels, this country will go forward with a greater impetus than ever before. We have the natural resources—Canada is one of the greatest countries in the world in that respect—we have just laws, and I am satisfied that no matter what happens to other parts of the world—and I am sure we are all looking forward to the restoration and permanence of peace—no matter what happens elsewhere, I am satisfied that everything will go well with Canada.

With regard to the League of Nations, which has been so much discussed and is now almost an accomplished fact, I have this to say—that I think it feasible; but there must be more on the part of the peoples of the world than the aspirations for peace. Permanent peace in this world will depend upon the attitude of the peoples of the world towards each other, towards life and towards civilization. In the last analysis permanent peace must rest upon an ethical basis. In the meantime, that the peace of the world may be restored and may be maintained, it seems to me that there must be the sanction of force, actual or potential, in order that the decrees and decisions of the powers who are parties to the league may be enforced, and all nations must in that connection realize their duties, obligations, and responsibilities.

My hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) has spoken about the political situation, and he has welcomed back some hon. gentlemen upon this side of the House, telling them that the light is in the window and the door upon the latch. Well, I am inclined to think, Mr. Speaker, that the members of this House, like the people of this country, are not thinking very much about party politics at this time. The problems that we have to face are so vast, so complicated and so important, that matters that used to be of interest to us now take a secondary place. When the ship of state, after this world tempest through which it has passed, is equipped and refitted, and sails once again into smooth seas with the prospects of favouring winds and a prosperous voyage, it will be time enough to consider the old party conditions that used to engage our attention to so great an extent. This war, Mr. Speaker, has almost destroyed civilization. What we need in this country to-day is a spirit that seeks not the individual or the sectional gain, but the welfare of the country as a whole. With that spirit in Canada I feel that this country, with its resources, and with the intelligence and patriotism which it possesses, can meet with faith and with confidence whatever vicissitudes the future may hold in store for us.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, when a death occurs in a family the sympathy of friends is always precious, and to the Liberal family sitting on this side of the House the sympathy extended by our friends, irrespective of party allegiance, is a very dear and precious thing, and I wish on behalf of hon. gentlemen sitting to your left, Sir, to tender my sincere and hearty thanks.

To the eloquent eulogy to the work done in the field by our Canadian army offered by the leader of His Majesty's Government, I say, Amen and Amen, but may I be allowed to add something else. There is another side, alas, to the medal: during the last four years we have often thought of John Bright's great saying, when, speaking in regard to the Crimean War he said:

> The Angel of Death is abroad in the land. One can almost hear the beating of His wings.

To the members of this House, and to the men outside the House—aye, and the women too—who have lost their dear ones, I think it is only proper that the representatives of the people at large should give their humble, their hearty, their sympathetic condolence, and the prayer that the Comforter of all will comfort them in their grief.

I was delighted to hear, Mr. Speaker, the adherence of the leader of the Government to the plan of a League of Nations, because I believe that without a League of Nations, without some international organization for the enforcing of peace, we are likely to have a recurrence of war. I agree with him when he says that the immediate cause of this conflict was the boundless ambition of the German empire and its military caste, and

the desire for domination of the Prussian people. Yes, that was the immediate cause, but there were underlying causes deeper than that, Mr. Speaker. There was first f all this fact—that we lived in a world where force was the ultimate arbiter, and until we live in a world where force is not the ultimate arbiter, that is to say force used by one nation against another, wars are almost bound to occur. It occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that before the war broke out the civilized world was like a western mining camp, where each man was dependent for his own safety and security upon the revolver or the bowie-knife he carried. But in a western mining camp the good sense of the community revolted at such a condition of affairs, because it always led to murder and sudden death. Therefore, they erected Judge Lynch's Court, and Judge Lynch called upon the respectable citizens to band together and put down the outlaw, the bandit and the desperado. That is the situation in the world to-day. Judge Lynch's Court, the League of Nations, is in process of formation, and it is for all the well-intentioned peoples of the world to rally round a league to enforce world-wide peace. And it is something to be said for the North American continent that the great protagonist of that idea comes from this side of the Atlantic. I refer to the work of Woodrow Wilson, whose name will go ringing down the ages as that of a man who tried to reconstitute the world on a better basis. He has been supported by nearly all the great men of the Motherland—by Lloyd George, by Lord Robert Cecil, by Viscount Bryce. Viscount Bryce said in a letter which he wrote to a great meeting for the purpose of promoting the ideal, "we must destroy war or war will destroy us." Not only was the fact of force being the only arbiter one of the causes of war, but there was the vast interest which certain classes in every civilized nation had in manufacturing armaments; there was a personal interest in keeping up international friction in order that private gain might ensue. And last, but perhaps not least, was secret diplomacy, the international relations of practically every country in the world being conducted not by the representatives of the people, but by a small group in each country. Time after time this was the case; instance after instance might be cited where the different civilized nations of the world did not know to what their governments had committed them.

I have a suggestion which, in view of the financial experience of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) and my own inexperience, I offer with a good deal of diffidence, but it has such a common sense ring about it that I believe he and the rest of the members of this House will regard it as reasonable. We have a vast expenditure outlined. I do not believe that the Canadian people know to-day in what financial position we are, and I suggest that the Acting Prime Minister, who carries also on his broad shoulders the heavy burden of being Finance Minister—a burden which, I am sure, is grievous to bear these days—will bring down and place before the House at the earliest possible moment a succinct statement of the liabilities of this country. It is quite true that we may have to spend vast sums for reconstruction and in order to provide employment during the term of reconstruction.

But we must be careful about it. A large amount of this money will be borrowed. If we borrow too much the lenders will begin to look askance even at our boundless resources and even at the ability of those who are conducting the affairs of the country, and say: We cannot lend you any more money. That would be a sad condition; so I think it would be proper and fitting that such a statement be laid before the House at an early date.

We all hate taxation. In a few days I will have to write a cheque, with great regret, to the order of the Receiver-General of Canada for income tax. Although personally I am glad that it is as small as it is, as a citizen I know that it should be a great deal larger; and if I may offer advice at this time to the Finance Minister it is that the income tax of the country should approach the scale of the income tax in the United States and in the United Kingdom. So far, the rates of taxation imposed on large incomes in Canada have been away below the rates imposed in the United States and in the United Kingdom.

It has been stated that the War-Time Elections Act should remain on the statute book of Canada until it is superseded by some other Act. I take issue with that statement, and I believe that my feelings will be shared by many sitting on the opposite side as well as by those sitting on this side of the House. The War-Time Elections Act, Mr. Speaker, is a blot on the statute book of Canada. I am not allowed, I believe, to characterize as iniquitous, legislation passed by the House of Commons and the Senate and signed by the Governor-General. But I will take the

words of the minister (Mr. A. K. Maclean)—now, there are so many ministers that I have forgotten what department he is in charge of, but, he acted as Minister of Finance last session, and in bygone, happier days he acted as financial critic of the Opposition. He said, when this War-Time Elections Act was under consideration that it was a horrible Bill, and I believe that the Minister of Public Works (Hon. F. B. Carvell) who sits beside him, characterized it in even stronger language. I call upon these men and I call upon every man who loves liberty and justice and British fair play to see to it that this War-time Elections Act is wiped off the statute book of Canada at the earliest possible moment. It was passed for the purpose of winning an election. It was a tampering with the electorate by a body of men who proposed to appeal to the electorate after it had been tampered with. It goes to the very root and to the very basis of our representative institutions. I ask the Acting Prime Minister to be worthy of himself; I ask him to be worthy of those high ideals which he has placed before us with such eloquence and, I believe, with such sincerity, and not to allow his leadership to be sullied and besmirched by the retention of this Act upon the statute book of Canada.

Now I pass to a more agreeable task—I would far rather be complimentary, Mr. Speaker, than denunciatory. It is, perhaps, presumptuous for me, a member of the same age as the member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) and the member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), to attempt to say anything about their remarks. But their speeches were of such high quality, so eloquent, and breathed such a true spirit of harmony and unity and proper national aspiration, that I must be allowed to give them a meed of praise. Their tone was admirable. Both asked for national harmony and national unity, and the member for Fort William and Rainy River, who showed that the Surgeon in Arms is as eloquent with his tongue as with his pen, told us, almost in the words of Abraham Lincoln, that a house divided against itself cannot stand. May I continue the quotation. Abraham Lincoln went on to say that this house shall not fall; it shall cease to be divided.

There are divergent influences among the Canadian people. There is a difference of faith; there is a difference, apparent rather than real, of economic interest, and there is a difference of tongue. All these differences lead to misunderstanding. The

French have an expression: De tout comprendre est de tout pardonner—to understand everything is to forgive everything. What can we do to bring the nation together, to promote understanding?

As far as religious differences are concerned, the solution is very easy. We have only to put in the background everything that divides us and to put in the foreground everything that unites us. Although I come of Scotch Presbyterian parentage, I do not pretend to be a theologian, but I suppose some remnant of theology is in my blood, and I submit that the things upon which we are in accord are infinitely more important than the things upon which we differ. I, therefore, imagine that the way to get over the unfortunate differences which have existed between Roman Catholics and Protestants in the past is to think more of our common Christianity and less of the differences in our creeds which divide us. As far as our economic differences are concerned, those differences would be better got rid of by the application of the principle of liberty and freedom than by the application of the principle of restriction. As far as the language difficulty is concerned, why, it is no difficulty at all. I am very familiar with that part of the province of Quebec where French-speaking man and English-speaking man live side by side on neighbouring farms, and there is no difficulty. Why is there no difficulty? Because they understand each other. I remember once being called upon to visit a small place lying on the boundary between Quebec and Ontario. I went into a Scotch woman's house, the house of a Scottish Canadian. I was talking to her son, and he was not only bilingual, but trilingual. He spoke French and he spoke English, and he had the Gælic. I say this, Sir, that never have I come in contact with English-speaking people living right amongst French-speaking people but I have found that both not only respect but like each other. Why? Because they know each other. I would suggest, as one means of healing all breaches which may have existed in the past, in order that we may go on rejoicing to that future which I hope Providence has in store for us, that we English-speaking people should endeavour as far as possible to learn and have our children learn French, as the French-speaking people in this country learn and have their children learn English.

The statement is made that Labour is not altogether satisfied in this country. I

agree with the Acting Prime Minister when he says—and he does honour to the workers of Canada when he says it,—that during the war there was less labour disturbance in Canada than in any other country in the world. But is the worker entitled to be dissatisfied as things have been in the past? I put this to you, Sir. Before the industrial revolution, when the man,—the journeyman and the apprentice,—worked side by side with his master, the man, as a general rule, had a modest sufficiency to eat and to wear, and he lived on a basis of more or less equality with his master. Then came the industrial revolution, and mankind harnessed the power of steam, and afterwards harnessed the power of electricity and he increased his power of creating wealth ten times, aye, I think, twenty times. But what resulted to the worker? The worker did not live with his master; he did not work side by side with his master; but he was depressed into a mere "hand," and the master became the great factory employer or great manufacturer. The worker, although by his skill, aided by electricity and steam, he was able to create twenty times the wealth that he did before, remained very little better off than he was before the industrial revolution began. That is to say he had a fair, but not an adequate sufficiency of clothing and of food; and before, by the force of trade-unionism, he raised his pay by combining against his master, he was not as well off as he was before the industrial revolution occurred. Now, the workman feels that he is living in a new world. The British workman, the French workman, the Canadian workman, each feels that his sacrifices on the field entitle him to expect that the world will be a better place for him to live in; that no longer will the great portion of the most arduous work in the world have to be performed for a bare pittance. I, for one, do not blame him. I, for one, want to see the workman get a greater proportion of the wealth which his labour has created. There will, in this connection, have to be co-operation, and I feel certain that members interested in this subject, as well on the Government side as on this side of the House, will be glad to study the Whiteley report in which is outlined the system of industrial councils in which men representing the masters and men representing the workers will sit for the purpose of a common management of the industries in which they are engaged.

The hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) spoke in somewhat severe terms of the Bolsheviks. The popular idea of a Bolshevik is a wild-eyed anarchist looting a bank. I am not sure whether the common view taken in this country of the Bolshevik is altogether correct. I think that perhaps there is another side to the question, and as this is the great forum where truth and exact knowledge should be brought before the people, I take the liberty of referring the House to some articles which are appearing in the Manchester Guardian from an eye-witness from Russia. I think the Manchester Guardian will be admitted by all to be one of the very great organs of public opinion in the old land. The writer of the articles which appear in the Manchester Guardian was, since the autumn of 1916, engaged in relief work under the auspices of the Society of Friends' War Victims' Relief Committee, and he spent a large portion of his time in Russia, learned the language completely, and has a great deal of interest to tell us. I believe that the House will be interested if I read a short extract from an article which appeared in the Guardian on the 22nd of January of this year. It is entitled "A Rural District under the Bolsheviks." The writer says:

> Of all the industrial and economic enterprises in the district none suffered less change than the Co-operative Society, which had been started before the war under the old regime, and which continued unchanged under the Provisional and Kerensky Governments, and enlarged its membership 500 per cent under the Bolsheviks. In the time I speak of the Co-operative Society had virtually become a monopoly, and had either put out of business or absorbed the small traders. It could get credit from the Soviet, was recognised by the railway officials as a Government department, and could undertake purchasing operations on a large scale and look to guarantee of transport. It had an organisation of sub-branches in nearly every village, and could distribute and sell its goods without having to get permits and licenses from the Soviet. The Government decided to purchase wheat and rye in Siberia for seed and consumption.

If the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) is here, he will see that when he bought seed for distribution and consumption in the Northwest, he was acting just like a Bolshevik.

> —and naturally placed the order with the Co-operative Society. Purchase of medical requirements in Moscow for the numerous Soviet hospitals was done through the same channel, members of the Soviet often travelling with the buyers in order to guarantee good faith.
>
> The profits of the Co-operative Society, which were reduced to minimum, but which on the millions of roubles of turnover amounted to a considerable sum, were devoted to educational purposes. Evening classes were started in modern languages, geography, history, and the Russian language; in bookkeeping and business training; subsidies were granted for agricultur-

al colleges and schools, and scholarships were founded for the gymnasia (secondary schools.)

The educational programme of the Bolsheviks was ambitious, but it was this ambitiousness which commended it to the people. The Bolsheviks aimed at starting a school in every village and increasing the number of gymnasia in the district and founding a university, but in this project they were stopped by lack of teachers.

The article goes on to say:

Under the stricter days of the old regime the Boy Scout movement was not permitted in Russia, but latterly was allowed a certain amount of liberty under police supervision. Under the Bolsheviks, however, it flourished, and troops were formed in many of the cities and department towns.

It will be interesting to those who live in the dry province of Ontario to know how the Bolsheviks dealt with the illicit liquor traffic:

The Russian public had not been accustomed to reliable law courts or a just police administration. Under the Bolsheviks, as under the Provisional and Kerensky Governments, the villages appointed their own police when necessary, choosing the oldest men as those most likely to have wisdom and discretion in human affairs. As an instance of this may be mentioned the way in which the old regime and the Bolsheviks dealt with illegal vodka distilling. In the days of the Imperial police anyone caught in the act was arrested by the police, but, as everyone knew, each offence had its price, except that of political propaganda, and a sum of money amounting maybe to several hundred or several thousand roubles, would settle the matter, and until the time of blackmail came round again the business could continue unmolested, however much the public might be against it. Under the Bolsheviks a man found distilling vodka would not be punished but his still would be taken from him, the public would be informed of his guilt, and the amount of grain which the food committee would allow him to buy would be limited to that needed for his own domestic use.

I am placing these facts before the House, not because I am here to defend the Bolsheviks, but because I think it is well to realize there may be two sides to every question, and we should not be carried off our feet in denunciation of other people before we really know what they are doing. As I understand it, Bolshevism is a form of socialistic government in which the lower classes—I should not use that expression because it is obnoxious in this country—in which the manual workers have assumed to take the whole control of the government to the exclusion of the intellectual and trading classes. I think that is morally wrong because it is government of the people by only part of the people, and I think it unwise because it eliminates from the government classes which might have a considerable contribution to offer. It has been suggested that Bolshevism must be put down. What is meant by that? Does it mean we are to send more men to Russia for the purpose of fighting? If that is so, I would say first of all that it is a course the wisdom of which is very doubtful. Outside interference may tend to solidify the people under the Bolsheviki, and perhaps in endeavouring to put down disorder we may possibly trample on liberty.

You will remember, Mr. Speaker, the situation at the time of the French revolution. You will remember how the French revolutionaries were denounced, and properly so, not only for their excesses but for other things as well by the civilized countries of Europe. You will remember how kings banded themselves together for the purpose of putting down the French revolution and how the revolutionary spirit of France, the free spirit of old France, enabled the barefooted armies of the republic to conquer all their enemies, and they were not conquered until the first republic had become an Empire and until Napoleon had seized the reins of power and turned the enthusiasm of the French revolution into channels for his own imperialistic benefit. And therefore I say, we come to this: We have Canadian soldiers today fighting in Russia; we have sent Canadian soldiers to Siberia, where they are fighting. I do not propose at this moment to condemn the Government for sending them, but I say that the Government must at the earliest possible moment let the Canadian people know why Canadian boys have been sent there. Certain explanations which have been given do not explain. It has been suggested by some one that they are sent there for the purpose of promoting Canadian trade. I for one would rather that in all the future history of Canada we never sold a single mowing machine or any other article of manufacture or commerce there than that the blood of a single Canadian lad should be spilled in vain.

There is another matter in this connection which must be inquired into. It is a relatively small force that has been sent. I do not know whether my opinion is right or not, but I believe I am right in saying that this force was so small that it could have been recruited through the voluntary system. I believe I am right in saying that drafted men who expected to be sent to fight the enemies of civilization in France

or Flanders have been sent off to the snows of Siberia to fight other men, who, it is a strong chance, are also fighting for freedom, but in their own way. Without fuller investigation, I shall say nothing further on that matter but this: It is the duty of the Canadian people in Parliament assembled to have the reasons for this expedition set before us as early as possible, and I say that it would have been proper and fitting before this expedition was sent at all that Parliament should have been convened in order that the people's representatives might have been consulted.

How are we to overcome the dissatisfaction and unrest in this country? First of all, let the Government, at the earliest possible moment, get rid of their Orders in Council. Let us re-establish parliamentary government at the earliest possible moment. Do hon. gentlemen on the Government side realize that the Canadian people, and in fact all people, are looking with a searching eye to representative government, to authority of all sorts, and the Government which will meet with their approval is a Government which will truly represent them. Constituted authority is on trial. They had an election in England recently, at which about fifty per cent of the people voted, and during that election, and I believe since, what has happened? They are having direct action in England. People are not looking to Parliament for redress as they did in days gone by, but are taking the law into their own hands. That is a very sad condition. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that some organization—I forget which, for the moment, but I think it was the Socialists—wished to hold a meeting in Albert Hall. At all events it was a meeting of an organization which did not please the owners of Albert Hall, and they cancelled the contract with the Socialists; they broke their agreement. Then what did the Union of Electrical Workers do? The representatives of that union went to the owners of Albert Hall and said, " Unless you keep your contract with our friends of such and such a union or Socialist organization and let them have the hall we will see to it that you have no electric light when you have the great Victory ball on such and such a night.

The owners of the hall thought it best to keep their word with the group to whom they had leased the hall. But that is a bad business. Those people were imposing their will, in a right cause, it is true, on that occasion, but that is direct action. That is the sort of thing we want to avoid. You know these orders in council have not increased the prestige of the Government in this country. My friends from the Maritime Provinces will agree with me when I say that a ship beating into harbour, especially a fore and aft ship, is a beautiful sight, as it beats in, tacking with the wind, taking advantage of every slant in the wind, by the action of the skilful helmsman. It is a grand sight to see it at first go-off on the starboard tack, and go round and get into the eye of the wind, and then go off on the port tack. But, Mr. Speaker, a man or a party proceeding to an objective in that manner is not a beautiful or dignified sight. What have we had? We have had orders in council galore. As a matter of fact, we have had so much information by way of orders in council, and such like, given us by the Government, that the Government felt that the old vehicle, the Official Gazette, was too small to enable them to do justice to the situation, and therefore we have at this time, when economy should be the slogan, the Canadian Official Record, a small paper, and strange to say it is exactly the shape of an American publication of the same sort, and it contains some priceless articles of information. They reproduce things which are already in the Canadian Official Gazette, and then they will tell us that Sir Robert Borden greatly enjoyed a nine-penny lunch that he had in England at such a time, or that James Jones, of Richmond, Que., has had his bakery establishment closed for three days for allowing two batches of dough to go bad and be wasted. That is the sort of thing the Canadian people are regaled with, in order to keep up their interest in the war.

I come now to the last subject of my remarks. I wish to speak concerning the matter to which the acting Premier referred when he concluded his eloquent remarks. He said he believed that a party government should be set aside for the time being in Canada, because he believed the problems which we had to face were so complex and so difficult. I agree with him that the problems are complex and difficult, and just because they are complex and difficult there are bound to be differences of opinion upon them, and if we are going to have good government in this country, we must have party government, if those who are at one on the principles along which the Government should proceed are in one party, and those who believe that the Government of the country should be carried on along

other principles are in the other party. We have had a great dividing line between the two parties in Canada for more than a generation, and we have those who believe that the tariff of this country should be a low tariff, primarily intended for the purpose of raising a revenue, and we have those who believe that the tariff should be a machine for protecting the manufacturers and other interests in the country. There is room for differences of opinion. Honest men may be on both sides of the question, but I say that now, when we have returned to peace, cleavage in opinion is bound to arise. What is the situation in Canada to-day? We are face to face with an appalling debt and before the war we had pushed our urban railway development to such an extent—and here I will not ask you to decide with me, or discuss who is responsible for pushing it to that extent—that we had outstripped, I think, by a generation our rural development. We built railways, and several of those roads are bankrupt. We had last session to consider the taking over of the Canadian Northern railway, which was a tremendous liability on the back of the country, a railroad which will not carry itself for years to come, and, by the way, we had to spend $8,000,000 for the privilege of taking over that liability. We find to-day that the Grand Trunk Pacific is not paying its way, and that the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, the parent company does not want to implement its obligations in regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific. We are face to face with this situation: that our financial and economic future is in danger unless we augment by fifty to one hundred per cent, the rural population of this country. That is the way to look at it. It is not a question altogether of high tariff or low tariff; to use an expression time and again given me by safe and sane men, "It is a condition and not a theory that confronts us." Now, how are we going to increase the rural population of this country? Good roads are a good thing, better schools are a good thing, and co-operative societies are a good thing; but what we need more than anything else is to give to the agriculturists of this country as advantageous conditions under which to operate as are given in any other part of the world, and notably in the United States. In order to do that, we must so arrange our tariff that what our agriculturists require to buy, they can buy at a reasonable price, because certainly, as far as our western agriculturist is concerned, he has to take the world's price for what he has to sell, and it is not fair that he should have to pay a quarter or a third, or in some cases almost half as much again, as the natural price for what he has to buy. I say that that is the first great argument in favour of the lowering of the tariff, and I do not think that, with all the best will in the world, the interests represented, and ably represented by gentlemen on the opposite side of the House, are prepared to go that far with me in regard to the tariff question. There is an issue between us, and there will be a healthier condition in Canadian public life when that issue is practically admitted. Then I say that protection is merely State aid given by a community to certain industries. You cannot tax yourself into prosperity any more than you can pull yourself up by your boot straps. It imposes a tremendous burden on the consuming public of this country, and that burden is a good deal greater than the amount of money which finds its way into the treasury. There are those in this country—and I think their number is increasing from day to day—who say that the tariff should be swept away altogether. Although I believe thoroughly in the principle of free exchange, I do not think that would be fair or wise. It would not be fair to invested capital, and it would not be wise, because a very moderate tariff should be retained as a means of collecting revenue, but a 42½ per cent tariff is not a means of increasing revenue. It is a means of keeping goods out of your country. I hope I shall not be accused of pro-Germanism in advocating the policy and practice of free exchange. I saw during the recess a speech made by the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) in which he said that if the war was on he would accuse those who advocated a lower tariff of pro-German feeling. It is somewhat difficult for me to follow the mental processes of the monopolists of this country because I had been taught that Great Britain was the great example of free trade and that Germany was one of the great protectionist countries of the world. Every protectionist government in the last war, with the exception of that of the United States, which had a vast internal area of free trade, had to have recourse to the necesssity of borrowing for the purpose of meeting its debts while Great Britain financed not only herself, not only her incomparable effort in the war on land and sea and in the air, but financed her Allies and her dependencies very largely through taxation raising from a quarter to

a third of the amount spent on the war out of the pockets of her own people.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did not Great Britain borrow four billion dollars from the United States of America?

Mr. McMASTER: She did. She borrowed very heavily. I do not pretend for an instant that she did not have recourse to borrowing, but the main point is that Great Britain borrowed less and raised by taxation more than the other countries that have followed the protectionist practice. Why should the lamp shine in the window, why should the latch string be on the outside of the door, because we know that there are men in this House who differed from us on the question of how best to raise men for the Canadian army? They had the right to their opinion. We had the right to ours. I would, on this occasion, follow the generous example set by the leader of the Government who said in substance that where he differed from the late, lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier on public questions, he would leave it to history to decide, that we were too near events perhaps to arrive at a proper judgment. We will follow that example and we will leave to history to decide whether the way of raising an army advocated by gentlemen on that side or the way advocated by us was the proper and better way. But that day has passed. That question is settled, please God never again to be raised in our lifetime.

The great question before the Canadian people in this era of reconstruction is going to be the tariff. Some people say: Leave the tariff alone until we have reconstructed. What a ridiculous suggestion that is! Here is a house that has been blown down by a cyclone. Some people say that the house should be built of wood and others that it should be built of brick. Those who want to built it of wood say: Do not discuss the question of whether it shall be built of wood or brick until we have built it again of wood. That is the position of people who advocate that reconstruction should ante-date the decision of this question.

What is the attitude of the Liberal party on the question of the tariff? I know that an hon. member from Alberta and an hon. member from Manitoba were somewhat critical in their remarks upon the success which the Liberal party had achieved in reducing the tariff. I frankly admit that I wish that during the years from 1896 to 1911 we had reduced the tariff more. But you saw, Mr. Speaker, just as soon as the guiding hand of the Liberals was taken off the tariff how the duty was increased by 7½ per cent even in war times. We are just and fair, and, of course, as former Liberals, you cannot help being just and fair. You will also remember that there was a great reciprocity campaign. Some bird has whispered that the loss of some of those who were identified with the Liberal cause prior to 1911 was due to that reciprocity campaign of 1911. Be that as it may, you remember that Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his party went down to defeat on the issue of reciprocity in natural products with the United States. After all, my friends, if the Liberal party is not giving satisfaction in the direction you would like, there is no reason why you should hang back with the crowd that is going in the other direction altogether. This is the view of the tariff taken by the Liberal party and voted upon by every member of this House on the 23rd of May, 1917:

> That wheat, wheat flour, and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list.

I do not know whether trading in wheat with the United States is quite as disloyal a thing as it used to be because I understand that not so very long ago an Order in Council was passed allowing trade in wheat with the United States. But then, shortly after that, I think the millers will tell you, there was some sort of an embargo placed upon this trade which prevented the carrying out of that Order in Council.

> That farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repairs for same, rough and partly dressed lumber, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers be added to the free list.

Of course, there will be the retort in some Unionist's mouth: We have put tractors on the free list. Yes, tractors have been put on the free list up to $1,400, but if you put the tractor on the free list, why did you not put the plough, which has to be pulled by the tractor, on the free list? How could you logically differentiate between the tractor and the plough? Surely it is not because it is only the comparatively well-off farmer who can afford to have a tractor while every poor fellow who goes on the land requires a plough? Surely that is not the reason? I do not believe it is. It is just due to that fact that I described before; there was just a little wind rising in the west and the helmsman took advantage of it to throw the boat's head a point or two to starboard. But, let me continue:

> That staple foods and food products (other than wheat flour), domestic animals and foods therefor, be admitted into Canada free of duty

when coming from and being the product of any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty.

That substantial reductions be made in the general tariff on all articles imported into Canada, except luxuries.

That the British Preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff.

I say to my separated brethren: Go to the Acting Prime Minister, who is also the Finance Minister, place the Hansard containing my few humble remarks before him and say to him: Now, Sir, are you willing to go as far as the Grits will go? Then govern yourselves accordingly. Do you remember that old story in ancient writ of how the prophets of Baal and Elijah worked together one day on Mount Carmel? You remember how Elijah said: "If Baal be the Lord serve him, and if Jehovah be the Lord serve Him." If your principles are for liberty and low tariff you know on which side of the House you should sit. If protection and high tariff be your God, then stay where you are.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hope the hon. member will not further transgress the rules of the House, but that hereafter he will address his remarks to the Chair.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): May I ask the hon. gentleman if he has the number of votes cast in that division, and if he can tell me how many members of the then Liberal party voted for that resolution?

Mr. McMASTER: I have not that information. I was not then a member of the House, but I am sure the information is within the knowledge of my hon. friend.

Just one other remark and I shall have finished: There are perhaps those who are exercised in their minds what they should do. Perhaps a feeling of loyalty—mistaken, I think—to an absent leader may have some effect upon them. To them, through you, Mr. Speaker, I address these words: Let it be not said of them, as was said of Lancelot by Tennyson:

> His honour rooted in dishonour stood,
> And faith, unfaithful, kept him falsely true.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Carvell the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 10.28 p.m.

[Mr. McMaster.]

Wednesday, February 26, 1919.

The House met at Two o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Militia Council for the year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon Major-General Mewburn.

Copies of General Orders, Appointments, Transfers and Promotions in the Canadian Militia promulgated between January 1, 1918, and February 1, 1919.—Hon. Major-General Mewburn.

Copies of all Routine Orders of the Canadian Expeditionary Force promulgated from January 2, 1918, to February 22, 1919.—Hon. Major-General Mewburn.

Report of the Minister of Public Works for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Carvell.

Dispatch from the Right Hon. the Secretary of State for the Colonies to His Excellency the Governor-General transmitting copies of a parliamentary paper containing extracts from the minutes of proceedings of the Imperial War Conference, 1918, and papers laid before the Conference.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Report of the Postmaster General for the year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Appropriation Account, 1917-18, Royal North West Mounted Police.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Orders in Council with reference to the work of the Director and Associate Director of Public Information.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Fifty-first Annual Report of the Department of Marine and Fisheries for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

Statement of Harbour Dues collected during the fiscal year 1917-18.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

Statement of leases of wharves, piers and breakwaters under the control of the Department of Marine and Fisheries.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

Statement of fees received on account of Sick Mariners' Fund during the fiscal year 1917-18.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

Orders in Council passed on the recommendation of the Minister of Trade and Commerce since the last session of Parliament.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

Copy of an Order in Council dated the 14th August, 1918, passed under the provisions of the War Measures Act, 1914, relative to the certificates of Masters and Mates—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

VOTES AND PROCEEDINGS AND JOURNALS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That a Special Committee composed of Messrs. Pardee, Nickle, Lemieux, and Currie be appointed to consider and report upon the question of systematizing the work of compiling the Votes and Proceedings and Journals of the House of Commons with a view to economy.

He said: A committee was appointed last session to consider and report upon this subject. Not having had time to consider the question fully, it reported on the 21st of March, 1918, and recommended that during the recess the Chief Clerk of the Journals Branch should work out the details in connection with the subject. This has been done, and it is now proposed to appoint this committee immediately to consider the question again and to report at its earliest convenience in order that the change, if approved, may be carried out without delay.

Motion agreed to.

SAINT JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 5, to authorize a further extension of time for the completion of the Saint John and Quebec Railway between Gagetown and Westfield.

Mr. McKENZIE: Explain.

Hon. Mr. REID: It is simply to extend the time for completion until the end of the present year. The time expired in December last.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are the operations proceeding now?

Hon. Mr. REID: Yes, the work of construction has been going along. Not much is being done, of course, in the winter, but the work will be completed during the present year.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, February 25.

Hon. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, I first want to congratulate the mover of the address in reply to the speech from the Throne (Mr. Redman) and the seconder (Mr. Manion) on the manner in which they fulfilled their duties yesterday, and in doing so I assure them that this is no perfunctory compliment. I felt that rarely in my somewhat lengthy experience in this House have I heard the mover and the seconder of this motion take such lofty grounds or grasp as intimately as they did the great problems confronting the country.

After all, the greatest problem which this country has ever faced—I assume that the same is true of all those nations of the civilized world which have been engaged in the great war—is that of getting back from a war basis to a peace basis. One would be surprised if he could sit at the Council table and listen to the demands and complaints and suggestions that are coming in every day from every part of the country, due entirely to the condition in which we find ourselves on account of the war and on account of its having terminated much sooner than most people anticipated. Fortunately, the Government—and when I say "the Government" I mean the country, because the people must do their part as well as the Government—were in a fairly good position to get back to peace. Probably no warring nation outside of the United States was in a better position than that in which Canada found herself on the cessation of hostilities—I am even somewhat doubtful that the United States were in a better position than we were at the close of the war.

But very great problems must be faced and very great difficulties must be overcome in getting this country back to a peace basis. In my judgment, it will be years before we get back, if we ever do, to exactly the same conditions as existed before the war. One hundred years ago, when the great European war of that period was brought to a close, no doubt things looked blacker to the people than they look to us to-day, although the financial obligations of the nations of the world were then as nothing compared with what they are now. The war which has just ended has been the greatest medium for the expenditure of moneys that the world has ever known and probably ever will know—we all hope so, anyway. The world, therefore, has a different problem to solve from that which faced it a hundred years ago. But in the peoples of the world there is a wonderful amount of vivacity, a wonderful amount of recuperation, and just as the people of old overcame their difficulties, so shall we, in the course of a few

years, overcome ours and get along just as well as we got along before the war. The only thing I want to talk about to-day, therefore, is what is involved in our getting back from a war basis to a peace basis.

It is idle for any one to say that abnormal conditions do not exist throughout the country. We hear it said that the wounded or disabled soldier who returns from the battlefields is in an abnormal condition but while that may be true, he is not alone. There are just as many other abnormal people and I think a good many more in Canada to-day as there are amongst returned soldiers. An abnormal condition exists in the minds of a very great body of the people of Canada. It is called by various names, varying, I presume, to some extent according to the degree to which they are abnormal.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Not in the Government, though.

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, no, not in the Government—I am speaking now about the rest of the people. Just here in passing, while I do not know that this has much to do with the Address, may I say that I was somewhat surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) last evening in discussing certain matters, because I may say he and I are not very far apart on many of the subjects discussed by him. I wish to refer to this statement that the popular and erroneous idea of a Bolshevik is a wild-eyed anarchist looting a bank. Well, if he had gone a little further and said that a Bolshevik was a wild-eyed anarchist looting a bank, shooting down all the Bourgeois or property owners in the country and carrying off their wives and children, he would have come nearer to the definition of a Bolshevik than he did. He says that this parliament is the great forum where truth and exact knowledge should be brought before the people. He gave us very frankly the Manchester Guardian as the source of information from which he derived somewhat lenient definition of a Bolshevik. I can only say that is not the information which I have, and I think there are very few people who have any personal knowledge of the Russian situation to-day who will agree with the definition of the Manchester Guardian. During the last month we have had before the Government people who have been in Russia, who have lived there since the revolution, who know the condition of affairs, and they give us a very different idea from that given by the correspondent of the Manchester Guardian, from which my hon. friend quoted yesterday evening. The conditions which are depicted to us as existing in Russia are such that, in my judgment, Russia is a proper place to keep the Bolsheviks in for some years to come, and the only thing that worries me is how soon we can get some of their ilk back to their fatherland, where they may enjoy some of the benefits of the new civilization set up by Lenine and Trotzky, men who, the moment they attained power in Russia, did not hesitate to turn their backs upon the Allies, upon the great civilized nations that had been trying to save Russia from the barbarism of Germany, and upon the civilized nations which had furnished the people of Russia with war material and had put them, in the spring of 1917, in a position to have carried this war on as they never were in a position before and, I believe, to have brought the war to a close in the summer of 1917 if Lenine and Trotzky had not proved traitors to the Allies. If those be the men whose ideals we should follow, then I shall part company with my hon. friend so far as that is concerned. But I am sorry to say that we have, in a very large degree amongst certain classes of people in Canada, a state of unrest—I do not call it Bolshevism, but I believe if such people were in Russia, they would go further than they dare go in Canada—and it is to meet this condition of unrest that the Government has, since the armistice was signed, been bending its energies. And, we intend bending our energies in this direction as long as it is necessary, in order to do everything which we can reasonably do to get Canada back to its normal condition.

The speech from the Throne has told in a general way what are the proposals of the Government. The Acting Prime Minister yesterday referred to a good many of the measures which are being put forward by the Government as a means of meeting this condition of unrest. He referred to the tremendous amounts of money which th Government purposes asking Parliament to vote in order that it may be expended upon railways, highways, and certain other public undertakings, but he did not refer to one great expenditure, which is to be incurred, in the building of ships. As the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), in whose department this is, is not here,—and we shall all be glad, I am sure, when his health enables him to return to the House—I may be pardoned for referring to it. The Government is spending a large amount of money this year—I am not sure as to the exact

amount, but I imagine it must be twenty or twenty-five million dollars—and it expects to spend about thirty million dollars during the next fiscal year in the construction of steel ships in Canada. I know there will be criticism of this; at least, I assume there will during the session, because criticism has already been launched in the public press, and, so far as I am concerned, I want to meet it here and to give my views very plainly. It is always a very easy matter to be wise after the event. A year ago there was nothing which the civilized world needed so much as shipping. A year ago shipping was more vital to winning the war than were men or shells or anything else. The greatest cry of the allied armies a year ago was for ships, ships to carry American soldiers across the ocean and ships to carry food to the allied armies. The Canadian Government decided to undertake a shipbuilding programme which involved the construction of fifty-two ships varying in size from 3,500 tons dead weight to 10,000 tons dead weight. Some of those have already been completed and are in service. I do not deny—I do not for a moment try to conceal the fact that those ships are going to cost more than they would have, had the Government gone out into the open market after peace was declared and bought the ships. But buying the ships after peace was declared would not have helped furnish ships in order to carry on the war; and if the war had continued, as most people expected it would, over another winter and another summer, two-thirds or at least one half of those ships would have been at the service of the country. Even to-day, while we admit that the war is over and the crying necessity for those ships has ceased to exist, the construction of those ships plays an important part in many portions of Canada in furnishing labour to the unemployed, a task which I look upon as the paramount duty of this Government and of the government of every province and every municipality at the present time. So far as I am concerned, —and I can speak for my colleagues, so far as we are concerned collectively,—in the allocation of the public moneys we have taken into consideration practically altogether the probable requirements to take care of unemployment in the labour world generally rather than the advantage which a particular work or expenditure of money will be to the people in the vicinity in which the work is done or the money expended. That has been the underlying principle in the making up of the estimates. The ships are being built to-day at Montreal, at Toronto, at the head of the Great Lakes, at Port Arthur and Fort William, and at Vancouver and Victoria. Were those works not going on in those localities, especially on the Pacific coast, you would find a very different condition of affairs from what exists to-day. I, therefore, make no apology. No apology is required. I am simply pointing out that we are doing this in order to try to meet the pressing requirements of the moment and to place the country in a position to get back to a peace basis.

The Acting Prime Minister referred to another matter to which I desire to give a small amount of consideration, and in doing so to give it my heartiest endorsation. I refer to the highway policy which will be laid before the House by the Minister of Railways and Canals. I fear that my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) had not carefully read the resolution which is on the Order Paper before making his remarks yesterday evening. I remember quite well a former occasion when a proposal was made in this House to grant assistance for the building of highways, and my hon. friend was quite justified in the reference he made to some of his former colleagues, but if he will read over the resolution which is on the Order Paper to-day and was there yesterday, if I mistake not, I think he will come to the conclusion that it is as fair a proposal as could be put forward. In case he has not read it, I want to state to this House, and I hope it will get to the country, that the proposal put forward by the Government is that during the next five years the Government of Canada shall grant to the several provinces the sum of twenty million dollars for the purpose of building practically permanent highways, at the rate of four million dollars per year. The money will be expended by the provinces in the way suggested by the leader of the Opposition last night, namely, by their organizations and through their officials, but before any of the money can be expended an agreement must be entered into between the Federal Government and the Provincial Governments setting forth the character of the road to be constructed and giving a general description, specifications, and practically the location of the road, although I believe the word "location" is not included in the resolution. The word "description", however, is included and before a dollar can be expended the location of the road, its character and description, and the specifications, must be agreed upon, and after that has been done the road must

be built under the inspection of engineers of the Federal Government as well as of the Provincial Government. All these safeguards must be carried out before the money is payable, and when they have been carried out I have no fear whatever there will be anything but an honest expenditure of the public money. The money will be spent on the roads on which it should be spent, not on by-ways by any means, but on highways —the great arteries of the country— and I know of no other manner in which public money could be better expended during this reconstruction period. I need not argue the necessity of good highways, for there is hardly a man in this country to-day who has business to do or who seeks pleasure who is not aware of their necessity.

Reference was made yesterday to the highways in the state of New York and other states of the Union. I do not know that we can hope to reach the degree of excellence of their roads within the next five years, but we can do something towards it. I had the pleasure last year of travelling over a part of the highway in the province of Quebec constructed by the Provincial Government in recent years, and I can only say that if we extend that class of highway through every province in Canada we shall have accomplished wonders. My hon. friend had evidently not read the resolution, because he did not seem to realize the method of distribution. He is right in saying there are only two possible methods. One would be on the mileage basis, and the other on the population basis. Both of these methods were considered, and it was decided to distribute the money on the basis of population, but in view of the tremendous proportion of the population of this country located in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario it was thought unfair to the smaller provinces— and I use the word simply with reference to their population—to make the distribution simply on that basis, and therefore we have set aside eighty thousand dollars per year for each province, large and small alike. In this way about twenty per cent, or $720,000, of the four million dollars per year will be appropriated, and the balance is to be divided among the provinces according to the last Dominion census; that is to say, according to the census of 1911 for the provinces of Nova Scotia, New Brunswick, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Ontario and British Columbia, and according to the census of 1916 for the provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. If hon. gentlemen will take the trouble to figure it out, I think they will find the Government proposal to be absolutely fair, and it ought to satisfy everybody. I only hope that every province in this Dominion will take early advantage of the proposal, not only for the benefit to themselves, but because this work will provide a tremendous amount of employment for the unemployed in different portions of Canada, and that, after all, is a matter of very great importance.

I have been talking about other departments, and it would be a very logical question for some one to ask, "What is your department going to do?" That is a question which, in view of the tremendous number of inquiries which have been put to me in the last three months, I think I ought to answer. I am afraid when the Estimates are brought down, as they will be at the close of this debate, there may be some minor disappointments in the minds of members and greater disappointment in the minds of municipal bodies and different organizations in Canada who have been looking forward to the construction of public works throughout the country to a very large extent during the coming financial year.

I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as the Public Works Department is concerned I am adhering strictly to the principle which I laid down some few minutes ago, namely, that we are not constructing public works simply because they would be a good thing for the community, but we are constructing them primarily because they will provide employment for the unemployed, although of course they will also be of economic value. We are going to start work in the large centres, where we know unemployment now exists, at the earliest possible moment. We intend to start the construction of public buildings in the cities of Montreal, Toronto, Calgary, and probably Hamilton, within the next ten or fifteen days. I said "probably" with regard to Hamilton, because we may not be able to make just as early a start there as in the other places, but there will be only a few days difference.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Where is Hamilton?

Mr. CARVELL: Somewhere on lake Ontario, I believe. I am also going to take the responsibility of starting these works before the money has been voted by Parliament, because I believe Parliament will concur in our views and vote the money in order that we may relieve a certain amount of the unemployment that already exists in the large centres. It is the

duty of the Government to relieve that unemployment as far as possible.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will these works be constructed by the Government, or by tender and contract?

Mr. CARVELL: By tender and contract, most certainly. Perhaps I should qualify that statement to this extent: there may be some buildings which will have to be torn down to clear the site for the new ones. That work possibly might be done by the Government, but it would only be a small proportion of the work to be done, and so far as the main works are concerned that will be done by tender and contract.

Mr. ROSS: What is the nature of these buildings?

Mr. CARVELL: In Montreal, an extension to the Custom House. One-half of the Custom House there was built some years ago and the foundation prepared for the other half, we are now going to complete the building. In Toronto the building will be—I don't like to use the word "Custom House," as I do not like the term—but it will be a general Federal building which will include the Custom House, and the same may be said of the building at Hamilton. In Calgary, the building will be for a post office primarily, but it too will be a Federal building to be used for Federal offices like the buildings in the other cities. Not only will these particular works provide employment, but the buildings are actually required to house the public servants in the cities I have mentioned. I wish I had sufficient money to erect buildings of this class in every large city, because one of the things that has surprised me greatly since I took charge of this department has been the rentals we are compelled to pay for offices for public services in different parts of the country. The rentals are simply tremendous. It would be a good business proposition, if we had the capital, to erect buildings in very many cases other than those I have referred to this afternoon. In the other branch of the Public Works Department, the Engineering branch, we are doing repair work and maintaining the works. There were some places, particularly down in the lower St. Lawrence, where tremendous damage was done by storms last year. In such cases repairs must be made, but I may as well tell the House that we are not putting in new works of a very extensive character. simply because we believe we can expend the money on other work, such as highways, railways and canals. shipbuilding and such things as these which will produce better results and give more employment. Yet I think that hon. gentlemen will see from the estimate I have given that due regard has been had to maintaining the public service. If hon. members will consider the statement made by the Acting Prime Minister yesterday as well as the statement made by myself to-day, they will perceive that we are launching on a programme which involves the expenditure of a tremendous amount of money. We are asking Parliament to commit this country to $20,000,000 for roads during the next five years. We are asking also for $25.000,000 to be spent on the housing programme to which I have not referred, and to which not much reference has been made. This programme means, so far as we are concerned, only loaning the money to the provinces at 5 per cent. We are pledging the credit of Canada in order that the provinces may be able to carry out this much-needed work. I do not know that the time has arrived in all parts of Canada when it is necessary that a public body should go into an extensive housing scheme, but there are, without any question whatever, conditions existing in some of the big cities which must be ameliorated. Perhaps unsanitary and improper housing conditions are the greatest breeders of unrest and anarchy which can exist in any country, and I think there are places in all Canada where conditions of this kind exist to a greater extent than they should. If the Dominion, the provinces and municipalities can do anything in these troublous times to put the people in better living conditions, they will be doing a wonderful work to make them happy and prosperous, and people cannot be happy unless they are fairly prosperous. But it means an expenditure of probably $25,000,000, which sum the Government must provide during the next three or four years for this housing scheme. In addition, there is the educational scheme which has been referred to by other speakers, involving a very large amount of money. My hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister yesterday afternoon referred to the tremendous sums we propose expending on railways during the coming year. I did not figure that up. I thought I had a citation of it before me, but it must amount to $70,000,000 or $80,000,000. It is so big that a matter of $10,000,000 does not matter much one way or the other.

Mr. ETHIER: Is an amount for the construction of the Georgian Bay canal included in the programme?

Mr. CARVELL: No, it is not on the programme for the present year.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is there any provision made for the construction of branch railways in Nova Scotia?

Mr. CARVELL: I think not. I would not be positive about that however. I am speaking from memory, and did not expect to be asked about this railway question particularly. There is provision, as I recollect it, of about $10,000,000 for the construction of branch lines in the West. I think that this expenditure for the West will be pretty well confined to lines already partially constructed. Many of these lines have been graded and are only waiting for the steel. In general terms, the idea is to extend those lines already under construction, but, in addition, very large sums are to be expended on betterments over the whole Government system. This will distribute the money all over the country and will provide employment. After all, provision of employment is the great problem which we have to face in Canada to-day.

Having gone over some of the methods by which we propose to spend money, I do not know that I would be out of place if I touched upon the financial situation of the country, although not in the way of a budget speech. I was somewhat impressed by the speech of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) last evening, when he said we ought to take stock, and see where we stand. I think that is a very good suggestion. I think the country and this Parliament could very well afford to take stock and learn our exact position. Mr. Speaker, we have been going through the greatest eruption the world has ever known. Canada has accomplished, in the way of providing an army, what would have been thought an absolute impossibility had anybody suggested it four and a half years ago. If any hon. gentleman had stated in this House in the session of 1914 that armies of half a million men could be raised in Canada in four years he would have been looked upon as a lunatic. Yet it has been done, and it could only have been done by lavish expenditure of money. Therefore, if our public debt has gone beyond anything we ever dreamed of, it is because it had to go; as long as the war was on there was no use in arguing, the money had to be provided. It has been provided. And remember another thing, Mr. Speaker, you cannot carry on any war without wasting money, because war is all waste; money has to be wasted. However, having gone through the war, and I am happy to say having gone through it successfully—I am talking now about the business affairs of the country and not speaking of the war particularly—I think it behooves us as business men to take stock, and see where we stand. I am making these statements first for the careful consideration of the members of the House of Commons, and, secondly, I hope, for the careful consideration of the public at large. If there is one thing that has impressed me more than another since the signing of the armistice in November last, it has been the tremendous demand made upon my department and the Government generally for the expenditure of public money. I wondered at first what it meant, and, even to-day, I am not able to comprehend its meaning, but, having analysed it to the best of my ability, I think probably the war has had something to do with it. You must remember, Mr. Speaker, that for four years the great businesses of this country have been carried on from an entirely different standpoint from that existing before the war. Formerly men had to look after their own business, do their own buying, do their own manufacturing, look out for trade markets, and do their own collecting. But the war came on, and we had the Munitions Board and other Government activities, and the great majority of the banking business of the country has been carried on by the Government. This Government furnished the funds, the manufacturer furnished the goods, handed them over and got his cheque. The manufacturer, the farmer, the fisherman, the producer of all kinds of wealth simply furnished the goods, the Government paid him for them and he got it into his head that this was going to go on forever. He comes along and says: What is the trouble; we are not getting the orders that we got last year; why are these cheques not coming along as usual?

That is the only reason I can give for these tremendous demands which have been made upon the Government for money. We were asked almost to assume the role of commercial travellers as soon as the armistice was signed. It was believed that it was the duty of the Government to go to Europe, to Siberia, and all over the civilized world and get business. We are doing the best we can. We are not getting as much business as the business men of Canada would like us to get, and I might, perhaps, say that if the business men of

Canada would do a little more for themselves than they are doing they might get a little more business than they are getting. The time must come when the Government must cease acting as a foster father to the business institutions of the country.

We realize that it will be our duty for the next five or six months, or possibly a year, to do all we can to secure business for the country and we are doing that. But it is not as easy to get business on the other side of the Atlantic as we thought it would be. We thought that all we would have to do would be to go over and say: We have a million feet of lumber to sell; who will give us the most for it? The trouble is not that Europe would not like to buy our lumber and the other produce that we have, but they have not got the money to pay for it. That is the real difficulty. As my hon. friend the Finance Minister stated yesterday, we are compelled to furnish credits: that is, we have to put up money in Canada to buy the goods from our own people, then turn around and sell them to foreign countries and take our chance of getting the money back. We will get it back in time, but it means a heavy financial burden that the Government has to carry.

Now, to come down to the more local conditions, to the demands for public works; I do not know how many millions of dollars I have been requested to spend in the last three months, but I think I would be safe in saying that it would run from $50,000,000 to $75,000,000. That is impossible under present conditions unless the Government and Parliament—because it gets back to Parliament in the end—want to lay down the policy of going out into the markets of the world and borrowing money for the purpose of expending it upon public works of a local character. If Parliament wants to accept that policy, the Government is here to carry out its directions.

But, before we launch upon that policy, I want to make my position clear because I believe it is my duty to lay before the country the condition of affairs as it exists at the present time. I have shown you how our debt has gone up, due to causes over which we had no control. I do not know exactly what the public debt is at the present time but I have no hesitation in saying that when this war is over and when the accounts are all paid and the balances are all struck—because you must remember we have been furnishing a very large amount of money for the British Government in Canada to be used in buying supplies and munitions and the British Government have been paying our troops and furnishing them with supplies and munitions on the other side of the water and this is a question of accounting—I do not think I will be very far astray when I say that our public debt will be $2,000,000,000. Two billion dollars is a tremendous amount of money for a country like Canada and yet an amount of money which we can pay without any trouble, or upon which we can pay the interest, if we do not lose our heads and if we exercise business methods in carrying on the affairs of the country. I am not staggered; I am not surprised at the size of the amount. I am only pointing out that it is there. If I am anywhere near right in my figures this is going to mean to Canada an annual expense of about $110,000,000. Before the war, the interest on the public debt was only $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 and that was something that nobody ever thought about. It played no important part in our financial arrangements and if the Government, or Parliament, wanted to spend $1,000,000 or $2,000,000, or $5,000,000, or $10,000,000, on a public work, they could do so as far as the public debt was concerned. But here you have to face a very substantial sum and I do not think I am far astray when I say that it will mean an annual charge of $110,000,000. That is going to go on as long as you and I are on the earth and probably longer. I do not know whether I am right or wrong in my estimate but I think I am right when I say that pensions will eventually cost $50,000,000 a year. They are going to cost at least $30,000,000 during the present fiscal year and there are to-day in France and England over 20,000 sick and wounded Canadian soldiers who have not even yet been brought home. When those 20,000 men come home a very great proportion of them will be entitled to pensions and no matter what other services in this country are pinched, no matter what other services are going to be pared, pensions cannot be cut down. The men who stood between us and the extinction of our civilization are entitled to fair treatment at the hands of the people of Canada no matter what differences of opinion there may be as to the scale of the pensions. There will be fault found by individual persons because the scale is not high enough. These things will continue but at least the policy as laid down with regard to pensions must be carried out and I do not believe that it will be a dollar less than $50,000,000 a year for years to come.

There is another new source of expenditure in connection with the war, and I am only

dealing with war expenditures, which perhaps the people have not commenced to realize. I am sure my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) did not commence to realize it when he yesterday referred in the way he did to the Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department. After pensions it is the greatest problem which the people of Canada have to face in so far as the soldier is concerned. I do not know but that it is even a greater problem than that of pensions. A pension goes to a man who is able to look out for himself. He takes his pension and uses it as part of his living expenses. But, we have, unfortunately, thousands of brave men who have been wounded, who have been sickened, who have been gassed, who come back not able to take care of themselves, not able to live even on their pensions and who must be taken care of by the State. The Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department has been created for the purpose of taking care of these men, if they are sick and trying to give them some sort of technical education in the hope of enabling them to take care of themselves and, in a general way, acting as a sort of godfather to the whole body of invalided soldiers. It is going to cost next year $25,000,000 to take care of the work of this one department. The amount will probably be a decreasing sum. I believe that as time goes on it will take less money every year but it will go on for the next forty or fifty years because just so long as there is a returned soldier who requires medical treatment just so long must the people of this country provide ways and means by which that man can receive such treatment. Under the regulations as they exist to-day, no matter whether it be this year, or next year, or twenty-five years from now, every soldier who is sick, whether as a result of his war activities or not, is going to have the right to go to these institutions and receive medical and professional treatment. Therefore, these institutions must be kept up.

Now I point out to you, Mr. Speaker, only three items of expenditure which we must face as a result of our war activities, and they amount to the sum of $185,000,000. Think of it, $185,000,000, which we did not have to pay four and a half or five years ago—or perhaps I should say $175,000,000, because there are about ten or eleven millions of dollars of interest included in this estimates—of absolutely new expenditure which we must face. On taking the other side of the account and looking at our income—and I am only going to give you a few of the big items,—I am not enumerating these figures for the purpose of discussing the financial situation from any standpoint except to throw out to the people some ideas which will perhaps set them thinking along these lines and therefore I may not be absolutely correct in my figures—I will state now the receipts from three sources: Customs, Excise, and Income and Business Profits Tax. Customs this year will yield about $140,000,000. I may be two or three million dollars astray, but I am not very far out of the way, and I believe that the Customs receipts this year are bigger than they will be next year. I want it to be remembered that I am not now discussing the fiscal situation of the country in any shape whatever—I am keeping away from that, another opportunity will probably be afforded before next July when these matters can be debated—I am just taking the fact that the buying powers of the people of Canada are greater at the present time than they have ever been in the past, and greater than they will be in the future for some years to come. We have imported more goods than we shall import in the future, and in addition to that everything costs from fifty to one hundred per cent more to-day than it did in the past. Therefore I think when I state the customs receipts as $140,000,000, I am giving you almost the top notch figures which we may expect to receive from this source, and I will be very much surprised if during the next few years they are not very materially reduced from that amount. The receipts from excise during this year will probably run up to $25,000,000. They may go a million or two above that sum, because it is pretty hard to estimate absolutely accurately the receipts from this source, but I think I am not very far from the mark when I place the receipts at the sum mentioned. The receipts from Income and Business Profits Tax I place at $30,000,000, and I think that is as high as we can possibly go. Now, Mr. Speaker, I see no way of increasing these three principal sources of revenue to any very great extent. No doubt the Income Tax can, and will be, increased. I agree with what my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) said with respect to this tax. Like him, I too will have to write a cheque for Income Tax. Like him also, I am glad it is as small as it is, and yet for the country's sake I wish it were four or five times as great.

I am a firm believer in the Income Tax; in fact I am one of those who believe that the scope of this tax should be very largely extended. I believe the scope of this tax should be extended

upward and downward so that it might take in practically every man and woman who earns income in this country. I do not mean to say that the Income Tax should be made so great as to become absolutely burdensome; but I would like to see every man who earns $1,000 paying an Income Tax—not a very big tax, but enough to cause him to realize that he is helping to pay the taxes of this country. I know of nothing that will conduce to better government, and the more honest administration of public affairs, than the fact that the common people realize they are paying a straight tax into the coffers of the Government. However, that is only a statement by the way, in speaking as I do I am only giving my own personal views. I do not believe that the revenue from the Business Profits and Income Tax, while it probably can exceed the figures I have mentioned, will do so to any very great extent. Possibly I may be pardoned here, even though the present debate may not relate to the Budget, in stating that I see very grave difficulty in continuing the Business Profits Tax. That tax was all right during war time, but in peace time—I am only giving my own individual views, and not in any way speaking for the Government—it is an improper method of taxation to apply. During war time men make tremendous profits, and should hand back a portion of those profits to the Government. But upon the restoration of peace, I have some doubt whether industry will flourish, whether men will invest their capital to any great extent in the carrying on of business if they see that a very great proportion of their profits is going to be taken away from them in the shape of taxation. Therefore Parliament will have to consider very carefully this question of Business Profits Tax. The question of Income Tax should also be considered very carefully; but be that as it may, the amount of money which we can obtain from these sources is somewhat limited. The three items which I have already given you as representing our three chief sources of income during the present fiscal year are practically accurate, and it is therefore apparent that the moneys which we must pay out each year for many years to come amount to almost as much as the total revenue from the three principal sources referred to. In addition, the affairs of the country must be carried on. All the different departments of the Government must be maintained. The militia, whatever there may be of it, must be carried on. The Naval Department, whatever there may be of it, must be carried on. The railways must be carried on, and from present indications it is going to take some money to maintain and operate those railways in Canada during the next ten years. The public works of the country must be carried on—all the activities of life, in so far as the Government of Canada is concerned, must be carried on; and I want to tell the House, Mr. Speaker, that this cannot be done for less than $125,000,000.

3 p.m.

I have shown you that practically the whole liquid revenue of this country will be taken up with the debts, or with demands, directly due to the war. The question then arises which every business man must ask himself—where is the other $100,000,000 to come from? That is the question which I want the people of this country to ask themselves when they demand the expenditure of public moneys because in their opinion it would be a splendid thing to have that money spent in their respective communities. That is put up to me in my own province, it has been put up to me from every province in Canada, and I know it has been put up to every member of this House. There is no question about that, I have the evidence so far as a great many of these demands are concerned. Demands of this character are put up to members of Parliament. Their constituents come to them and say: "We must have a building here, we must have a wharf there, we must have a breakwater somewhere else." I want the people of this country to realize the situation, and I want them to ask themselves the question, "Where is this extra $125,000,000 a year coming from?" If they make satisfactory answer to that question I am prepared to go on and build public works for them. No man who ever occupied the position of Minister of Public Works would like any better than I would to do so, I wish I could build ten times as much as I am building; but I try to look upon governmental affairs as a business proposition; and when I cannot see in sight the money with which to carry out these public works I am compelled to ask myself: Am I justified in going out into the money markets of the world and borrowing money for this purpose, or am I not? That is the question which members of this House must ask themselves, and that is the question which the people of Canada must ask themselves and answer before, as a matter of policy, the Government can reach a satisfactory conclusion on the question.

Now, I hope, Mr. Speaker, you will not consider that I am a pessimist because I have given to the House some little indication of the financial position of this country, because, as a matter of fact, I am not. An hon. gentleman behind me makes the observation that he has heard more cheerful speeches. I want to state, Mr. Speaker, that when I started to make these few remarks I resolved that I would not be an optimist. For that reason I have made the remarks I have this afternoon. I wanted to set hon. gentlemen like my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) thinking. He usually does some thinking, and I hope before this debate is concluded we shall hear some of his thoughts; I am sure he will give us thoughts along good business and economic lines. However, if anybody conceives the idea from the remarks which have fallen from me this afternoon that this country is bankrupt, that it cannot pay its liabilities and cannot go and borrow money if it wishes to, such an impression is wrong. We are in nothing like the condition of European countries. I read in the newspapers—I think it was yesterday morning—that there is very serious talk of repudiation of public debt in Europe.

I hope it is not true, but we see it in the newspapers. There seems to be no doubt whatever that Germany will repudiate her public debt. Personally, I hope that she will repudiate it for about fifty years, until she has paid a proper indemnity to the rest of the civilized world. I am not worrying at all about the repudiation of the public debt of Germany or of Austria. But a very serious condition exists in Great Britain. They have a debt which is so large that one sometimes wonders how they can pay it; but I believe that they can. I am happy to say that Canada is in a different position. Our debt is large, but with our tremendously valuable natural resources and with the possibility of obtaining immigration after things settle down, we shall be all right. We want immigration if we can get the right kind. Those who come to this country must be hand-picked, I admit, but we want immigration; we want to settle our vast fertile areas in the Northwest. When I was in that country last September and October I was amazed at the amount of land that is not being cultivated. I had been there before, but I had never realized the extent of it. There are chances enough out there to double, treble and quadruple the present output of the country, and with that wonderful heritage at our hand I see no difficulty whatever in getting more immigration.

I went over the Transcontinental last year, and I saw people taking up the forest land in the province of Quebec and hewing out homes for themselves in the wilderness! I found the same thing in the northern part of New Brunswick. When I was in British Columbia I visited the copper mines, and found them to be simply marvellous. When we consider the resources of our country, a man would be out of his mind to insinuate for a moment that we cannot pay our debt, and at the same time carry on the public services. But we have to adopt cautious business methods in order to tide ourselves over the next four or five years. We have to consider all our expenditures. This year we are expending money, which, we admit, is borrowed money—borrowed, it is true, from the people of Canada, but borrowed just the same—money which must be repaid, principal and interest. But the expenditure has to be made; therefore I am not halting a moment in proposing the expenditure which we are asking Parliament to vote us for the present year. But I am asking the House to look carefully into the condition of affairs before the coming financial year is over, with a view to seeing what we are going to do in the future, and to look carefully and from a business standpoint into the question where we are going to get the extra $100,000,000 of revenue which we shall require after this fiscal year.

I believe that Canada will go through the reconstruction period in better condition than any other of the warring nations except the United States, and possibly we shall be in as good a position as that country. We have some unemployment, but, I am happy to say, not very much. When all the works which the Government of Canada is proposing and will propose in the Estimates to be brought down in a few days, as well as the works which are foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne, are carried out; when the provinces and the municipalities do their share, and when the manufacturers and employers of labour do their duty, we shall make some progress. I think that here I ought to say what I have said in public on two or three occasions. Hundreds of firms in Canada have grown rich through carrying on war business, and it is their duty to employ every man they possibly can employ during the reconstruction period, whether they make profits or not. I do not say that they should do that to the extent of losing their capital, but if they do no more than break even, it is their duty to keep on employing men, to assist

in avoiding unemployment throughout the country. The watchword of the governments, federal and provincial, and municipal; of business men, farmers, and all who can employ labour during the next year or two, ought to be, keep unemployment out of the country if you possibly can. If we keep every man employed who ought to be employed or who wants to be employed, it is a very small question to us what our debt may be or what our method of taxation may be. If we keep our people employed for the next year or two we shall have no Bolshevism or anarchism and many of our difficulties will be solved; we shall have no trouble in getting back to ordinary conditions of civil life, and there is no reason why Canada should not go on and prosper.

Having said this, I have said all that I wish to say; I simply wanted to throw out this warning. I have faith in the ability of our country to overcome all obstacles. I am confident that the people will do their share, and if this Parliament does its duty during the next year or two I have no fear for the outcome; Canada will be back to a peace basis, a richer, prouder and happier nation than ever.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister has invited a question, and before he concludes I want to put it to him. He asked three or four times how we were going to get this $100,000,000. Perhaps the minister, having some inside information, will tell us what he himself thinks about it.

Mr. CARVELL: I think I stated that I was not making a budget speech; that I was simply asking the House and the country to do some thinking. By the time the Budget is brought down, my hon. friend, as well as members on this side of the House, will have had time to give thought to the matter and the question can then, perhaps, be answered.

Mr. McKENZIE: So far, the minister does not know.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to congratulate my old room-mate and intimate friend (Mr. McKenzie) on being appointed temporarily to the position of leader of the Liberal party. Knowing him as I do, I feel sure that he will fill the position with great credit to himself as well as to the men who have honoured him with their confidence.

I wish also to be permitted to thank the leader of the House (Sir Thomas White) for the very generous and eloquent tribute he paid yesterday to my departed leader. The speeches yesterday were of a very high order indeed and quite worthy of the traditions of this House. I wish to add a few words on behalf of the old Liberal guard of Nova Scotia. The leader of the Opposition spoke for the Liberals of all Canada, but I want to speak for a moment specially for the Liberals of Nova Scotia as to the loss that we have sustained in the death of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

I believe that in no province of Canada, unless it be the province of Quebec, did the departed leader have a more loyal and devoted following than he had in Nova Scotia. Throughout his long career he has been admired and trusted by the Liberal party of that province. Since the days of Joseph Howe no public man has secured the confidence and devotion of the Liberals of Nova Scotia to the same extent as Sir Wilfrid Laurier. He was to the Liberals of that province what the trusted and revered Highland chieftain was in the old days to the clansmen in the Scottish glens.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not want to miss any of the speech of the hon. member. I would like to hear what is said. We cannot hear very plainly, and I would, therefore, ask my hon. friend most respectfully if he would speak a little louder.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I shall endeavour to meet the wishes of my hon. friend. I am not now referring to the leaders of the party in the province of Nova Scotia; I am referring chiefly to the rank and file. In that province, in the farm houses on the hillsides and in the valleys, in the homes of the fishermen in the harbours and coves along our rock-bound coast, in the huts of the lumbermen in the forests, as well as in our more populous towns and cities, there are tens of thousands of men and women who are feeling a deep sense of personal loss in the death of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. If, Sir, you will permit me a personal reference, I have known Sir Wilfrid for a quarter of a century. I had the honour of his friendship, and it was one of my most precious possessions. I have seen him scores of times when he was dealing with questions of more or less difficulty in his own room with his friends around him, or in the secret caucus of the party, where a man is bound to show his hand, and I have never known a single occasion, whether I agreed with him or not, on which I did not believe him to be actuated by the highest and best motives.

He had in marked degree two qualities that every great statesman must possess, namely initiative and courage. In 1911, with two years of his Parliamentary term yet to run, he staked all on a great issue and lost. To be satisfied that he was right was more to him than to be successful, and time has amply vindicated his course in regard to that great question. His followers, when that contest was over, all greatly admired the cheerful way in which he accepted his defeat, and at the age of seventy again hoisted the flag on a new battlefield. He was a good loser. He was great in victory, but he was even greater in defeat. He was a true democrat; was always willing to accept the verdict of the people. His lifelong ambition was to stamp out racial and religious strife from the public life of this country, and to help build up on the northern half of this continent a great, prosperous and united Canada, a land where there would be justice for all, free scope for all, a fair reward for labour and a new home for freedom. He always stood firmly for British connection, but he used to say that loyalty is the child of freedom, and that if British connection is to be built on an enduring foundation, the Canadian people must maintain the right to manage their own affairs.

Many things have been said about Sir Wilfrid Laurier in his time, but no Canadian worthy of the name ever doubted his honour or his patriotism. He was a great Canadian, but he was more than that. His reputation was wide as the Empire itself, and his memory will be cherished by men everywhere who love liberty and admire courage and devotion to duty. He died in harness, with his heart still young and his intellect unimpaired. The manner of his taking off is, I am sure, what he would himself have chosen. Our grief is not for him; it is for his sorrowing, stricken and lonely widow, and for ourselves. He was a diligent student all his lifetime and his mind was well stored with the classics of both languages. His English models were Shakespeare and the Bible. Amongst his heroes in the affairs of State were such men as Bright, Gladstone and Lincoln. He also had great admiration for those doughty reformers of his own mother land, Montalembert and Lacordaire. He had a firm grasp of current literature and current events. I have frequently heard him talk in his own delightful way about books and men and events, and on such occasions I have often thought, what a pity that death will some day come and make an end at one stroke of all this accumulated store of knowledge and experience. The stroke came and left us only the memory of his life and the inspiration of his example; but those are precious things to possess, and we are glad, even in the midst of our sorrow, that we knew him when he was here. We can say of Sir Wilfrid what was said by an English poet of the late Lord Roberts:

Clean, simple, valiant, well-beloved,
Flawless in faith in fame,
Whom neither ease nor honours moved
A hair-breadth from his aim.

And yet from life a new life springs
Through all the years to come,
And glory is the least of things
That follow this man home.

Mr. Speaker, I wish, in referring briefly to the Address, to associate myself with the sentiment expressed in the Speech from the Throne regarding the successful ending of the war. After four years of what looked at one time almost like a hopeless struggle, victory at last came. Our troubles, as the Hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) has said, are not yet over; but it is a splendid thing amidst all our anxieties that the casualty list is closed and the guns are silent. This country has reason to be proud of its record, and it has a special reason to be proud of its soldiers. When their achievements in this war are recorded there will be no more splendid story in the history of this or any other country. Kipling says that this is the first time since creation when the whole world has united to fight the devil, and we have every reason to rejoice that the world has been successful. Prussianism has been beaten into the dust by its own weapons, and its brute force has been overcome by the valour of free men inspired by the knowledge that they were fighting for right against wrong. To my mind, the most hopeful feature of the situation is the destruction of autocracy in Central Europe. War lords never flourish in a democratic country. England was very loath to go to war; so was France; so was the United States. The establishment of responsible Government in Central Europe is the best guarantee that we can have for the future peace of the world. As I have said, we have every reason to be proud of and to rejoice in our victory; but it is not a time to tighten our purse-strings or to relax our efforts, especially in so far as our soldiers and their dependents are concerned. More than ever, now that the war is over, we must make our soldiers feel that we are not indifferent to or ungrateful for the splendid work that they have done for us during the past four years

I would like to be permitted to quote this plank from the platform of the Liberal party in Great Britain, adopted at a conference held in Manchester in November last:—

> This committee pledges itself to secure that our sailors and soldiers shall have the first claim upon the consideration of Parliament as they already have upon the gratitude of the nation; that none of those who have served in the national forces shall be allowed to fall into distress either from lack of employment or from any other defect in our social organization; that those who have been incapacitated from following their old occupations shall be freely assisted to train themselves for new employments, and shall be further assisted by the State in every practicable way to establish themselves in business or as wage earners; that the pensions from the State to disabled men and to widows and children shall be sufficient in amount to secure a satisfactory standard of comfort, and that the Pension Fund shall be generously and sympathetically administered.

This language expresses the needs of the hour so clearly that in my judgment the Liberal party of Canada could not do better than adopt it, and bend their energies to enforce it. I listened with a great deal of interest to the speech of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) in which he informed us that large grants were to be made for certain local improvements, including highways in the provinces, and housing. He told us that the Government intends to control the expenditure of this money, that conditions are to be attached to the expenditure, and an agreement is to be made between the local and federal government before the money can be expended. I wish to enter my protest against that proposal. I do not think there should be any dictation on the part of the federal government as to how the money is to be spent by the local governments. The local governments already have their machinery; they have highway organizations, and highways by the constitution have been placed absolutely under their jurisdiction. If this Government can afford to advance the provinces' money for that purpose, well and good; but I consider it a mistake to attempt to control the local governments in any way in the expenditure of the money that is placed in their hands. To my mind it is an insiduous way of securing control over local affairs. I have noticed in recent years when grants have been made by this Government there has been a tendency to encroach on the rights of the legislatures in the various provinces. There is no reason why this Government should direct the expenditure of highway money any more than the expenditure of money for education. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) has in his way been a sort of champion of provincial rights. He has been claiming for the Western provinces their natural resources.

Mr. McMASTER: But has not got them yet.

Mr. SINCLAIR: But that is his policy.

Mr. CALDER: Hear, hear.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Now he is a member of this Government. Why, then does he not stand up for the rights of the provinces. Why is he asking for the natural resources to be given to the West? I assume it is in order that the Western provinces may be put in a position to manage their own local affairs. Then why not allow all the provinces to control without Federal supervision the money that is to be expended on their highways? I submit that this policy of attempting to control the expenditure is wrong, and while I do not wish to be understood as opposing at the present time the grant for highways, I say it should be a free grant without any strings to it. If we have money to give to the provinces, I submit, the proper way to give it would be to increase the provincial subsidies and allow the provinces to manage their own affairs. The provinces are not mendicants. They are not asking for money that does not belong to them. The money comes from the provinces in the first place, and the Provincial Governments can be trusted to expend this money just as wisely as the Federal Government possibly could.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: Does my hon. friend advocate the expenditure of this money?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Yes, but I am opposed to any conditions being imposed by the Federal Government in connection with its expenditure. The Minister of Public Works also referred to the construction of ships. He told us the Government had embarked on a policy of building ships, and that a very large sum of money was to be expended. He admitted he could go into the market at the present time and buy ships cheaper than he could possibly build them. If that be true, why pay more than they are worth? As far as my information goes, I believe that he is paying under these contracts about four times the normal value for the ships he is proposing to build. In normal times ships could be built for about $50 per ton dead weight; but in the contracts I have seen the Government is paying something like $200 per ton. The Government will never see

their money again; I fear it is an improvident proposal. It took the Government four years finally to make up its mind to purchase ships. The time to purchase ships if they were to be of service in the war was in 1914 when the war broke out, but the Government waited until the war was about over, and then embarked on a very expensive programme of building ships for which they propose to pay four times the normal price. Such a policy is not at all likely to promote the building of ships in Canada. If the Government could devise a way of promoting and assisting ship-building in Canada, that would be a very wise and proper move to make, but to buy ships at four times the normal price is certainly not likely to stimulate the building of ships by private enterprise. I am not in favour of Government ownership of tramp vessels; I do not think the policy a wise one, and I do not think it will do much to solve the problem of providing employment which I understood the Minister to say was the main reason for its adoption. If that is the Government's object, I can say that I know of no other industry that gives so little employment of labour for the amount of money expended as the building of steel ships. The production of the plates and other material call for a large amount of labour, but the material in the case of the present contracts is to come chiefly from the United States. The Government could easily have found some other industry where they could have employed a larger number of people with a smaller expenditure of money. Is there not something we can do in this country that would bring us in some return? Would it not be better, for instance, to buy tractors and plough up the western prairies and produce wheat?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: We would need the ships to carry the wheat.

Mr. SINCLAIR: I am afraid if we make the rates of freight correspond with the outlay on the ships the wheat would be too expensive. Would it not be a saner policy to expend part of this money in building branch lines of railway in Nova Scotia? I can show my hon. friend places in my own constituency where by the construction of a branch line, he would open up the country and encourage production and help at the same time to make the Intercolonial profitable. Building branch lines of railway where they are needed would be doing something for the country, and would be a far better policy than buying expensive ships for which there does not seem to be any future to justify the expenditure involved.

So much for the remarks of my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works. The return of peace creates a new situation in this country, so far as the two old political parties are concerned. The Union Government was formed ostensibly to carry on the war. Thousands of patriotic people voted for it because they believed that to be the real reason back of it. My humble opinion is that these people were deceived. What are the results? Our brave soldiers did their full share toward winning the war, but I am not so sure about the record of the Union Government. What they have done to win the war remains to be shown. If you say they won it by means of the Military Service Act, that statement will require to be substantiated; we have yet to learn that any substantial number of the soldiers conscripted under that Act ever reached the firing line. We on this side were not deceived. We were well aware that the Union Government was formed, not to win the war, but to defeat the Liberal party and win the election. There was a zig-zag streak in it from its inception. It is obvious that if it was a war move it should have come three years earlier. But it came on the eve of the election when it was clear to the Prime Minister and to everybody else that the old Conservative-Nationalist party could not win the election. But even if, for the sake of argument, we say it was formed to win the war, the war has been won and the reason for its formation no longer exists. What is wanted now in this country is a strong and efficient government, with a united party behind it. I do not think any one will pretend that this Government has a united party behind it. The supporters of this Government, like old Gaul, are divided into three parts. There are, first, the Unionist Liberals, a distinct class by themselves. Then there are the Unionist Conservatives, who, I am told, have no great love for some of the Unionist Liberals In the third place, there are the real Conservatives, who, I am also told do not waste any affection on either of the other two. Now on all sides the question is asked, will the Prime Minister, now that the war is over, attempt to keep this ramshackle party together. It is not for me to answer that question. If it is contended that Union Government should be kept together for the purpose of reconstruction I beg to take issue squarely with that proposition. To put forward such a contention would be to take refuge in an indefensible line of trenches. Will

any one seriously contend that a Cabinet dominated by the big interests and led by a dispenser of titles is likely to give an efficient lead to the work of reconstruction on democratic lines? Besides this, Union Government is regarded, even by its chief supporters, as a temporary makeshift. My hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) at Toronto, on January 12th, informed his audience that the Union Liberals proposed to remain until the soldiers got home. I understand this to mean that when the last transport ship touches the wharf at Halifax or St. John the whole combination will fall to pieces like a house of cards, and after that it will be every man for himself—and let us hope, Mr. Speaker, that the fate that is said to overtake the hindmost will not overtake any of them. But, speaking seriously, is it reasonable to expect any progressive or constructive legislation from a government with a death sentence like that hanging over it? You know, Mr. Speaker, that a man who is in prison awaiting his execution is most likely to spend most of his time preparing for death. Apart from this, the reconstruction party may well last for four or five years, and I submit it should not be left for a moment in the hands of a government that is not now, and never was, representative of the Canadian people. The Parliament that deals with reconstruction should be a parliament fresh from the people, elected without any switching of ballots, without any aid from the War Franchise Act, and without resort to the rusty tools of the bigot or the fanatic, and without any manipulation on the part of the press or the big interests. The Military Service Act, which was made a pretext for smashing the Liberal party, is no longer a live issue. Its usefulness, if it was useful, practically ended with the firing of the last gun. This gives rise to a new situation. The question arises, what will be the ultimate fate of the Liberals who strayed away from the fold? The question was raised yesterday, will these wanderers come back or will they end up by taking refuge in the bosom of the Prime Minister? These Liberal Unionists will have to decide that question for themselves. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) in his speech yesterday left the latch string out, and a light in the kitchen window. I want to warn these old friends of mine, however, not to make the mistake that the prodigal made, for he stayed so long in the far country that his new master put him to work at a very undignified and menial task. It would be a positive grief to me, Sir, to think that any of these old friends of mine, who sat with me for so many years around the fireside of the Liberal party, should ever be set to work to fatten pork barons or other animals of that class. Permit me to suggest to these gentlemen that if they are coming back, the sooner the better. Besides, there is a limit to the time that the fatted calf may be kept waiting. The Union theory of government has had its day. It has been tried, and I submit that it has been found wanting. In 1917 certain wily politicians, assisted by the newspapers and a few energetic millionaires, spread the doctrine that in politics there should be no party, and that we should all be of one mind and do just what the Prime Minister and the Minister of Finance told us to do. The result of their proposals was to establish in Canada an autocratic government somewhat similar to the government that existed in Germany before the war. With the help of the War Franchise Act they succeeded. The result is that we have had an Administration that has thrown Parliament overboard and assumed more absolute control over the life and liberties of the people of this Dominion than was ever claimed by the Kaiser of Germany over his people. We must not lose sight of the fact that this country belongs to the people and not to the Union Government. The fact is that to-day in Canada we do not enjoy the blessings of responsible government. We are living under a government of party bosses, who, in secret conclave and behind closed doors, decide among themselves what we shall have and what we shall not have. The members of this Parliament are not masters of anybody. They are the servants of the Canadian people. What would you think, Mr. Speaker, of a servant who would not tell his master what he was doing? They have governed this country by orders in council, a system which has been aptly described as law-making in the dark. Thousands of these orders have been passed, all in secret and behind closed doors. So arrogant did they become that some of these orders in council, of vital concern to the people of this country, were passed while Parliament was in session, without consulting the people's representatives. One of these secret regulations affected the liberty of every workingman in Canada, but it was passed without notice and without any opportunity for discussion. The theory of this Government evidently is that all the people have to do with the laws is

to obey them and leave the making of them to their betters. So much for the methods of the Union Government. The old party system may be denounced by superfine philosophers but it is the best guarantee we have for good, clean, honest and progressive government. It has produced the soundest constiution in the world and worked that constitution in the Mother of Parliaments without a serious hitch for over two hundred years. The result of all this is the splendid fabric of British liberty, no part of which can be placed to the credit of the Mugwumps. An alert Opposition is always useful and desirable and is just as necessary in wartime as in times of peace. There is such a thing as checking graft and stopping extravagant and wasteful expenditure by prompt and courageous action on the part of the Opposition. We on this side frankly confess that we regarded it as a fitting thing that while the war was on, and the State was fighting for its life, no pains should be spared to promote a calm and friendly atmosphere and thereby focus attention upon the war and the issues arising out of the war. But even this can be carried too far. Everybody knows now that the easy-going method adopted by the Opposition during the early months of the war produced evil results. Graft became rampant. Millions of money were stolen and millions more wasted and the patronage system had spread so that the efficiency of the army was threatened. Then came the investigations and exposures. These exposures were of immense value to the country. No man can estimate their value. For example, after the investigations before the Public Accounts Committee, and the Kyte charges, and the exposures that followed, the operations of such grafters as Benjamin Franklyn Yoakum and Col. John Wesley Allison became impossible.

These recent experiences warrant the conclusion that an alert Opposition is the only safety and the first requisite of a decent democracy. The man who repudiates the party system, denies the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people.

Reference has been made to the success of the Victory Loan, and it is certainly a matter for congratulation that the response was so cordial. The last two domestic loans aggregated over a billion dollars. The annual interest charge on these loans alone will exceed $50,000,000. This very large sum has been made absolutely free from taxation and in my judgment, improperly so. The large interest rate was ample without this concession, and if the Finance Minister had trusted the people, if he had appealed to the patriotism of the people instead of their greed, he would not have been disappointed. Taxation or no taxation makes no difference to the small investor. It is in the case of the super-tax where the pinch comes. The small investor pays no super-tax. Why then were the bonds made free? There can only be the one answer. It was done to accommodate the plutocrats, or as Disraeli would say, "The paladins of High Finance."

Referring back to the election contest of 1917, what shall we say of a political party that was pledged to the hilt to the conscription of wealth, and when they secured power not only failed to conscript wealth but went so far in the opposite direction as to make wealth free from taxation? The result will be that while the returned soldier will have to pay, the millionaire and the profiteer will be free from the burden of the war. The hon. the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) has good points about him but he started wrong. If he will excuse me for saying so. He entered public life, not as the representative of the people, but as the representative of the big interests. Under his management the manufacturers have been treated tenderly; so have the banks, the millionaires and the profiteers. My hon. friend has been at the head of our financial system for the past eight years, but so far as I know he never yet showed any disposition to drive any of the money changers out of the temple. This last act of freeing the war bonds from taxation is quite consistent with his past record and is what the people of Canada had every reason to expect. There appears to be no end to my hon. friend's borrowing. He has become a sort of political Oliver Twist. No sooner does he finish one plate of soup than he begins to clamour for another.

A few months ago he announced that in order to tide him over the year 1919 he would require about $300,000,000. A little later he hinted that he could make use of $500,000,000. By offering an extravagant rate of interest and freedom from taxation, he secured from the Canadian people about $687,000,000. But he was not satisfied. No sooner had he secured this enormous sum of money than he wants more. Without stopping to take breath he organizes a new borrowing scheme by means of thrift stamps. If this abnormal appetite for "more" continues, I suppose we shall have to resort to the old remedy of brimstone

and molasses. I am not saying that I object to thrift stamps, but the thrift will be very one-sided if there is no thrift on the part of the Government. Why should we ask the little children and old women in the country to save up their cents and invest their savings in war stamps in order to give money to a Government that will not take care of the money or use it properly when they get it?

Just a word on the food question. People everywhere are asking why the Food Board, which has been in operation for years, has failed to control prices, while the Food Boards in Great Britain and the United States have succeeded. It would be interesting to know the reason. The prices of food have gone sky-high, but only a very small part of the increase has gone to the farmer or the fisherman. The big millers and the pork barons and the middlemen have grown fat and flourished under the very noses of the board. While our soldiers were fighting the Hun in Europe, the Government gave the Hun profiteer at home a free hand to fleece the Canadian people. What does the hungry labourer with a large family to feed, and flour at $14 per barrel and bread at 14 cents for a 2-pound loaf, think when he reads in the papers that the Ogilvie Flour Mill Company has distributed to its millionaire shareholders 12 per cent dividend and 15 per cent bonus last year? When the labourer remembers how tenderly the celebrated pork baron of Toronto was treated after the O'Connor exposure, and when he sees these flour barons pocketing 27 per cent on their investment, while his family is feeling the pinch of these outrageous prices, is he not driven to the conclusion that in some way or other these big interests are under the protection of this Government?

There has been enormous expenditure of money in connection with the work of this Food Board, there have been investigations and cartloads of advice, but I am not aware that any poor man in Canada, or any soldier's wife or widow, has been able to buy a pound of beef, or a loaf of bread, any cheaper by reason of the expenditure of all this money and all this energy. The question is naturally asked, What is there to show for it all. I read a story recently in an English paper that a conservation orator over there was deploring the fact that Great Britain is compelled to import so much timber. "It is my belief," said the speaker, "that there is not a man in this vast audience who ever did a single thing to prevent the destruction of our forests." Thereupon a man arose in the rear of the hall and said: "I beg your pardon, Sir, I have shot woodpeckers." I will not say that the Food Board has accomplished nothing, but considering the money expended, the results have certainly been meagre. The control of prices was the most important task committed to them, and in this they have signally failed. If you want proof of this, I can furnish it from themselves. We have their own admission. On page 5 of the Canadian Food Bulletin of November, 1918, I find the following:

> Plainly, the fixing of prices cannot be done by a centralized control at Ottawa, and it is worth noting that all food orders must, under our Constitution, be made for the whole of the Dominion; the only way to limit their application to one area is to make exceptions of all other areas. That is, the order must be chipped and whittled down negatively to the rer quired size if it is to be localized. If prices are to be fixed in a way which shall not cut off supplies, it must be done by local power. What other power better represents the people than a properly elected municipal council?

There you have it. During the past four years we have this highly paid organization fooling and fiddling over the prices of food, and at the end of it all we have the helpless admission that they cannot do anything at all, and that the only institution that is capable of doing anything is the municipal councils. Now, that may be true, but why, let me ask, go through all this solemn hocus-pocus covering a period of four years, to reach this conclusion? Mr. Speaker, what do you think of this Food Board, and what do you think of a Government that during the whole four years of the war has tolerated this muddling and tinkering with a question so vital to the Canadian people?

Reference has been made in this debate to the prevalence of industrial unrest. I want to make the statement that the chief cause of industrial unrest is the high cost of living, and the general belief in the existence of profiteering. Wages have increased, but wages have not kept pace with the high cost of living. Under these circumstances what should the Government have done? They should have taken these profiteers and middlemen by the throat and compelled them to reduce their demands. What did the Government do? They took a short cut, they went behind closed doors and passed an Order in Council making it a criminal offence for a working man to strike, while at the same time the chief offenders were allowed to go scot free. They did more, they appointed a Director of Public Safety, and organized a

force of Dominion Police, so that if the hungry man clamoured too loudly for more wages they could furnish him with a pair of handcuffs. I want to say to my hon. friend the leader of the Government that we will never build the New Jerusalem in this free land of ours by resorting to these Hun methods.

This Administration has claimed a great deal of credit for abolishing patronage and reforming the Civil Service. It would appear that some good people actually believe that they did these things. I have seen a report of a meeting of clergymen where they passed a resolution thanking the Lord that the Union Government had the grace and strength given them to effect these reforms. My own idea is that the Lord had nothing to do with it, and judging from the amount of deception practised in connection with the matter I am inclined to view that it came from the opposite quarter. The trouble with some well-meaning clergymen is that their bump of credulity is abnormally large. The western farmers evidently do not think patronage has been abolished. At their meeting in Winnipeg in November last, they placed the abolition of patronage as one of the chief planks of their platform for the next election. The trouble with the Civil Service is that it was debauched after 1911, and reform is impossible without first cleaning out the stable. It has not been forgotten that within two years after the Administration came into power, they crowded the Civil Service with 25,000 new appointments. There were only about half that number of vacancies made by deaths and dismissals. This new army was not needed, and they demoralized the whole service, 4 p.m. and this condition still prevails and cannot be remedied by organizing a board to make new appointments. If the Government cannot muster the courage to send their unwelcome friends back to productive employment, the only thing to do is to wait for ten thousand funerals before any remedy is possible. Prof. W. L. Grant, who has been studying the situation, suggests as a partial remedy that no new appointments be made for the next five years. In this connection permit me to quote from The Civilian. The Civilian is the only paper in Canada that is wholly devoted to the Civil Service, and should be the best authority on that question. The item I refer to is a report of an interview between the executive of the Civil Service Association and Sir George Foster, relating to the distribution of a proposed war bonus.

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

When the question arose as to what the total expenditure would amount to if this bonus were paid, we find the following statement:

> This, of course was a mere matter of multiplication—so many civil servants at $350 apiece, total so much. But the difficulty is in the first factor in the calculation, for, as was pointed out by Mr. Burling and others, nobody knows how many civil servants there are. The Civil Service Commission is carrying on at this moment a most elaborate inquiry partly with the object of ascertaining exactly what persons are to be counted as belonging to the Service.

You will see, Mr. Speaker, from this item that the chief trouble is that the Government has crowded the departments with employees to such an extent that nobody can say how many civil servants there are, and they frankly confess their inability to count one another. I am informed that the Government actually employed a firm of experts in the United States to count and classify them. We must also remember that this is the condition of affairs in the year of our Lord, 1918, after four years of war; and during that whole period the Government had been crying out about the scarcity of labour and imploring old and young, women and children, to volunteer to work in the fields and factories so as to save the nation and win the war; and all the time they had battalions of chairwarmers in their own offices paid at the public expense to do nothing; and in the very months that the war ended, these employees were still so numerous that they themselves recognized the difficulty of counting one another. All I have to say is that the clergymen who thanked God for what the Union Government accomplished in connection with the Civil Service were satisfied with very small mercies.

Curious things have happened in this country the past year. A certain Rip Van Winkle by the name of Parsons, who, I am told, was recently the official head of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, has been attempting to raise the old, discredited cry of "No truck or trade with the Yankees." That cry, as hon. gentlemen will remember, did good service for him and his associates in 1911. The only explanation of his reverting to that cry now is that he must have been asleep during the last four years. In the face of all our recent experiences to the contrary he again quotes the worn-out remark of ex-President Taft that an exchange of products between the two countries would make Canada an adjunct of the United States. This argument had its origin in prejudice, and found a ready market at the time among men of

low intelligence and high credulity. But after the experiences of the past four years I feel confient that even this class will regard it as out of date and refuse to accept it. It was never contended that the reciprocity agreement was not a fair bargain: its opponents frankly admitted that it was absolutely fair. Besides, it contained a clause enabling us to withdraw from it at any time we saw fit to do so. Still, with all these precautions, certain hon. gentlemen opposite, of whom the leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) was one, professed to be alarmed about our fiscal independence. It does not take much to frighten some people. It has not been forgotten that a few years ago some hon. gentlemen opposite used to smell annexation and treason in every potato or codfish that crossed the boundary line. Why? Was it because they did not trust the United States, or was it that the United States, being the stronger, would take an unfair advantage of us? The fact that since that time the Finance Minister went to Washington, hat in hand, to get leave to borrow $100,000,000 in New York shows that he did not really fear any of these things and that the campaign of 1911 was nothing more than a hollow sham. Besides all that, a nation that has been compelled within the last year to submit to the humiliation of depending on the United States navy to protect its coast and its commerce and its fishing fleet is hardly in a position to harbour suspicion as to the good faith of that same power in regard to less important matters of trade and tariff. There is no serious opposition today among the rank and file of the Canadian people to reciprocity with the United States in natural products. There is no serious opposition to it even by the Government; as witness their recent decision to place potatoes on the free list. I doubt if there is a single narrow-gauge statesman in Canada to-day who is prepared to raise the old, worn-out cry of "No truck or trade with the Yankees"; it has been buried in the same grave as their opposition to a Canadian navy and to the British preference. The attempt to stir up ill-feeling between Canada and the United States in 1911 had all the appearance of a skilfully-contrived German propaganda.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who made the first proposal in 1911 for the annexation of Canada to the United States? Was it not made by American speakers?

Mr. SINCLAIR: I never heard of any proposal being made for the annexation of Canada to the United States; it is all news to me. I was saying that the campaign of 1911 had the appearance of a skilfully-contrived German propaganda, and we all ought to be thankful that the conspiracy failed and that our relations with our great neighbour to the south have never been more friendly than they are to-day. Time has amply vindicated the policy of my late revered leader in regard to reciprocity with the United States as well as in regard to that very vital question, the establishment of a Canadian navy.

The question of the franchise has been mentioned in the Address. This is a matter of vital importance. Three attempts have been made in the history of Canada to gain an unfair advantage by legislation in connection with the franchise. The first was what is called the gerrymander of 1882. The second was the Franchise Act of 1885, providing that a revising barrister be appointed in each constituency in Canada to compile the electoral lists. The third was the War-Time Elections Act of 1917. I am happy to say that those three attempts to gain an unfair advantage by legislation in connection with the franchise were all made by the same political party. One of the most serious charges to be laid at the door of the Union Government is this War-Times Election Act—it is known in my province as the War-Time Tammany Act. The leader of the House told us yesterday that this Act was not to be repealed until something else had been provided in its place. I trust that the other thing which is to be provided in its place will be fairer and more respectable and decent than the War-Time Elections Act. This Act is a disgrace to Canada and should be repealed at once. It is customary for the police, when the row is over, to confiscate the sling-shots and the sand-bags and the brass knuckles; why should there be any distinction in this case? The Act should have been repealed last year; every day that it continues on the statute book of Canada, it serves to perpetuate our disgrace. Frankly, I was disappointed last year when I saw man after man, each a Liberal-Unionist, stand up in his place and vote for the continuance of this Act; I thought that there would be some conscientious objectors among them. What is the situation up to date? We on this side of the House stand for fair elections; hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House stand for the War-Time Elections Act. These positions are as opposite as God and mammon; no man can hold to the one without despising the other. I dislike as much as any man to refer to

these matters, but it is our duty as representatives of a free democracy to challenge the methods by which hon. gentlemen won the election of 1917.

I want to lay down the principle that absolute fairness in the use of the ballot is the first requisite and the only safety of a decent democracy. Fair play has always been the biggest word in the Anglo-Saxon's creed, and when men outrage that principle, they must take the consequences. It is as much our duty to hold these people up to the public gaze as it is the duty of the Allies to expose the Hun outrages of the last four years. You will remember, Mr. Speaker, that red-letter day in the history of Great Britain, when, in November last, a string of German naval ships twenty miles in length steamed slowly up through the North sea and surrendered to Admiral Beatty in the Firth of Forth. No ceremonial courtesies of any kind were paid to the vanquished enemy. Admiral Beatty gives the reason. The following contains an extract from the official order that was flashed across the sky from the flagship of the Grand Fleet the night before the surrender:

> At midnight Admiral Beatty signalled that while courtesy toward the enemy was obligatory, the methods by which the Germans had waged war should not be forgotten, that no international compliments should be paid.

In the same way, it is obligatory upon us to keep before the Canadian people the method by which hon. gentlemen opposite won their seats in 1917. We on this side of the House will follow the example of Admiral Beatty. There will be no ceremonial courtesies so far as the War-time Elections Act is concerned.

Let me quote an editorial from an Australian paper to show what our great sister Commonwealth thinks of the conduct of the election by which this Government came into power:

> Canada stands in the unhappy position of having had her ordinary constitutional government overthrown by what is practically a military revolution.
>
> The recent elections in Canada were simply a farce and a fraud from a legal and constitutional standpoint, as they were conducted under war precaution regulations, which permitted great numbers of unqualified persons to vote, and denied the franchise to large numbers of legally qualified Canadian citizens.
>
> The ordinary Canadian electoral roll was set aside, and a manuscript roll compiled by specially appointed officials acting under military regulations, was used.
>
> An election controlled by military despots, and carried out in defiance of electoral law, is something quite new in the annals of British constitutional history, and by no stretch of imagination can the present Borden ministry claim to be the constitutional representatives of the people of Canada.
>
> It must be apparent that, from a legal and constitutional standpoint, the recent Canadian election is null and void, and the Parliament so elected has no constitutional authority for its acts.
>
> Our local conscriptionist politicians are now bewailing the fact that they did not adopt the tactics of their fellow-conspirators in Canada, but it would be a dark day indeed if the frauds perpetrated there could be repeated here.
>
> Canada now stands as the shocking example of what organized force is capable of, even in a British community, and emphasizes the good sense of the Australian people in their refusal to exchange constitutional government for military despotism.

Considering the distance from Canada at which this editorial was written, it is surprising how correctly the writer was informed.

Having said so much about the sins and follies of the Government, let me say that the fact that during this session on which we have entered we have to deal with the present and the future rather than with the past, is obvious to us all. We on this side fully recognize that the task confronting the Administration is not an easy one. The returned soldiers have the first claim on the gratitude of the nation. They must not want for anything that the country can do for them. The dependents of the brave men who have fallen in our service must also be tenderly cared for. The claims for pensions must be adjusted in a generous spirit. Labour problems must be dealt with. Taxation must be fairly and equitably levied in order that money may be found to meet the enormous financial obligations of the country, and it is the duty of every member of the House, I care not on which side he sits, to contribute everything he can to the solution of these problems. But the Government must of course take the lead. The first requisite of an Administration is initiative; the second is efficiency. If the Government fails in those, it fails in everything. The collapse of initiative on the part of this Government is proved beyond doubt by the resignation of the Parliamentary Under Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. Why did the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) resign? He resigned, first, because the Government had failed to grapple with the problem of the returned soldier; second, because the different departments of the Government failed to work together. My hon. friend from Colchester has been careful to use diplomatic language, but his real meaning is that the Administration is incompetent, and he refuses any longer to be

responsible for its failure to do its duty. The returned soldier is the greatest problem before the Canadian people, and if the Government cannot grapple successfully with that problem, then it should make way for some Government that can.

So much for initiative. We come now to the question of efficiency. You say that this Administration is an efficient instrument to grapple with the grave problems that are confronting the country at the present time. We say, judging from its past record, that it is not. That creates an issue, and the burden of proof is on you. I submit that in all the speeches that we have yet heard from hon. members of the Government, the proof is not forthcoming. A good example of inefficiency and drift is pointed out by my hon. friend from Colchester in his letter of resignation. When the question of soldiers' pensions became urgent in 1916, the Government had no solution to offer. When pressed to take action, they appointed a committee of private members to take evidence and report. This committee did its duty well and made a comprehensive report which, according to the hon. member for Colchester, the Government pigeon-holed and up to the date of his resignation no more was heard of it. The hon. member for Colchester is not a man who would say or do anything reflecting on his party without having ample and serious reasons for doing so. It is, therefore, for the Government to explain—and it has not yet done so—what justification the hon. member for Colchester had in the action he took.

With reference to the efforts of Great Britain in this war, the remark has been made that in the old land they did every thing but talk. The opposite is the case here. This Government talks, but very little else is accomplished. Everybody knows that there is nothing that weakens a Government so much as bold talk and feeble action. We have been putting our trust in Boards, Committees and Royal Commissions. What we really need is men at the head of affairs who can do things themselves and who have the courage to take the whole responsibility. Nearly every important matter that comes up, instead of being dealt with by the responsible minister, is turned over to some irresponsible commission of busybodies who in turn travel the country, collect information and make a report which is duly pigeon-holed and forgotten while the country has the pleasure of paying the bill. Let me give a few examples:

1. The Trade Mission to London which should have been attended to by the trained experts of the Department of Trade and Commerce.

2. The National Advisory Council for the employment of labour. Where, let me ask, is our Department of Labour?

3. The Royal Commission on Wheat Supply. Have we not a Department of Agriculture in this country?

4. The Department of Public Safety. Has this country ever been so dangerous a place to live in that the Department of Justice could not protect the citizens?

5. The National War Savings Committee, consisting of fifteen men from different parts of Canada selected to deal with the question of thrift stamps. Surely this is a matter that should be dealt with by the Finance Department. What do we keep a highly paid staff of experts in the Finance Department for, if we have to resort to a committee of fifteen from the outside to attend to such a simple matter as thrift stamps?

These are only sample bricks. There are hundreds of these so-called commissions. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) himself informed us in the House that they were as thick as blackberries, and the number is increasing day by day. If everything is to be turned over to irresponsible commissions, what is left to the twenty-one ministers of the Crown and their departments to do? When these gentlemen were elected, the people of Canada who voted for them expected them to be useful as well as ornamental. My hon. friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) is smiling at that, but that is a fact. Lord Macaulay was right when he said that war could not be carried on successfully by a debating society. The same is true of Government. If the Government of this country is to be of real service to the people in the anxious period that confronts us, efficiency must be the watchword in every department. The work must not be turned over to irresponsible outside committees.

Permit me to say this, that the party that will do the greatest service for this country in the future will be the party that will stand above all for good faith and honesty, and public honour. We have talked so much of late years about tariffs and bonuses and bounties and shipbuilding and wheat and steers that we are apt to run away with the idea that these are the principal things and to neglect the weightier matters, such as faithfulness to our pledges, and even-handed justice be-

tween man and man. In my judgment no party can any more succeed in this country that seeks to serve itself. The people will demand not only sincerity on the part of its representatives, but also a frank recognition of the rights of the ordinary man.

I was much struck with a paragraph in Lloyd George's recent election address referring to labour and capital. Permit me to quote:

> I say to Labour: You shall have justice; you shall have fair treatment, a fair share of the amenities of life and your children shall have equal opportunities with the children of the rich. To Capital I say: You shall not be plundered or penalised; do your duty by those who work for you, and the future is free for all the enterprise or audacity you can give us. But there must be equal justice. Labour must have happiness in its heart. We will put up with no sweating. Labour is to have its just reward. And when the whole nation sees that wealth lies in production, that production can be enormously increased, with higher wages and shorter hours, and when the classes feel confidence in each other and trust each other, there will be abundance to requite the toil and to gladden the hearts of all. We can change the whole face of existence.

We can do the same here. Precisely the same task awaits us here in Canada, but when we speak of labour we must include not only the workmen in the factories and the mines and on the railways, but also the tillers of the land and the toilers of the sea. Surely it is not beyond us to develop a system of government by which quiet, industrious men can live and labour and enjoy the fruit of their own industry.

Mr. Speaker, before taking my seat, permit me to say that, representing a constituency that in common with others has made great sacrifices in this war, I am here to support any proper measures looking towards reconstruction. My constituents will expect me to demand so far as lies in my power, honest and progressive administration, and fair and generous treatment for the men who have survived and for the dependents of the men who have fallen in the great struggle.

The only desire of members on this side of the House is to guard the public treasury, to see that Canada plays her part with honour, and to assist in such measures as will establish on a firm foundation in this free land of ours the principles of democracy that our soldiers fought so bravely to maintain.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Mr. Speaker, at the outset of my remarks I desire to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion for an Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. The task that was assigned to them was a difficult one. As every member of the House knows, the atmosphere in this Chamber in the early days of the session is just a little tense, somewhat frigid, and the task of breaking the ice, so to speak, under those circumstances is by no means an easy one. I am sure every hon. member will agree that the choice made in selecting these two young men to undertake this responsibility was a very happy one. They had both seen service overseas; they had come in contact with conditions "over there," and their experiences I am sure were such as will enable them to speak with authority on many of the questions which must be considered by the House during this session. I am sure we all feel that their addresses will be exceedingly helpful to us in the work of the session.

I wish also to express my thanks to the other hon. members who have spoken both on that side of the House and on this. The session now under way will, I think, prove to be the most important session of Parliament ever held in the history of Canada. The problems that are now staring us in the face are in my judgment the most difficult problems Canada has ever had to deal with, and for that reason it is very desirable and very important that we should have at this early stage of the session the viewpoint of every one on the prevailing conditions. It is quite true we may not agree with all that has been said by our hon. friends opposite. Nevertheless, I think it is very desirable, in order that we may lay down proper foundations for our work this session, that we should have their views, that they should state to this House quite clearly and definitely whatever criticisms they may have to offer, that they should tell us the feeling in the country as they see it, and state whether in their opinion the work that has been done by the Government has been done properly or not. That necessarily is very helpful, and particularly helpful to the members of the Government. I have been connected with public life, not here but elsewhere, for a period of some fifteen or eighteen years, and I have never during all that time objected to criticism or attack. I like attack to be fair, and I like criticism to be constructive, not merely destructive, and I am sure it will be helpful to every hon. member who is desirous of carrying out the responsibility cast upon him at this crisis to get the views of other hon. gentlemen in the House.

Naturally, our friends opposite, particularly the last speaker, have drawn a pretty dark picture. He in particular dipped his brush pretty deep in the browns and the grays and the blacks. To him all is gloom; the whole horizon is filled with dark clouds, with scarcely a gleam of light anywhere. Well, I hope before I get through to say something that will at least assure our friends on this side of the House that all is not so black, that there is a little light somewhere, and that the people of this country may reasonably hope for something.

The great war is ended. Thank God for that! I say, thank God, not because "the light is in the window and the latch string on the outside of the door," but because the curtain has rung down on the greatest tragedy in all history. I am not going to take up your time, Mr. Speaker, in dwelling upon the misery and suffering and sorrow of the last four years. I shall not deal with the causes of the war or the ideals for which we fought. Much as I would like to speak of our own boys and what they did, the battles they fought, how they fought their way through from Ypres to Mons, I am not going to deal with that matter to-day. Those questions have been dealt with by previous speakers. The mover and seconder of the Address dwelt upon them and spoke more fittingly than I could. I wish rather during the time at my disposal to speak of what lies ahead, of the work that confronts us, of the tasks that we members of Parliament must undertake during the months that lie before us. The armistice was signed on the eleventh day of November. Hostilities ceased suddenly. It was not thought that the war would come to a conclusion so early. There may have been a few, very few, who understood the conditions and knew exactly the situation, but, so far as the great majority of the people of this country were concerned, they little expected the war would end last year. I well remember the conditions in Europe when I was over there in the midsummer of 1918. The Acting Prime Minister referred to those conditions yesterday afternoon. When we landed in London in the early part of June, you would scarcely meet a man anywhere with a smile on his face. I never saw such dejection and despondency in my life. In all the circles of government over there, where they had a clear knowledge of the situation on the continent, there was not much indication of the end of the war then. Hon. gentlemen will remember how the fifth army was smashed. You remember the talk of the Huns breaking through to Calais and Paris. That was exactly the situation. The men who were responsible for the conduct of the war at that time were seriously considering the problems that would arise when the Huns did reach Paris and the channel ports. That was the situation then, and was the situation during the whole six or seven weeks I was over there. I went on board the ship, and we were two or three days from shore when we got the despatch that the Germans had renewed their attack towards Paris, and a few days later we heard of the Allied offensive and their successes in driving the Germans back. There was not a soul on that ship who was not very much surprised, and when later on we received the news that the Hun was being beaten back, those of us who had been in England in June and July, knowing the conditions which had been depicted to us, simply could not believe that these things were actually taking place. With our knowledge of the situation "over there," as we saw it in England, and as we were told about it, it seemed to us impossible that there should be any end to the war in the year 1918. At that time the whole energy of the British Government and of the French Government was devoted to devising ways and means to prevent the Hun from reaching the sea, the channel ports, and Paris. So there was not very much talk at that time about preparations for after the war, and we must not be very much surprised in this country if, in that respect, the whole duty of the Government was not completely performed.

There were other things we had to consider, as was the case with the other nations who were very much in the same position as we were. Our Government was intent at that time on doing all they could do in supplying the sinews of war. While some work was done in preparation for peace I must admit frankly that all was not done that might have been done. But hostilities ceased much sooner than had been expected. There is another thought that was also given voice to by the Acting Prime Minister yesterday. The problems that now stare us in the face are, in my judgment, more difficult than the problems of war, and I will tell you why. It took something like four years for Canada to build up her war machine. We were working month after month and the machinery was being added to all the time, growing in size, and it became a huge machine. In the process of making it the people of this country were affected directly

and indirectly in a multitude of ways. The problem that now faces us is the unravelling of the conditions created. We must remember that that problem came upon us all at once, and I can assure my hon. friends that the problem is not by any means simple. From my knowledge of the situation at the present time, I am thoroughly convinced that the problems that this nation now have before it, in connection with the unscrambling of our military organization and the re-adjustment of conditions which have arisen as a result of four years of war, are very much more difficult and complex, and the result much more far-reaching than the problems that had to be dealt with during the war period itself. I am absolutely convinced of that, and I desire to impress the fact upon every member of this House. The immediate problems that are confronting us now, staring us squarely in the face, will not wait. These problems, in my judgment, are the most difficult problems which a nation has ever faced, and if they are not attended to properly, unless we find proper solutions for these problems, well, God help Canada; no man can tell what the consequences may be. We have a little unrest and some dissatisfaction, and there is great pessimism in some sections of the country, and it may mean something very much worse. I do not wish to frighten anybody and I do not wish to be over-pessimistic, but right here in Canada we have conditions that are akin to conditions that exist elsewhere, and it is very necessary that every member of this House should understand his responsibility in relation to the solution of these problems.

Very shortly after the armistice was signed, and our people began to think of this new situation, there were a great many who began to wonder, as my good friend from Antigonish-Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), I suppose, must have been wondering, as to whether all was well at Ottawa—whether the Government had made plans and preparations to take care of this new situation. As you know, there were all sorts of rumblings and rumours about our muddling along, drifting along, not being prepared, and all that sort of thing. I do not wonder at that. It is really not surprising that ignorance should exist in the country, as to the actual work of government when we find responsible members of the House making statements such as we listened to yesterday and to-day. We can hardly blame the "man in the street."

The Government from the very first was seized of its duty. We always understood

that the war was going to end, that it would not last forever. As I stated, the end came suddenly, but, nevertheless, a good many preparations had been made and a good deal of thought and study had been given to many of the problems that would naturally come up when the war would close. There had been much spade work done. Some of the foundations were laid and in some cases even the superstructures were erected. In other words, we were not all adrift. Something had been accomplished.

I am not going to take up your time to-day in attempting to cover the situation, because that would take too long. Nor am I going into details, but I simply wish, by way of illustration, to mention some of the matters that had received attention before the end of the war came and to touch very briefly upon the relationship of these matters to the problems now existing.

In the first place, as regards demobilization itself. The demobilization of our forces is by no means an easy matter, and careful thought had to be given to the methods by which that could be carried out and the machinery which must be set in motion. We do talk about these things very glibly; we are all inclined to do that. We do not know what the job actually means. Personally, I do not begin to know what demobilization means in the way of creating machinery and seeing that that machinery is operated in such a way as to cause the least possible trouble. My hon. friend the Minister of Militia (Major-General Mewburn), and his officials, spent weeks over that problem. They went overseas, consulted the British and French authorities and spent further weeks in working out all these details in anticipation of what would eventually happen. You know what has happened. As far as I have been able to learn, the plan has been so well worked out, and the machinery has run so smoothly, that there is practically little or no criticism left in the country as to the manner in which the work is being done.

I am speaking now solely and only of demobilization, of actually getting the men out of the army. The Minister of Militia told me the other day of an instance that occurred within the last three weeks in which some 500 men had been returned. They were taken from the ship to the dispersal area, and within half an hour after these men had arrived at the dispersal area they walked out as civilians once more. That was by no means an easy task. It involved grave study and a careful arrangement of the details in order that it might be done.

We had this afternoon and yesterday some little slam at one of the departments that was created at our last session. I refer to the department of Soldiers Civil Re-Establishment. It was created for a very specific purpose. It took the place of the Military Hospitals Commission. It has been at work for something over a year. Its expenditures for the past year will amount to something in the neighbourhood of $12,000,000. We had a mild intimation to the effect that it was created very largely for the purpose of providing salaries for somebody. That is the usual, old criticism. We have heard it a great many times. I have used it myself. It will be used as long as parliamentary institutions exist. No, that department was not created for that purpose. It was created for a very definite, a very specific purpose. It was created with the object in view of caring for every disabled Canadian soldier who came back to this country. The work of the department has two sides, one medical, the other vocational. As a result of the work, in the first place, of the Military Hospitals Commission and later of this department, we have now, scattered throughout Canada in every province, something like one hundred and fifty institutions. I need not go into the details. The members of the House are just as familiar with them as I am, and they know where these institutions are and what they are doing. Something like 2,000 or 2,500 young Canadian boys, who were " over there " and who were disabled and maimed as a result of the war, have come back, have gone through these institutions and have been refitted for life as far as it is humanly possible to do so through medical treatment and vocational training. Those 2,500 young men are now back to civil life in this country as a result of the activities of that department. In addition, there are something like 2,000 or 3,000 men actually undergoing treatment in these institutions at the present time, and there are some thousands being fitted for new employment. I am now speaking of men who cannot, on account of their disability, their injuries, their sufferings, go back to their old employments. Thousands of them are now undergoing treatment at these institutions.

I do not wish to leave the impression upon this House for one moment that all is well with that department or with any other department of the Government. In the making of war, and in the dealing with these problems of which our country had no experience and for which we were not at all equipped, it must not be wondered at that mistakes have been made. There will be criticism, some of which will doubtless be ventilated here. Hon. gentlemen opposite have even hinted at criticism from within our ranks. Be that as it may, all I wish to do is to leave the idea with the House that the department referred to was created for a definite purpose, and in my judgment it has carried on its work well—not perfectly, but nevertheless well; —and if, as a result of our deliberations during the present session, we can devise ways and means whereby that department's operations may be bettered, I am sure the members of the Government, including the minister who has it in charge, will welcome any such assistance.

Again, Mr. Speaker, time was taken by the forelock some two or three years ago in connection with another very important phase of the returned soldier problem. The matter was taken up at an interprovincial conference in this city called by the Federal Government, at which I was present as a member of the Saskatchewan Government. We sat here for two days with the federal authorities deliberating over the problem of the returned soldier to see if there was any responsibility or any work the provinces could undertake or carry on. After full consideration and full consent by the provinces it was agreed to establish what are known as Soldiers' Aid Commissions, and if I am not mistaken every province has by statute created a body of that character. These have been for some time in operation, and have done splendid work in connection with many of the problems that arise in connection with the returning men. I have visited some of these institutions, and the member for London (Mr. Cronyn) can speak of my visit to the Soldiers' Aid Commission in that city. I talked with the young man in charge, who has a staff of some six or eight persons assisting him, went through the office files, and saw the nature of the work which is there being carried on. Work of a similar character is going on throughout the length and breadth of the Dominion, and has been in progress for the last two or three years. These institutions have yielded splendid results. There is a great field of activity for them.

During the session there will doubtless be discussion on the question of soldiers' settlement, a very vexed and most difficult problem. If there was but one Government in Canada in which the ownership of the public domain was vested, the problem would be very much easier of solution, but hon. gentlemen know what the existing conditions are. There are nine provinces scattered over an enormous area,

and in these provinces varied conditions prevail, some owning their Crown lands, and others not. I can assure hon. gentlemen that the evolving of a satisfactory soldiers' settlement scheme under such conditions was a most complex and intricate one. I am not going to discuss the subject now, because ample opportunity for that will later on be given, but the problem was one which demanded from the Government very great consideration. We had numerous suggestions—I might say hundreds, and even thousands—from all over the country with respect to the matter; everybody had a scheme professing to afford an easy solution, but most of these suggestions were not very satisfactory because they were not very practicable. So far as I can see the Government have dealt with the question in the only practicable way that could be found.

It will be remembered that last session a Bill providing for assistance to the provinces in connection with the establishment of Labour Bureaus was presented. That action was not taken without due thought and reflection. As a matter of fact, at an interprovincial conference, called previous to last session, that question came up for consideration. It was only after thorough consideration by the premiers of the various provinces, who were accompanied in some instances by a number of their colleagues, it was only after the whole situation had been reviewed in all its aspects and the conditions likely to arise after the war reviewed, that the conclusion was reached, jointly with them, that the best way of handling the problem when it arose would be to make
5 p.m. provision for the establishment of bureaus of this nature throughout the Dominion. Hon. gentlemen opposite must not imagine that we forced this policy upon the provinces, or that we endeavoured in any way to interfere with provincial autonomy in connection with this matter. The subject was considered deliberately, coolly, and calmly with the provincial governments, and it was agreed, with the full consent of the various provincial authorities, to deal with the situation in the manner that I have described. In consequence, last session's measure providing for assistance to the provinces was submitted, and this year, on account of the conditions now prevailing, a very much larger assistance than was anticipated at that time needs to be provided. Speaking broadly, about fifty of these bureaus are at present in existence and all our work in connection with finding employment not only for the returned soldier, but for the civilian in Canada as well, is concentrated in these organizations. The danger was that if some action of this kind had not been taken we would likely have had chaos in this country in regard to the employment problem. While the system may not be working to the entire satisfaction of everybody in this country, nevertheless, so far as I have been able to judge from the representations made to me, it will reasonably meet the existing situation.

We must not forget that in this country—and the Government were thoroughly cognizant of the fact—there are a large number of organizations, patriotic and otherwise, that were simply sitting waiting, willing and ready to undertake any work that might be placed upon them just as soon as the nature of the problems requiring treatment was made manifest. Very shortly after the armistice was signed, the Government realized that the whole situation had changed, and that it was necessary to deal at once with the new conditions which had arisen. As hon gentlemen know, a new committee of the Cabinet was constituted. In this connection I may say that I am not afraid of committees or of commissions. If you have a reason for doing a thing, do not be afraid to do it simply because some one talks about it. We have had a number of committees and a number of commissions, and the great majority of them have done very useful and very necessary work, work that no government and no member of a government could carry on during these strenuous times. Very shortly after the armistice was signed we created a new committee of the Cabinet called the Repatriation and Employment Committee, which was appointed for the purpose of co-ordinating the work of the different departments of the Government and of all the various organizations outside of the Government machinery that had to deal with this problem. We had a pretty busy time for a while; during some six weeks we had a great many meetings. I am free to admit that there was a good deal of overlapping; that a good many toes were being tramped upon, through nobody's fault, by different organizations and by the departments. This committee and those associated with it found it necessary clearly to define the work of the various agencies that were brought into being to deal with the problems of demobilization and repatriation. I have had something to do with the work of this committee. I know a little

of its organization and of its administrative activities, and I think I can say truthfully that we have in Canada from ocean to ocean an organization handling this problem of repatriation such as does not exist in any other belligerent country in the world. It is a very complex organization; thousands of people take part in it—it is very necessary that that be so.

There has been a good deal of talk in some countries with regard to this problem. Much has been put down on paper and many fine reports have been got out and committees and commissions formed to enquire into and deal with the subject. We have had to make inquiries as to what is being done elsewhere, and we have gathered some information. When I say that we are well in advance of the other belligerent countries in this work, I think I am stating just what the situation is. The work is not perfect; many mistakes have been made, and perhaps more mistakes will be made. There will still be a good deal of criticism, and there will likely be room for it. There has been no work just like this in history; consequently we have had very little to guide us: The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) referred this afternoon to the great war of 1812, but that war was simply a baby as compared with this giant. You cannot look into past records and get much assistance from them, because the world has never experienced a situation such as this. This war has had far-reaching consequences; it has touched practically every home; it has touched practically every aspect of our national life. To say, therefore, that in dealing with matters arising out of these new conditions mistakes should not be made or cogs should not slip—well, after all, the Government and its agencies and the private organizations that are dealing with this problem are merely human, and these things will happen.

The immediate problems which confront us naturally fall under two headings, reconstruction and repatriation. The term "reconstruction" as used in Europe at present has a somewhat different meaning from that which it has here. Something has happened over there that has not happened in Canada. A smashing and demolishing of things has taken place; there has been a devastation over there, that we have not suffered. I have only to picture in my mind what I saw in the neighbourhood of the Somme to have some little realization of what the building up of that country means in the way of labour and expenditure that will be necessary during the next few years. But the term "reconstruction" has a real meaning to us, a very deep and a very significant meaning. While it does not mean to us what it means to the people over there, nevertheless our people have learned some lessons from this war. They have learned that all is not well in the world; that some reforms are necessary. Our people clearly understand that work is ahead of this nation in that regard. In my opinion reconstruction, as applied to Canada, embraces the adjusting of the affairs of the nation so as to meet the new social and economic conditions that have arisen as a result of the war. Do not make any mistake about it, new conditions, social and economic, have arisen in our country as a result of the war, and we must adjust the affairs of the nation to meet them. Reconstruction involves also a national stock-taking of all our policies and laws that affect the well-being of our people, with a view to placing the nation in the position she should occupy as a progressive, democratic community. Every member of the House will place his stamp of approval on that statement. Reconstruction further means the taking of a long step forward through the adoption of measures and policies truly conceived and effectively and honestly administered in the interests of the great mass of the Canadian people. Reconstruction, if it means anything to us, must mean the adoption of higher ideals of citizenship, the searching for measures that will have an ever increasing tendency to unify and harmonize our many conflicting interests. They are here; we have heard a little about them so far, and I may touch on them myself before I sit down. Above all, reconstruction involves the creating of such social and economic conditions as are necessary to the comfort, happiness and prosperity of our people as a whole. Reconstruction means a going forward, not a standing still. It means progress, not stagnation.

I am but a young member of this House, and I naturally hesitate to give advice or even to voice a warning; and yet I feel that, I must do this if I am to discharge the responsibility that I bear as a member of the House and as a member of this Government. Many people in this country have the idea that our problems consist in getting back to the conditions that existed prior to August 1, 1914. Any man who holds that idea has failed to learn the lessons of the last four and a half years. I have stated on the public platform at two or three meetings that I have held, that Canada will

never again be the same old Canada. The people of this country by the thousands, aye, by the hundreds of thousands, have suffered during the last four years. The lessons of this war have been burned into their very soul. The people of Canada as a whole are thinking differently, and let us not make any mistake about it, they are going to act differently when they have an opportunity.

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. CALDER: My hon. friends opposite applaud. Let me tell those of them who are strong party men as they are, as I have been and as I probably am, that the old ideas and the old ideals of the past are fast passing away. People in this country have been losing their moorings; many strings have been cut. The people of Canada, when the time comes, will support that Government and no other, whatever Government that may be, that has a true conception of what the people of this country demand in the way of progressive legislation.

Our reconstruction problems cover practically the whole range of our domestic policy. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was quite accurate in his statement that the tariff forms a very essential part of that work. Public health; questions dealing with child labour; the question of the control of public utilities, the nationalisation of railways, telegraphs, telephones; the distribution of the burden of taxation,—all those problems are naturally reconstruction problems. We are not going to deal with them in a day, or a week, or a year, or a session; it is going to take time. Many of them will require considerable thought and study. There are going to be sharp differences of opinion in regard to some of them, and as regards others there is a possibility that there will be only one way in which the question of policy can be decided,—that is by a direct appeal to the electorate. I am not going to take up the time of the House in dealing with those problems in detail now. Many of them will be considered during the session; some of them will be dealt with; others will have to be left over.

Just a word or two about another series of questions which we have to consider. I refer to the repatriation problem which is on our hands. What is the problem involved? What does it embrace? During the war we took something like half a million young men out of the civil life of this country. I have heard it stated that they represent more than one-half of the young men in the country. We put them into the army. They have been in the army from one to four years. They have lived under army discipline. They would go where they were told, and come when they were called. Their whole habits have been changed. Their life has been entirely different. They have suffered. Now they are coming back. The whole problem of repatriation involves the question as to how we can place those young men back into the civil life of this country where they can become useful citizens capable of properly maintaining themselves and their families. It is the biggest problem we have ahead of us, the one that is knocking at our door just now, the one that must be solved satisfactorily unless Canada is to reap an irreparable loss. What is the attitude of the men themselves towards this question? I think hon. members will all agree with me that their attitude is, on the whole, splendid. There are some exceptions. These men are coming back as civilians, not as soldiers. The great majority of them are anxious to get back into civil life just as soon as it can be arranged. They are pretty weary of the khaki; they want to get their military uniforms off their backs just as quickly as they can. They expect, and have a right to demand, a proper place in the civil life of this country just as quickly as possible. You know, many if not most of the men expect a little more than before they went away, and they are right in that. Their ideas have been broadened; they have got a broader view of life than they had before, and when they come back they expect to have an opportunity to climb just a little higher than where they were before. I say that they should have that opportunity. We should endeavour to assist them in every possible way to carry out that legitimate ambition. What is the attitude of our people on this question? During the days immediately following the armistice I think it was not just what it should have been; our people were a little indifferent; they did not quite understand the greatness of the task that confronted the nation. But it did not take long for them to find out, and I think to-day we have in Canada, from ocean to ocean, an entirely different spirit. I think our people as a whole are anxious to help solve the problem that confronts us. We have thousands of willing workers in all our chief centres throughout the country doing

splendid work, and I know the men themselves appreciate what is being done.

What is our attitude to be in this House? There is no doubt what our feelings are. There is not a single member of this House who does not realize the debt we owe these men who went over there to fight our battle and uphold the liberties and institutions of this and of every other civilized country in the world. We all know that, and we all realize that the debt we owe these men can never be repaid in dollars and cents; the men are not looking for that. It seems to me there is one fundamental idea that we should keep in view in dealing with this problem. Our aim should be to endeavour to create such conditions as to make the returned soldier self-reliant at the earliest possible moment. We should not encourage him to lean on the State, as that would be the greatest wrong we could do him, or on charity or on municipal or other institutions. I have met numbers of these men and talked matters over with them quietly, and the prevailing feeling I have met is a desire to get back into the life of this country just as quickly as they can. It is not charity, not dollars and cents, that they want. What they want is proper employment and a chance to make a home for themselves and their families, and unless this House approaches the problem from that viewpoint we are liable to make very many mistakes and do harm that it will takes very many years to repair.

I do not wish to say something that will be misunderstood, but nevertheless I am going to say what I have in mind because I believe in plain speech—I think we always get farther and act more properly when we speak our minds very plainly, and I just wish to give brief voice to this thought: We shall never deal with this problem properly unless we are very careful about the politician who is abroad looking for votes. I say that advisedly, I say it purposely; and I do not think it will be misunderstood. The greatest danger that confronts Canada to-day in connection with this whole problem is the self-seeking politician who is abroad in the land looking for votes and unless we as members of this House realize what our responsibility is and approach the problem from that angle at this its most critical stage, we are liable to make serious mistakes from which we shall not recover for very many years.

There are just one or two other questions I shall touch on. Almost every speaker except the last (Mr. Sinclair) has referred to the necessity for a united Canada. There has been considerable internal strife in the past, very serious strife. That strife operates against everything that the great majority of the people of this country want. Canada is never going to prosper or develop as she should so long as this internal strife continues to exist, and I desire to add just one word to all that has been said on this question. Unless the public men and statesmen of this country use their heads and their hearts for the purpose of putting an end to these conditions, Canada will never be what it should be, and we can never prosper as we should.

As a western representative, and particularly as a representative of the province of Saskatchewan, I feel I should say one word more. I refer to the conditions existing in Western Canada, where all the elements of disunion exists—A pretty big and serious problem. I am referring now to the tariff cleavage between East and West. You know, we might as well look that squarely in the face and recognize the situation as it exists; there is no use dodging it, that situation is there. What are the people of Canada going to do? Can it be settled in some way or another? Is there a possibility of a settlement? There is no doubt as to the feeling out West. There is no division among the people. All parties are practically united. What is to be done? You will have an opportunity later in the session to consider the question. In the meantime, I simply wish to point out to this House, and to the people of this country, that that is one of the other questions on the horizon that in many ways looks dangerous; at any rate it divides the people of this country and puts them in two hostile camps, fighting against each other all the time. If Canada is to be what we hope it shall be, then an honest and earnest attempt must be made to solve that problem which stares us squarely in the face.

I have just a few words to say with regard to some remarks made by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). I speak to him as one of the separated brethren. There are a few of us in this House, there are a good many thousand out in the country. I desire on this occasion to say a word or two, I will not say in their defence, but on their behalf. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) very tactfully I think, threw out an invitation in connection with a statement he made that the light was still burning in the window, and that the wanderer would be welcomed home. My hon. friend from Brome was just a little more blunt, and suggested that some of us should go and

see the Finance Minister, and ask if he agreed with the Grits as far as the tariff was concerned, and if he said no, there would be nothing further for us to do except to walk over to the other side of the House. He also intimated that if we Liberals on this side of the House had forsaken our old ideals and were worshipping Baal, the high god of protection, why we could stay just where we were. I am not going over the old story. Everybody knows the history of this country during the past year and a half. People know why this Government was brought into being. My hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) would say it was conceived in iniquity and all the rest of it. But I think the people clearly understand the issues that were at stake at that time, and the reasons why the Government was brought into being. There was a very important principle at stake, and we differed honestly in regard to it. I have never quarelled with any man because he held different views from mine on that question, and I do not propose to do so. It is a passing question. It has gone and I hope the occasion will never arise again in this country, and that conscription will never be necessary. I wish to say—and I am sure I voice the sentiments of every Liberal Unionist on this side of the House, and of the vast majority of Liberal Unionists in the country—that when we acted as we did we believed we did the right thing. I do not think our friends opposite will quarrel with us when we take that stand. I wish to say personally that I have never had one such regret for the action I took. I have received many letters from my friends, and I have conversed with many of them. They have wagged their heads and wondered what was going to happen—and they were the only people who worried; I have never done so for a minute. I say it was not easy to do what was done, but when a man has a conviction within himself, and the consciousness that he has done the right thing he does not need to worry very much. I have learned a lot of things, Mr. Speaker, since coming to Ottawa. I am not going to mention them all, but I have learned that the problems and difficulties confronting this Government during the past year and at the present time are very great. I have already intimated that, in my judgment, the work immediately ahead of us was more important and more difficult than the work we undertook during the war period. My hon. friend from Brome, if I judge his speech aright, seems to think that there is just one thing to be dealt with at the present time, namely the tariff. In the meantime the home may burn down. We have problems confronting us right now demanding immediate attention, all kinds of problems that must be considered and solved during the next few months, and I wonder if the people of this country are asking us to lock horns just at this moment on a question that has divided the people of Canada for something like forty or fifty years. I doubt it very much. Just let me say that when I joined this Government I joined as a Liberal, and I am a Liberal to-day. More than that, no person can make me anything else. There may be those who would like to drive me out of the Liberal party, but they cannot do it. I care not whether I am in the organization or whether I have any part in the organization—that means very little in times like these. I have had letters from my friends out West saying: For goodness sake, Calder, come over while there is time —as somebody said to-day—or it may be too late. This question of party is a very small thing at the present time, in my judgment. There is something bigger at stake than mere politics at the moment. We have bigger, more important work to do. When the time comes later on there may be those who will desire to play politics in this country. Well and good; let that be done when the time does come. Just now we have something else to attend to.

We have a hard session ahead of us, and probably it will be a long one. We shall have many problems to deal with and probably there are a good many rocks ahead. Canada is facing a very serious situation. I have not any doubt at all as to what the outcome will be. During four years of war the Canadian people played a magnificent part, and they secured results in every phase of war work that no person could have dreamed would be possible of accomplishment. I have not the slightest doubt that in connection with the problems that we are now dealing with, and which we must deal with during this session, our people will be equal to the situation. I am not pessimistic in any sense. Our people throughout the war have shown a genius for organization, and an ability to meet the situation with which they are confronted that will stand them in good stead in the months to come. I have not the slightest doubt at all that we will get safely over the hill; indeed, much more safely than many

other countries that are troubled with problems such as we have at the present time.

I might just say, in conclusion, that I did not last session avail myself to any extent of the opportunity of speaking in the House. I think I probably acted wisely in adopting that course. Being new here, I was very anxious to get to know the members and to learn a little about the atmosphere and all that sort of thing. I must thank the House for the indulgence that it has shown to me to-day and the attentive manner in which it has listened to my very rambling remarks.

On the motion of Mr. L. J. Gauthier (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville), the debate was adjourned.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Thursday, February 27, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Thirteenth Report of the Board of Railway Commissioners for Canada for the year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

Certain Orders in Council respecting Housing.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

RAILWAY ACT AMENDMENT.

PROPOSAL TO PLACE COASTWISE AND INLAND WATER VESSELS UNDER RAILWAY COMMISSION.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG (East Lambton) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 6, to amend the Railway Act.

Mr. MURPHY: Explain.

Mr. J. E. ARMSTRONG: This Bill is for the purpose of compelling the boats on our inland waters and coastwise trade to come under the control of the Railway Commission. At present the only boats that are under the control of that commission are those that are connected with the large railway corporations in our country. They are compelled to file their rates, tolls, tariff grievances, with the Railway Board, while the other 4,500 boats—because there are 4,500 boats on the Canadian Register—are allowed to charge whatever rates they please, call or not at any dock or port as they please, and are a law unto themselves. When we take into consideration the fact that the people of Canada have spent nearly $350,000,000 in deepening our waterways, buoying and lighting our harbours and rivers, building our docks, piers and canals throughout the country, and then find themselves without any control so far as Government control is concerned, we cannot help realizing that we are placed in a somewhat humiliating position. This is, however, practically the only public utility in Canada that is not under some form of Government control, and Canada is practically the only country in the world that has not absolute control over her shipping on inland waters and coastal trade. I hope, when this matter comes before the House, hon. members will give it every consideration and that it will become law at the earliest possible date. I understand that a Bill for the consolidation of the Railway Act has already been introduced into the Senate, and I hope it will come before the House in the near future. If it does, I trust I shall be allowed the privilege of placing an amendment in that Bill containing the principles contained in this Bill which I have now laid before the House.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 7, to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 8, to amend the Irrigation Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RECLAMATION OF DOMINION LANDS BY DRAINAGE.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 9, to authorize the reclamation of Dominion lands by drainage.

Mr. BUREAU: Explain.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This Bill, which is of some importance, provides for the establishment of a reclamation service for the purpose of reclaiming Dominion lands by drainage. The work contemplated to be done under this Bill is to be done under the Drainage Acts passed in Alberta and Saskatchewan, to which provinces the Bill alone applies. After a series of conferences a division of responsibility as between

Federal and provincial governments has been arranged. This Bill is to take care of the Federal responsibility.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

DOMINION LANDS SURVEYS ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 10, to amend the Dominion Lands Surveys Act.

Mr. SPEAKER: Is it the pleasure of the House to adopt the motion?

Motion agreed to.

Mr. BUREAU: Explain the Bill.

Mr. SPEAKER: I gave an opportunity to do so on the introduction. It is not competent to do so on the first reading.

Mr. BUREAU: You are going too fast.

Bill read the first time.

ALLEGED TRADE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Huntingdon): I desire to bring to the attention of the Government a question of national importance. In the Montreal Gazette of to-day, Thursday, February 27, there appears this cablegram from its resident correspondent in London:

> Canada's trade handicapped in favour of the United States. Trade Commission lodges protest with Lloyd George. Change unlikely soon. Until brains of country get back on jobs discrimination will continue.
>
> London, February 26.—Until the Peace Conference is over, and the brains of this country are back on their jobs again in Great Britain, there is little hope of the discrimination against Canada in the matter of imports being removed, declared I. N. Jones, member of the Canadian Trade Commission, to-day.
>
> In support of this opinion Lloyd Harris and Mr. Jones have addressed strong representations to Premier Lloyd George and Sir Albert Stanley, president of the Board of Trade, showing clearly where discrimination exists.

I wish to know what is the nature of this discrimination, and whether Mr. Lloyd Harris and Mr. Jones have authority from the Government of Canada to make such representations to the Prime Minister of England direct.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The news item in question was drawn to my attention only a few moments ago by my hon. friend. I have no official information in confirmation of the report, and I must take the liberty of doubting that Great Britain would discriminate against Canada in favour of the United States or of any other country. My experience in the negotiations which the Government has during the past few months been conducting with the British authorities respecting the purchase of our agricultural and other products has been such as to assure me, if assurance were needed, that Great Britain is doing everything possible to facilitate and promote the trade of Canada with the Mother country. I am unable to say whether Messrs. Jones and Lloyd Harris made any such representations or not. Their powers and duties are defined by the commission which appointed them as Trade Commissioners Overseas. From time to time they take up with the British authorities matters relating to trade, but not having any official information as to the particular matter in question, I am unable to make any further comment. I shall be glad, however, to look into the matter.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

THE PUNISHMENT OF DESERTERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): On the front page of the Ottawa Evening Journal of yesterday, under the heading, "All deserters appear again for heavy fine—minimum fixed at $250, and the new law is to be retroactive" there appears this statement:

> It is further understood that this order in council will be retroactive, that is to say, that any deserter who has already given himself up and been let off with a fine less than $250 can be re-arrested and re-fined at least to the minimum amount fixed in the new order. This will mean that hundreds of Quebec deserters who have been let off with a five dollar fine are liable to re-arrest and re-fine.

I should like particularly to know whether this is a proper representative of the Order in Council, and whether under its provisions those who have already been tried will be subject to re-arrest and re-trial.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): The Order in Council to which the extract refers does not provide for the punishment of any person who has already been punished in accordance with the law. There is a class of cases, however, of those who registered and were refused exemption who subsequently failed to report on being ordered to do so, and for whose cases, in the opinon of the Justice Department, as to which I think there can be no

dispute, no provision was made for a fine at all. The only punishment appearing in the regulations which it was open to magistrates to inflict in the cases was imprisonment. It is stated with regard to this class that there have been in many cases convictions where fines have been imposed. The Order in Council is designed to enact that wherever in such cases fines of substantial character have been imposed consistent with the magnitude of the offense—and the limits are fixed at $250 and $5,000—those convictions are ratified as legal. The Order in Council does not go beyond that to ratify any conviction as legal, nor does it make illegal a conviction which when it was made was in accordance with law.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Wednesday, February 26th.

Mr. LOUIS JOSEPH GAUTHIER (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville): Mr. Speaker, before entering upon the ground I wish to cover this afternoon it is my intention to make two preliminary remarks. First of all, I wish to tender to the Government of this country, and especially to the Acting Prime Minister, my sincere thanks for their broad-mindedness in honouring as they have done the memory of our late beloved Chief. They have sympathized with us fully in our sorrow, and it is only right that we should proffer them our gratitude.

I also wish to tender to the mover and the seconder of the Address my congratulations for the able manner in which they have performed the arduous task that was allotted to them. Not wishing to risk a breach of the rules of the House by falling into tedious repetition, I shall confine myself to endorsing all the good things that have been said of these two hon. members. Their speeches, which were delivered with masterly skill, showed marks of deep thought.

Coming now to the subject before the House, I shall first answer some of the statements that have been made by two hon. ministers of the Crown, namely the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) and the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder). The Minister of Public Works informed us that numerous complaints were reaching the Cabinet every day about after-the-war conditions, and his message to the people of Canada was to do away with unemployment in Canada. By this remedy, I suppose, he expects to avoid the complaints which threaten to overwhelm the Cabinet, and that peace will replace unrest. Is that a real remedy for the evil? Taking the picture he drew so vividly, with Canada called upon to borrow from $100,000,000 to $125,000,000 for a number of years to come, and with a net debt of two billion dollars, does he believe that his remedy will put a stop to the complaints which are pouring into Ottawa from all parts of the country? Does he believe that the feeling of unrest will cease in view of the policy of extravagance which he has offered to the House, involving an expenditure of money by the millions of dollars? According to his statement, we shall be compelled to borrow every year the enormous sum of from $100,000,000 to $125,000,000. I say, Sir, that we knew the evil as well as he did, but I regret to be compelled to confess that I do not believe the remedy he is offering will cure the situation, or that peace will replace the unrest that he told us existed in this country. This Minister of Public Works made a statement to which I have listened with a great deal of attention. I find, in perusing Hansard this morning, that the sentence he uttered in this House has been altered. It may have been a slip of the tongue, but I cannot, on account of those who heard the statement and who have not read the report, let it pass. I must enter my protest, and I must say to the House that I felt offended to hear an hon. minister of the Crown, on his own responsibility from his seat in this House, telling the members that he had read in the press that France intended to repudiate part of her war debt—France who has done so much for humanity, France with her indomitable courage, with all the losses she has sustained, France who has always been in the vanguard, fighting that right should prevail against might. If she were repudiating a single part of her war debt, she would not be the France we have known, the France we have loved, the France who has been the bulwark of civilization in the tremendous war which has just closed. There was another statement from the Minister of Public Works which has amazed me considerably. This statement I find in Hansard this morning, and I must take it as I heard it yesterday and as I have read it this morning. The hon. Minister of Public Works said last year that ships were more necessary than

anything else. In fact he is reported on page 50 as saying—

> A year ago shipping was more vital to winning the war than were men or shells or anything else.

Well, Sir, if this statement is true—and I believe it to be true because I have heard it before in this very Chamber—why did we have conscription? Why did my hon. friend leave his party on that very question? And if my hon. friend thought, according to the advice that he had received from men in high office, that he was led into error when he was told that ships were not more necessary than men, but that men were more necessary than ships and we were compelled to have conscription, how is it he now contends that ships were more necessary than men, and how can be explain his remaining where he is to-day? My hon. friend, in his desire to defend his new friends in the Government in which he holds such a high position, has been compelled to let the truth fall from his lips, as the Book of Wisdom says, "Iniquitas mentita est sibi," "Iniquity has been a witness against itself."

We come now to the other minister of the Crown, the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder). He has invited criticism, and I shall avail myself of his invitation, and I shall try to answer as briefly as possible. The hon. gentleman has uttered a sentence that can be applied to the speech he delivered to the House yesterday. He told us that there had been a good deal of talk by the opponents of the Administration, but there had been nothing done. I believe, Sir, this assertion fits exactly, if some one wished to study it, the speech of the hon. gentlemen and the administration of everything in his department. The hon. minister informs us also that partisanship has disappeared, or is about to disappear. May I be permitted to ask the hon. minister if it is not true that partisanship is still rampant in any department, and especially in his own department? I hold in my hand an official advertisement, and it is my intention to have it printed in Hansard. This is my answer to the assertion of the hon. minister that partisanship has disappeared, or, is about to disappear. Here is a statement issued by Mr. Daly, director of repatriation for the Repatriation Committee. It is in regard to free medical treatment for ex-soldiers and sailors. I regret to have to read such a document. It is contrary to the method in which I generally make speeches in this House, but I hope I will be allowed, for once, to depart from my rule. This is in answer to the assertion of the hon. minister, and, in order to be complete it must be read in its entirety: It reads:

> Those discharged soldiers or sailors who become ill or disabled again as a result of some disease or injury suffered during war service receive free medical and surgical treatment.
>
> This service is provided by the Medical Branch of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment.
>
> An ex-soldier or ex-sailor who has a recurrence of a war disability should, if he is not too ill, go at once to the local medical officer of this Department.
>
> If he is too ill he should have that medical officer notified at once.
>
> Should he be taken ill in a place where there is no representative of the Department, he should call in a local physician to give him the necessary immediate treatment and ask him to communicate immediately all details of the case to the nearest medical officer of the Department.
>
> The name of the authorized medical representative of this department for each locality is given alongside.
>
> Treatment at the expense of this department can only be secured through these representatives. The Department cannot pay any bills for treatment which have not been authorized by the department.
>
> If the medical officers recommend it pay is given to patients and allowances are granted to their dependents by the department, during the period of treatment.
>
> The established scale of pay and allowances that may be granted depends upon the extent to which the treatment recommended by the medical officer of the department prevents the patient from doing his regular work.
>
> Arrangements for special care of patients of the department have been made with hospitals in all the larger towns and cities from coast to coast.
>
> Sanatoria for treating tuberculosis under most favourable conditions are operated in every province under the direct supervision of the department
>
> H. J. Daly,
> Director of Repatriation.

Here is the list of medical men appointed by the Government. There are some names which are very familiar to us, and I have had information, which I believe to be reliable, which enables me to attach to each name the political proclivities of the appointee. I will give the list to the House as I have received it. The official document says that representatives of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, in addition to this list, are named also constantly. The list is as follows:—

City or Town.	Name of Unit Medical Director. Asst. Unit Medical Director or Medical Representative.	—
Nova Scotia:		
Halifax	Dr. Dugald Stewart, Leith House, Hollis St	Ex-Conservative member.
Sydney	Dr. Jas. Bruce	No information.
Prince Edward Island:		
Charlottetown	Dr. Alex. Ross	No information.
Québec:		
Montreal	Dr. A. E. Lundon, 301 Drummond Bldg	No information.
Quebec	Dr. A. R. F. Hubbard, 17 St. James St	Tory.
Ontario:		
Kingston	Dr. E. E. Latta, Golden Lion Block	No information.
Ottawa	Dr. H. T. Douglas, 132 Queen St	Tory.
Port Hope	Dr. A. G. Aldrich	Unionist.
Gananoque	Dr. J. J. Davis, Pine Street	Tory.
Picton	Dr. C. A. Publow	Tory.
Lindsay	Dr. J. A. White	Unionist.
Brockville	Dr. E. J. F. Williams	Tory.
Toronto	Dr. E. Ryan, 185 Spadina Ave	Tory.
Hamilton	Dr. W. Bethune, 300 Clyde Block	Unionist.
North Bay	Dr. W. J. Bell	Tory.
Chatham	Dr. R. V. Bray	Tory.
Sudbury	Dr. W. C. Cook	Tory.
Windsor	Dr. Cruikshank, 14 Labelle Bldg	No informatiou
Paris	Dr. W. J. H. Gould	Tory.
Brantford	Dr. C. C. Fissette	Unionist.
Windsor	Dr. C. Fuller, 1 Wyandotte St. W	Unionist.
Orillia	Dr. W. C. Gilchrist	Tory.
Haileybury	Dr. G. F. Jackson	Tory.
Mattawa	Dr. M. James	Tory.
Midland	Dr. T. J. Johnston	Tory.
Barrie	Dr. W. A. Lewis, P. O. Box 13	Tory.
Owen Sound	Dr. H. H. Middleboro	Tory.
Timmins	Dr. H. H. Moore	Tory.
Welland	Dr. W. R. McCulloch	Tory.
Collingwood	Dr. D. McKay	Tory.
Woodstock	Dr. S. McM. McLay	No information.
Stratford	Dr. L. F. Robertson, 55 Albert St	No information.
St. Catharines	Dr. J. Sheahan	No information.
Sault Ste. Marie	Dr. A. A. Shepard; 746 Queen St. E	No information,
London	Dr. N. B. Alexander, Room 56 Bk. of Toronto Bldg	Tory.
Fort William	Dr. A. J. Manion	Unionist.
Manitoba:		
Winnipeg	Dr. K. McIvor, Notre Dame Investment Bldg	Tory.
Saskatchewan:		
Regina	Dr. W. C. Arnold, McCallum-Hill Bldg	Tory.
Saskatoon	Dr. D. S. Creighton	Tory.
North Battleford	Dr. J. H. H. Jackson	No information.
Prince Albert	Dr. R. L. King	No information.
Alberta:		
Calgary	Dr. G. R. Johnson, Beveridge Bldg	No information.
Edmonton	Dr. G. G. Stewart, 410 McLeod Block	No information.
Lethbridge	Dr. G. W. Leech, 109 Sherlock Block	No information.
Medicine Hat	Dr. O. Boyd	Was Unionist Government Supporter.
British Columbia:		
Vancouver	Dr. A. P. Proctor, Board of Trade Bldg	" "
Victoria	Dr. C. D. Holmes, Central Bldg	No information.
New Brunswick:		
Fredericton	Dr. C. MacKay, Royal Bank Bldg	No information.
St. John	Dr. G. P. Peat, Bank of Montreal Bldg	Tory.

If you take the list you will find that out of 49 medical officers there are only 16 who so far as my information goes are not friends of the Government. I do not accuse the Government of appointing their friends as medical officers for ex-soldiers and sailors, but what is the use of a minister of the Crown coming into this House, speaking from his seat in Parliament on his own responsibility and affirming that partisanship has disappeared, or is about to disappear? The document says that additions are being made to this list constantly. If we take it in the same proportion, we will see that out of over 100 medical officers appointed by this department two-thirds of

them are friendly to the Government. I do not object to that; I admit that it is fair, but virtue should wait before praising itself too highly when the Government has such a record as this. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization has also told us that he has been in public life for fifteen years, and he has affirmed that the self-seeking politician is a danger to Canada. I suppose the hon. gentleman knows whereof he speaks. That is his statement. I do not challenge it. He has the experience. He is known as a public man from one end of the country to the other, and when he makes such a statement I believe the statement is true, coming from such a man.

The minister has informed us that the armistice was signed on November 11, 1918. This Government was elected as a win-the-war Government. Now, the war is over. I never could understand that, having beaten the Huns as we have, the world should be expected to accept the camouflage of saying that what was signed on November 11 was an armistice when it was in fact an unconditional surrender. We have absolute proof that Germany, in signing this armistice, was surrendering and that when she signed it the war was over.

If it is true that the problems following peace are more stupendous than those which preceded it, and if it has taken this Government four years to build up their war machine, as the minister has said, do they want to take four years more to build up their peace machine? Why did they not call Parliament together before now? Why have the Government waited three months and why have they shouldered responsibilities that they had no reason to shoulder at all? They were elected to win the war, they believe they have won the war and that should be enough for any set of men even such an honourable body of men as our ministers are. Why had Parliament not been called upon before a few days ago to do its duty and to shoulder its part of the responsibility? I suppose the Government, having built their war machine, want to build, according to their own ideas, the peace machine to be put into operation when the war is over.

The hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) said to the House that there was a feeling of unrest in this country. Could it be otherwise? In a country like Canada, with the peculiar kind of government that we have, is it extraordinary that there should be unrest? Not at all. I shall explain what I mean. Having the confidence I have in the institutions of this country, even if I were alone, I would stand up and make the statement which I shall now address to this House. This Government has been elected by a majority of the people. Whether the lists were right or wrong, we accepted the challenge; we lost the fight, but we are game enough to acknowledge that the ministers represent the majority of those who voted. But, they had a duty to perform. The first duty of all was to call Parliament in session when the war was over because they were elected to win the war and Parliament ought to have been consulted. The charge that I make against this Government is that they have waited for three months after the armistice was signed when they should have proceeded immediately to call Parliament together.

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization has told us that the members of the Opposition are like the man on the street. I have no objection to being likened to the man on the street. The man on the street is a citizen of this country. The man on the street is a voter if he has not been disfranchised by the Government.

The man on the street belongs to the common people. He bears the burden of taxation in peace time, and he risks his life in time of war, and he is entitled to the respect of even of a minister of the Crown. The man on the street, Sir, though he may be humble, modest, poor and even destitute has always been defended by the party which is now sitting to your left, and I am not ashamed to be compared to him. The man on the street is the backbone of the country when he is well treated, but when covered with scorn he is apt to lose his patience and to crush those who think they are powerful because they happen to be temporarily holding the reins of power in the country.

The hon. minister (Mr. Calder) also told us that "he was still a Liberal and that nobody could put him out." I really think, Mr. Speaker, that nobody can put him out of the Government, which he seems to control. The hon. gentleman announces that he is still a Liberal, that he was a Liberal when he entered the Cabinet, and that he will remain one. I shall not enter into any discussion with him on that point. I shall not discuss his motives for leaving the party, it is no business of mine. But speaking for myself, I tell the hon. gentleman I do not regret his exit from our ranks. When the fruit becomes too ripe, Mr. Speaker, it falls from the tree which has given it life and which has brought it to maturity. The tree still continues to grow and to give its own life to

other fruit, but the fruit which has fallen to the ground is destined for destruction.

Every hon. gentleman occupying a seat in this House will agree with me, I suppose, when I say that in order that this country may be happy and prosperous we must have stability in Canada, and to have stability our people must have confidence in those who govern them. I submit, Sir, that the present Government is a peculiar one. It was elected to win the war, and the Government still remains in office. It is a Unionist Government without union. Free traders live under the same roof with ardent protectionists. Ministers are the target for the poisoned arrows of their followers and supporters; there is division in their ranks, and the majority of the people of this country who had confidence in this Government when they elected it will, I believe, lose that confidence if something is not speedily done to solve the problems which confront us. To judge from the speeches delivered yesterday by ministers of the Crown, there appears to them to be only one problem to deal with, and that is the problem of how to remain in office. Let me tell these hon. gentlemen that the country is not at all interested in that problem. The inaction of the Government, and the divisions which exist within it, have created that feeling of unrest in the country to which the Minister of Public Works yesterday made allusion.

Among the problems that confront us I find that there are three which require immediate solution, and it is the duty of the Government to submit to Parliament a remedy which will cure the evils which threaten us. It is no use, Mr. Speaker, trying to avoid a solution of the problems which are calling for attention; it is useless to try and postpone the consideration of them. Now is the time for this Parliament to face the situation and to apply the remedy. The three problems in question, to my mind, are: first, the demobilization and reinstatement of our soldiers in civil life; second, the settlement of the question of capital and labour, and third, the agrarian problem. This Government was elected because it raised from one end of the country to the other the clamour that it favoured our boys at the Front. Do you not believe, Mr. Speaker, that it is about time to take care of the boys who are coming from the Front? Do you not believe that those boys should be shown whether those war-time speeches were the true expression of sincere feeling? From my seat in the House yesterday I heard members of the Government telling us what they were doing in the way of meeting the existing problems. Admitting, for the sake of discussion, that the Government is doing all that it can, that it has announced its actual policy in that regard, nevertheless, if that policy fails of results let the ministers have recourse to another. Mr. Speaker, when the boys rallied to the colours we promised to look after their interests. Well, the war is over. If the Government was able to supply ships to send our boys to the Front, let it with equal promptness find ships for transporting them back to their native land. I understand, Mr. Speaker, that it is a vexing problem, but a Government composed of the giants of the two political parties must surely be clever enough to overcome this difficulty in a satisfactory manner. Anyway, let it make an effort to do so. The policy which it has been pursuing has given rise to criticism and complaint. In all the large cities we hear it asserted that nobody is looking after the interests of the soldiers when they return from the Front. I repeat, Sir, that it is the imperative duty of the Government to provide in a speedy and satisfactory manner for the demobilization of our soldiers and their reinstatement in civil life. They have done their duty at the Front, and they are coming back covered with glory. Surely, Mr. Speaker, the Government does not want our soldiers to feel ashamed because it is not performing its duty as well as those gallant fellows did theirs on the field of battle.

The second problem to be dealt with is that relating to capital and labour. I was very much interested yesterday upon hearing the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvelll) tell the financiers and the industrial corporations of this country: "You have made money by the war; put your money into new undertakings even if you do not receive any profit therefrom." Is that a remedy, Mr. Speaker? Capital is timorous; capital wants to feel its way before entering into any new undertaking. Because they have made money, does the Government believe that the financiers should invest that money in new undertakings at a time when the industrial market in Canada is one of such little stability? Not at all. Before plunging into new enterprises, capital wants to know the exact condition it has to face. Our captains of industry have been wise in the past, they are wise in the present, and we rely on their wisdom for the future of our country. It is bad counsel for a minister of the Crown to tell the financiers of Canada to spend their money without looking for any return.

The workingmen also are confronted with a situation the details of which they must

understand. I admit that the transformation of our war industries into civil industries is a more or less difficult problem. I admit also that the workingman may not have been as provident as he should have been during the time of war; he was making a large salary and should have saved for the future. I am told, however, that the savings of the workingmen do not amount to much and that during the period of the transformation of our war industries into civil industries, they will have to rely on the credit extended to them by the grocer, the baker, and all those who supply the necessaries of life for them and their families. If the Government does not tackle the problem of capital and labour, the workingmen, when they have lost all credit, will be looking for trouble. It is just as well not to be afraid of what is coming. It is our duty, as a minister of the Crown has told us, to inform the Government of what we know, in the expectation that the Government will do what it should do. The cost of living ought to be lowered. Profiteers should be called to account; they should be punished, not knighted. But I suppose the word of these men is listened to with more careful attention than are the words and the voice of the poor workingmen of Canada.

The third problem is the agrarian problem; it is the last but not the least. The farmers have responded wonderfully to the appeals of the Federal Government and the provincial governments; men have gone back to the farm and have worked to intensify their production. But just at the moment when the farming industry was at its height the war was terminated, and now the farmers are looking for a steady market in which they can sell their produce. They must have this market. The Government is appealing to the soldiers to settle on farms when they return to this country. Many who had been attracted from the farms to our large cities went back to the farm. Is there any sense in appealing to our people to take up farm work, in asking our soldiers to settle on the farms and our young men to remain on the farm, when the agricultural products of our country find no market? The farmers deserve to have the market; there is no use in postponing a settlement of this ques-

4 p.m. tion; it ought to be settled immediately. This postponement cannot relieve the situation; I affirm, with all due respect to any members of this House who do not agree with me, that the postponement of the solution of such a problem as this is an economic error.

[Mr. Gauthier.]

Having regard to these troublous problems which confront the country, may I be permitted, without indulging in flattery, to say to the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) that his day is coming? The affairs of the country require wise direction, and the people hope that the hon. gentleman will prove that he has the intellectual, the moral and the political stature to find and offer to the people a solution of these pressing problems which will bring contentment and satisfaction to every home in Canada. This no time for postponing settlement of these questions; a policy must be pronounced without delay.

Notwithstanding the words that fell from the lips of the two ministers of the Crown who spoke yesterday, I contend that in this as in any democratic country a parliamentary Opposition is necessary. We on this side intend to do our duty as the Constitution requires us to do it. We have lost our late chieftain; he has gone beyond the Great Divide, but he has left us his spirit, which still dominates our deliberations; he has left his teachings, which we still hear ringing in our ears, and we have his gospel embedded in our hearts. It is a gospel of tolerance, of justice, of equal rights and of democracy; its foundation is the human soul. That gospel must at the end triumph. It may happen that the men of our generation will not see the hour of the triumph, but the triumph will come, because that gospel appeals to the mind and to the heart of every free man, of every lover of democracy.

Mr. CHARLES SHEARD (South Toronto): Mr. Speaker, as a young and new member of this House, I wish in rising to continue the debate to pay my compliment to the mover and the seconder of the Address, and to congratulate the Government on selecting two returned soldiers for that onerous and responsible duty. Not only was I very much impressed by the magnificence of their effort and the manner in which they discharged that duty, but I felt proud that amongst our soldier men we had two who could, upon the floor of the House of Commons, so vigorously, so ably, so splendidly, and with such refinement, in moving and seconding the Address, present the feelings prevalent in this country. The more particularly am I pleased because in the person of the seconder of the Address I have an old professional colleague and friend, one whom I have watched and admired and respected ever since the first

day he entered as a student on the study of medicine.

Having said this, I am compelled also to remark upon the conditions under which to-day this House has met and the conditions under which we met last year. Then it was indeed a dark day of deep anxiety for the Empire. Men from this House of Commons went forth upon the streets of our capital with deep concern to study the bulletins outside the newspaper offices so as to know what was the next thing that had occurred, anxious as to what might be the outcome, some doubting, all hoping, yet restless, worried, I may say; and that feeling was but a mirror of the condition throughout the entire Dominion. Those who were not only concerned with Empire but deeply concerned and anxious regarding their loved ones who were in the thick of the fray—aye, night and day, without exaggerating, they were there, living through the very mental anxieties almost of the lost, watching through the night, wondering if the next telephone ring might not bring some sad news, as it has done to many members of this House, to tell them that their dear loved one had unfortunately paid the full price of his devotion. To-day we meet under far happier circumstances. We meet, glorying in the realization that the Allied armies of the world have achieved a great and wonderful victory. We are proud too as Canadians that, in all the fighting, in all the struggling, in all the disasters, in all the uncertainties, in all the trials, the Canadian nation has played a man's part; a part equal to the best in this great, titanic struggle.

To-day we meet to make, in all seriousness, with every impartiality, a plain, honest, retrospect of our progress up to this hour. The hon. member (Mr. Gauthier) said that this Government was elected as a win-the-war Government. That is undoubtedly true and I want to express here my conviction that never before since Confederation has there been a government of this Dominion confronted with such a herculean task, confronted with such multitudinous and Protean difficulties, and that has come out with such a magnificent record of achievement as has the present Government. And, Sir, I am convinced, notwithstanding all the criticism that that is the unanimous conviction of practically all the people of this country.

I desire to say a word or two in the way of kindly admonition and advice, so far as I am able, regarding the work left as the aftermath of this great war and which it is the legacy of this Government still to wrestle with. I conceive it to be the bounden duty of every member of this House of Commons to shed any light that he can upon the difficulties so admittedly numerous which confront us to-day. The great work immediately before us as a lawful and legitimate legacy of this great war is the work of reconstruction. I have listened with a great deal of attention to the arguments that have been put forward from both sides of the House as to the specific proposals upon the question of reconstruction. Whilst the needs and the difficulties have been dwelt upon, I must confess at the outset to some difficulty in laying hold of tangible suggestions, suggestions into which one can, so to speak, get his teeth, that he may know what we are going to do next. I purpose, in my humble way, to offer one or two suggestions.

Our first duty is to the returned soldier. I do not think there is in this House a single man who is not desirous of doing all he can and all the country will, in his judgment permit him to do for the returned soldier. When the soldier comes back, welcomed as he is by his friends, flushed with victory and pride, hailed by his fellow citizens and received everywhere with open arms, may we not, as we cheer him and grasp him by the hand, have something in the hand to help to make his homecoming beneficial to him? For that reason, the first suggestion that I am going to offer to this House is the wisdom of considering an increase in the pensions for the returned men. I believe I am correct in stating that at present the pension for total disability figures are somewhere around $600 for the private soldier, and that a difference is made between the pension for the private and that for the officer. At the outset, speaking for myself, I very seriously doubt the wisdom of creating any such distinction. Whilst I give every credit to the officer, yet I think the magnificent work, accomplished by all our troops has been accomplished equally by the private as by the officer, and the same is true in regard to their record of suffering and sacrifice.

I will face this question fairly and squarely by asking myself, what would I be satisfied with as a pension for total disability so far as the country reasonably can provide? I know there are difficulties in doing all we desire, but after all is $600 under present conditions a very liberal allowance for total disability? Conceive what total disability is! I saw a returned soldier in the city of Toronto who had lost both legs and his left arm. I presume that man

would not be ranked as totally disabled and would not receive the pension for that class. Yet what condition is that man in to face life? Would any man take $600 or $6,000 per year and go through life under those conditions? And yet we commence by awarding a pension that is based on total disability, and then our Pension Board figures the degree of disability according to their conception of total disability, and total disability is an uncertain quantity. Some one may say that figures cannot lie. Well, I do not wish to say they cannot, but I know that some figurers can, and I know that when you want to obliterate the truth or cover up a patent and obvious defect, the best way to do it is to take a percentage basis of calculation; and calculating a man's degree of disability on that basis you can start with a very serious handicap and figure it down almost to nothing. I think that is where there is danger of dissatisfaction creeping in almost without the knowledge, and certainly without the intention, of the Government, and it might be held up by some as something which was not creditable and which did not represent an honest endeavour to deal justly by the returned men. For that reason I want to offer the blunt suggestion of raising the total disability pension from the present rate up to $1,000 a year. Some may say: You will bankrupt the country. Not a bit of it; because the number of total disabilities will be comparatively small, and I am convinced that if my suggestion were adopted it would not add a very great amount to our Pension Bill. But it would be a great satisfaction in the future to know that an earnest, honest effort had been made to discharge as far as we legitimately could our duty and obligation to the men who have so gloriously distinguished Canada among the nations. And, Sir, no matter to what height the tidal wave of our generosity may rise we still remain a debtor to our men who by their service have given us that protection which Canada can never fully compensate for.

The next question I wish to deal with is the question of the aliens. The alien question is a very serious one in many of our cities. It is a very serious one in the city of Toronto. Aliens are divided into two classes: the enemy alien, and the ordinary alien. The enemy aliens—and there were, and still are, a number of them resident in the city of Toronto—are individuals, we can hardly call them men, who have come into our midst and fostered the ideas of the Teutons. They have done all they could to injure the loyal citizens of my city; they have connived in every intrigue that they could possibly conceive. They have houses in some cases, and have sheltered within them enemy aliens until they were discovered by the police. They have propagated that rotten system of espionage which has honeycombed the civilization of the whole of this continent. They have been forced into concentration camps, they have been surrounded by guards, they have been threatened with the pointed bayonet, and to-day they are waiting and anxiously hoping that now the war is over they may creep back again and mix with loyal, honest, and patriotic Canadians. I want to say with all the emphasis at my command that I believe I am speaking for the whole of this country when I say it, that the best policy to adopt regarding enemy aliens is to pack them all aboard the first outward-bound ship and see that they go back to the countries whence they came.

While on this question, I am forced to refer to the War-Time Elections Act. I am glad the Government intend to bring down a measure which purports to make permanent some of the provisions of that Act. I hope they will see to it that none of the enemy aliens at least, whether or not they have been implicated as active enemies, will be placed on the franchise rolls of this Dominion for the next twenty years. We can do without them. It was one of the master strokes of this Government, an act which carried with it the commendation of all loyal people, when they decided in the great effort of this war to proceed along the lines of the old British people who came here and laid the foundations of our institutions. I think we can sometimes take a lesson from the great republic to the south of us, and upon this question I agree with the policy of Roosevelt, who declared that as far as he was concerned, speaking as an American citizen, he believed that a country that was good enough to live in was good enough to fight for. I like that sentiment, and I say it is a good one for the people of the Dominion of Canada to adhere to.

But when we have disposed of the enemy alien, we have by no means disposed of the whole alien question. Besides enemy aliens, we have many other aliens in the city of Toronto. We have aliens who have been exempted from military service for international reasons, very largely, and have continued to do business and to take advantage of the situation. I had the privilege when the Military Service Act was

being enforced to sit upon one of the exemption tribunals in the city of Toronto, and I will give a concrete case to illustrate my meaning. A young man who was conducting a grocery store in the city of Toronto applied to that tribunal for exemption. His father was an old, feeble and infirm gentleman who had put all his capital into the business in the hope that the son would be permitted to carry it on. The son was of military age, and applied for exemption to the military tribunal on which I sat. We discussed his case very carefully and thoroughly, but we decided that, although his business might be ruined, he would be compelled to go to the Front. As a result of our decision the store was closed, and he had to make the best of the situation. Wishing to know the true facts of the case, I visited the locality, and I was astonished to find that an alien had rented the store next door and had started the same kind of business. I asked him when he came there, and he said: "Oh, I came just now; I know you, doctor; I have no vote, but I do not care about having no vote, if I have the business." There are plenty of men in the city of Toronto who have received, in a smaller or larger degree, an advantage exactly under those circumstances and conditions, until now I think I am within the mark when I say that a large proportion of the small businesses in the city of Toronto are controlled by aliens, I do not say by enemy aliens, but aliens, men who have come into this country within the last few years. Forty per cent of the small businesses and many of the larger businesses are conducted by these people. Incident to the war, their businesses and their profits have increased enormously. We were told by one of the ministers that about 50 per cent of the active young men of fighting age from Canada have gone into the service. Well, you can see what remains. It gives, and has given, these aliens a magnificent opportunity, and they have taken the fullest advantage of it. What I want to say to the Government, and what I would respectfully suggest for their consideration, is the conception of some proper and practical method of taxation, so that these business increases which ensue as a result directly of the war, could be investigated, and the profits that have accrued, shared in by the country; to the end that when the men return and apply to be re-established in civil life, they will not be confronted by aliens who control the business which they wish to enter, men perhaps who very imperfectly understand English or speak it not at all. It is disappointing for them to find that, on their return, after having fought for the liberties of the people, these liberties are being enjoyed by men who are not possessed of British ideals, and who are not in the true sense Canadians.

While on this subject, I wish to say a word or two regarding our immigration. I am not speaking particularly of immigration as administered since this Government came into power, but the immigration system under previous governments. They have, so to speak, permitted the doors to be opened, and everybody who likes can come into the country without question, hesitation, selection, or inspection. I saw not very long ago a statement in one of the Toronto newspapers that there had been a special arrangement by which Mennonites were admitted into the western provinces of Canada, exempt from military service. I do not believe the statement; I am sure it cannot be true, and I do not believe that any member of the present Government would approve of such a thing. Do we not know Mennonites? Are they not essentially German? Have they not German traditions, German literature, German legends? Are they to be permitted, after being hounded from the United States of America, to gain admission into Canada exempt from military service? No, no, hon. gentlemen, I do not believe the Government made any such arrangement, and I do not believe that the Government in the future would be justified in giving any privileges to anybody coming into Canada which the native born Canadian himself cannot enjoy.

I want to say a word or two regarding the Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department, and I make my statement particularly as the hon. gentleman on the other side (Mr. Gauthier) said he considered it was only an organization for the distribution of patronage. If at some time the hon. gentleman would come to the city of Toronto and would visit the Davisville hospital or the Hart House or any one of several institutions I can give him names of, he would not only see that it was not for the distribution of patronage, but that it was marvellous in its achievements, magnificent in its ideals, splendid in its efforts, and in the work it has set out to accomplish. I can show him there, where soldiers who had been disabled for two years in the English hospitals have come home, have been placed there under the directions and guidance of masseurs, trained calisthenic directors, and under treatment the paralyzed muscles and the palsied limb have been restored, and the cripple has gone out of the hospital astonished at the

splendid results which have been achieved under skilled and scientific direction. I can go further, and show you that in every department of civil life they have, from the ordinary private soldier, evolved experts for almost every line of work. We have stenographers, typewriters, skilled machinists, expert electricians, mechanics, wood carvers, all developed out of soldiers who knew nothing about these trades before. Our men have been more encouraged and more benefited by that work and the examples which they have daily seen developed before them than by any work for the benefit of the soldier that has been done, I venture to say, by any country in the civilized world.

I congratulate the Government upon stating that they had at last decided to establish a federal Department of Public Health. This is to me no new idea. I read a few years ago a most able speech by the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) which he made in this House, a speech which was commended very highly by the members of the medical profession throughout the whole country, a speech to which my attention has been drawn since I was elected to this House by no less than 20 medical men in the Dominion of Canada, irrespective of politics or party, and residing in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Therefore I am more than gratified to see that a Federal Department has been at last resolved upon, but, if I understood the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) correctly, he said he could not understand the use of it; he could not see what was the sense of sending a medical man of the federal government to interfere with a medical man of the Provincial Government. Well, if that is his conception of a Federal Health Department work, I am sure, (adopting the words of the last speaker), he will have to linger long upon the boughs of the apple tree to which he is attached before he will on that question be anywhere nearly ripened so as to fall to the ground in the amplitude of his maturity.

I can conceive at this juncture of no department of the public service which any Government could institute more replete with opportunities beneficial to all classes of the community than a public health service, rightly and justly administered.

Let me just, en passant, give you a few thoughts that have occurred to me with regard to that work. First and foremost, it is a great work in connection with the Department of Immigration. We have had in the past, rushing into this country, without restraint, inspection or restriction, the diseased, the mentally defective, the criminal, the unhappy, the uncertain, the infamous. They have come in here to do what? To work? Not a bit of it. They are absolutely incapable of working. They are not skilled workmen, they are not farmers —they never were—and they are not artisans. They have been in many cases chased from one large centre of the civilized world to another, until they have embarked en route to the new world. Probably they have tried the quarantine station at New York, they have been hunted from there, and then they creep around by the sea and come into Halifax. They have done that in the past. I am not blaming the present Government for that; that is a legacy that dates away back, to the time when people of this class were allowed to come into the country.

I have reason to know whereof I speak, for I have had occasion to act in many of their cases. Not only have we to care for them, but we have the legacy which they leave. We have the epileptic, we have the mentally defective. The defective engrafts his progeny upon Canada, breeds in his turn other mental defectives still worse because with every generation the trait intensifies, until, as a result of imperfect and unscientific inspection, we have innumerable cases occupying our asylums, our jails, our reformatories and our prisons, which have entailed upon the Dominion of Canada a cost of untold millions. All you have to do is to study the catalogues and indices of psychologists and those who have checked up the subject to see the percentage of mental defectives amongst our imported population. Tnat is one feature.

Another feature that I want to refer to has reference to the epidemics which occasionally come in this country. We have had an illustration of one in the ravages of the "flu." "Flu" has been very severe in some localities. I was speaking on the subject with a medical man, a Canadian officer, who was located at Gibraltar. As far as he knew, the first case of 'flu in the south of Spain came under his observation and he told me of the investigations that were being made by the French and British Governments when the epidemic broke out. While I admit that no department, under present conditions, is in the slightest degree to blame for the ravages throughout Europe and this continent of such an epidemic, I merely cite that illustration to strengthen the point I have to make regarding this matter. They knew how these epidemics spread and developed and

they were able in a large measure to take preventive means which, I am quite convinced, restricted the further ravages of this disease. Would it not be a profitable thing for the Federal Government to have a scientific bureau of investigation where trained men would be able and competent to investigate all these sporadic and serious infectious maladies so that we would be able to deal with the situation before the advent of the infection and thus prevent the wholesale and general infection which is apt to follow if these diseases are not thoroughly and scientifically understood.

There is another point directly in line with that to which I would draw attention. There is the control and supervision of all kinds of quack nostra for the cure of all the ills that flesh is heir to. The men who sell and manufacture them know little of medical science and they care less. All they know is that it pays to advertise and that their sales are proportionate to their advertisements. They have indices of every disease to which flesh is heir and they have a remedy for each. The poor unfortunate invalid as he struggles tottering to the grave is on the list of the charlatan who has a cure-all to sell him. Is it not time that the Government of this Dominion should control absolutely and rigidly the manufacture and sale of patent and proprietory medicines? Is it not time that they tested in the public laboratories of the country every curative that is to be put upon the public market? Is it not time that they left the manufacture of serums to the provincial authorities whose laboratories in the main are excellent for the development and manufacture of these products? Yet they do not.

I want to give to you, Mr. Speaker, by way of illustration, an incident which occurred under the last Government. I am informed that the laboratories of the Public Health Department of the province of Ontario were ready to make Salvarsan, or as it is known, 6-0-6, as a serum cure for syphilis. Before they could distribute that amongst the medical men of the country, they required a Federal license and the officers of the Provincial Board of Health of Ontario came to Ottawa for the purpose of obtaining that license. They were not permitted to get it. They were absolutely refused the license which would have permitted the Provincial Board of Health to manufacture and distribute that curative product. They were opposed by what we may call the interests, by certain men who were engaged in the introduction of other so-called cures for the same thing. Now, I contend that these things should not be and that there is a splendid opportunity for a Federal Department of Public Health which will regulate all that kind of thing. We have been agitating about this matter in the Province of Ontario, and the Provincial Government has appointed a commission for the purpose of investigating venereal disease. The one thing which makes that malady more terrible than it really is, is the hope existing in the mind of the infected that he can secure a cure in privacy, and that by entering his cloister with some patent nostrum and shutting the door he can regain his health, with the result that the last state of that man is worse than the first. Now if these things are true about the human organism, they are equally true about another branch of the animal kingdom, viz: cattle and other domestic animals. They are equally liable with ourselves to infection, and they are equally liable to conditions and troubles which can be cured by scientifically and wisely directed effort. So also in connection with the vegetable kingdom. There are infectious maladies in the case of fruit trees, and various other species and varieties of vegetation, with which it is the bounden duty of the Dominion to deal, and not the duty of any particular province. I am fully aware that health affairs ought to be left to the provincial governments very largely. True they are to a great extent a matter of locality, or are very often modified by local conditions, nevertheless, it is wise that we should co-operate to the fullest, and assist to the utmost of our power in the work, the pioneer work, which has been so splendidly done by the provinces in the domain of public health. But that is begging the question entirely: there is still a large field of activity awaiting the attention of a federal health department. Moreover there are legacies, directly traceable to this war, which the federal health department must needs deal with. There are cases of tuberculosis, there may be cases of venereal disease, there are cases of mental aberration, there are cases of shell shock, there are cases of chronic nervous maladies which will be with us for ten or fifteen years to come, the treatment of which is not a burden belonging to any particular province but should rest upon the shoulders of the Federal Government representing the country as a whole, and should be scientifically and intelligently dealt with. I will not weary you any more by dwelling upon what I might narrate upon this line

I am leading up to the point which I want to impress upon you, that if we are going to have active, energetic, and proper service from this department, which the country needs, we must have a medical mind at the head of it. There is in its administration, as much technicality, as much minute detail, as much complexity as there is in the conduct of the Department of Justice; and yet would any member of this House entertain for a second the thought that a doctor, or a layman could administer, as Minister of Justice, that legal department with any degree of common sense or satisfaction. And yet the Minister of Justice has to deal with man-made laws, whereas in the Department of Public Health the administrator is confronted with the great complex and obscure laws of nature, which it requires long training to apprehend and even then they cannot be understood to the fullest degree. These laws can only be realized by a study in the greatest laboratory of all, in the hospital ward, where we see the varied phases through which the sick are passing, and where we are able, with gentleness and kindness, to make every allowance as we approach with a keen desire to help those cases which command our patience, our sympathy, and our regard. It is for that reason that I urge upon the Government to begin right, to place at the head of the Health Department some man who will command the respect of the whole of this Dominion; a man who is skilled and expert in medical knowledge, so that he can administer that department with the same efficiency and the same comprehension as is displayed in the administration of the Department of Justice. Some hon. gentlemen may say: You are extravagant in your ideas for the period of curtailment and economy which has been suggested by the ministers of the Crown. For my part, I am not altogether convinced that economy is the wisest policy at this juncture. It all depends of course on how we practise economy. The cheapest thing is not always the best, it may be cheap and yet very dear in the long run.

I was somewhat impressed with the speech of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), and I am sorry he is not in the Chamber at present because I wish to say one or two things about him. First of all, the hon. minister said he was not a pessimist. Well, it is hard for me to believe that he is an optimist, and in his speech he drew rather a sombre picture of the future conditions in this Dominion, as to what we were to do for revenue to keep going. To my mind he mixed up his accounts; I would like to have a professional audit of the statements from a financial standpoint. The hon. minister incorporated the expenditures for capital and permanent purposes with current expenditures, as I understood him, and forecasted an outlay something like $110,000,000 per annum. This is the estimate he gave us of the sum which would have to be raised. There was to be a Government building in Montreal, a Government building in Toronto, and I think he said a Government building in Calgary—these, amongst other things, were to be the subjects of outlay. I do not suppose the Government intends to go on erecting great public buildings annually, and I think therefore there was probably an over anxiety on his part in considering the expenditures incidental to the present year. I have great confidence in this Dominion, as we progress in our national development. I have great confidence in our resources, in the agricultural richness of Canada, in its mineral and timber wealth, in the value of its inland seas and fisheries; and I believe that if we wisely direct the development of our resources and see that they are not wasted, we need have no apprehension or anxiety regarding our ability to provide for all that is needed, or for all that the country imperatively desires. At the same time I am not in favour of exempting the great interests from the Business Tax. I know it is very popular to tax incomes and to say: "Let the man who has the money and the income take the taxes. Everybody says: there are few who have it, and therefore if we tax the few we will probably have less complaint from the great majority." But let me ask you as a professional man—and you know that doctors never make any money, they are one class of the community that work night and day and die poor—let me ask you who have been the makers of the great fortunes realized ever since the commencement of this war. I met a man the other day who had made, since the beginning of the war, no less than two and one-half million dollars. There are men who are engaged in certain industrial works to whom war-time conditions brought greatly increased trade. The Government has in the past taxed them, and I hope it will continue to do so even in peace times, because their profits were unduly and excessively large. Let us adopt a broad and equitable policy, so that every man will pay his share. I like a man who will always do his part, who will lift his share of the load, who will pay his share of the taxes,

who will carry his burden in common with the rest of us, so that we can all pull together with confidence up the slope, and in due course land the load on the top of the hill.

Now, I want to say a word with regard to the Civil Service Commission. Last session on the floor of this House I supported the Civil Service Commission; I thought that there were great possibilities for good in it. I have not changed my mind; I am still going to support the continuance of that commission. I do not say that it is perfect. I do not say that we cannot make improvements in it. I do not say that it always does the wise thing. There are certain things I want to know. First, I propose, if some one else does not do it, to put a question on the Order Paper with a view to finding out how many appointments made under the Civil Service Commission since it was established were given to returned soldiers. I want to see how in the total sum the returned soldier figures, because I have known instances where he did not get a good show.

I am an old examiner. I have been at the business for thirty years, and I know all the tricks of the trade. One time I had to do with an appointment in Toronto where there were tremendous crowds and very strong influence on both sides, and the appointee had to be a lady, so you can guess what difficulties we were in. The matter should have been dealt with by the municipal council, but the municipal council balked when they saw the beautiful faces and winning ways of the ladies' delegations; so finally, after shifting it from one committee to another, they landed it on my shoulders and said: Let him do the work. Then the deputations began to come before me, and I must confess that several of the recommendees left not much room for choice among them. They all appeared to have splendid qualifications, and I spent some time and many weary hours of thought in studying out what kind of problem I should put up to get the one that pleased me best. I am not a card player, but I understand that the card players say: When in doubt, play trumps. Similarly, when you do not know which side to please, please yourself. That, I think, is a good policy, and it is my policy. Well, in this case I had my own ideas. Some sections of the press were recommending one person and other sections were recommending another, and I said, I will hold an examination and decide the question on its merits. And then the examination proved exactly to go my way; I appointed the one whom I desired to appoint, and everybody was satisfied that the best girl won. I am not saying that the best did not win, nor am I saying that this is what always happens with the Civil Service Commission. But I will give you another illustration.

In London a student who was to be examined at the College of Surgeons had been a special pupil of one of the examiners, and this student was excessively stupid. This professor said to the student: "James, I want you to study the symptoms and pathology of cirrhosis of the liver. Do not bother with anything else, but

5 p.m.

study that so that you can say it backwards and frontwards until you know it thoroughly." The pupil agreed to do this. In the College of Surgeons in London the examiners work in pairs; one man asks the question and the other puts down the mark. So when this candidate was called in the examiner who had been teaching him said to his co-examiner: "I will ask the question now, if you do not mind, and you can mark him." So he was trotted in and the first question he was asked was: "Now, sir, just tell me the symptoms and pathology of cirrhosis of the liver." Of course, he excelled himself in the readiness of his answer. He did so well that he completed the whole thing before the time limit, and the examiner scratched his head, and, assured that if he asked the candidate anything else he would prove his ignorance, said: "You have done that so well, would you please repeat it?" So I say that examinations are not always a real test of a man's fitness, and when you come to test by examination a man who is already qualified for a technical position you are apt to get just where you do not want to get.

Apropos of this, I want to read a letter which illustrates exactly the question that I am discussing. A Canadian veterinarian of considerable ability who had seen service in Egypt, the Mediterranean, France, Belgium and Britain, who had qualified in the Ontario Veterinary College and had been four years in the war, was desirous, now that he had come home, of carrying on the work that he had given up when he went to the front. He came to me and spoke about applying for a position in the Government. I said: "I have nothing to do with it; you had better write to that Civil Service Commission." I do not know whether there is a place in the Government service at this time for a veterinarian, but this is the answer he got from Dr. Roche—this to the returned soldier, to the experi-

enced veterinarian who had seen four years' active service overseas:—

I have yours of the 5th and am enclosing you a temporary position form, which kindly fill out and return to the Commission, so that we may have your name on file in the event of the Agriculture Department placing a requisition before the Civil Service Commission for additional help in your line.

He did not see that that was going to get him anywhere, so he wrote again, this time to the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission. Apparently more consideration was given to his application this time and a fuller letter was formulated. The next letter he received from the Commission was as follows—remember, this is a case of a returned soldier, a professional man:—

With reference to your application for employment in the Civil Service of Canada, I would say that the work in which you are interested or for which you appear to be qualified, comes under "Special or Technical Positions," usually thrown open to competition and for which an examination is sometimes necessary.

Evidently they have not any fixed rule in the matter. (Reading):—

As a rule such vacancies are not of frequent occurrence, but when they do occur and are not filled by promotion, an advertisement thereof appears in the Canada Gazette. In order that you may receive copies of these notices, your name has been placed on our mailing list.

Well, I think I could have given him my copy of the Canada Gazette and not lost a great deal. However, I do not wish to criticise too severely the Civil Service Commission. They made two splendid appointments of considerable importance in Toronto. They appointed a postmaster and a deputy postmaster in the city of Toronto, and I do not believe there have been two appointments made by any Government since Confederation which have, to so large an extent, received the approval of the people, one and all. They took as their appointees in those particular instances men who had devoted their whole lives to the service. The man who was made postmaster was the former deputy postmaster who had grown up in the service, who knew every wrinkle in the whole office, who knew the very men that were employed there. Even although I was not consulted in regard to the appointment and did not know who the appointee was until after he got the job, I am glad that he was made postmaster. I congratulate the Civil Service Commission and the Postmaster General of this Dominion on making that appointment, because I know that almost irrestible efforts and pressure were exerted by certain political parties in order that that appointment should not be made. Not only was the postmaster appointed in that way, but as deputy postmaster they appointed a man from the ranks, a man who had grown up in the service, a man who had a magnificent and perfect record behind him, a man who thought that by devotion to the service of this country in a civil capacity, he would be justly dealt with and would receive advantages and emoluments which would be worth while. I wish, on the floor of this House, to offer my testimony and express my satisfaction in regard to those two appointments, to encourage the Civil Service Commission and also the ministers by showing them that when they are making good appointments, such appointments will not be forgotten. There is another thing I desire to add to this. A few days before I left Toronto I saw the newly appointed postmaster, and while I was congratulating him upon his work, I incidentally said, "Well, how is the salary now? Is it the same as before the war?" I really do not know what the salary is. "Why," he said, "the salary is the same as it has been for twenty years, but the work and the business have increased over a hundred fold." I have had some experience in work and in getting good service, and I think the poorest policy one can adopt is to underpay officials that have responsible duties to perform. While I am speaking about the post office in the city of Toronto and the whole postal service, I want to say that the postmen are scandalously underpaid in the cities—I do not know anything about outside. I say they are scandalously underpaid, because they cannot live on the pay they get.

Mr. EDWARDS: It is 100 per cent worse in the country.

Mr. SHEARD: I heard the discussion on the floor of this House last year in reference to the rural mail carriers. I heard it stated by hon. members that contracts were actually let at prices that would not pay for the horse feed. I believe that was, to a large extent, true. It ought not to be so. You will never get satisfactory service unless you pay a reasonable fee for it. It is all very well to say: Well, they get so many hundred dollars a year. In all this discussion of labour, somehow or another, people do not appear to have grasped the cardinal thought of the purchasing price of a dollar. A man's pay must be proportionate to the purchasing price of a dollar. What is the use of giving a man $950 a year as a postman in the city of Toronto, when that sum will not pay for his house rent, clothes and fuel—those three essentials? You cannot expect him to be

satisfied. We had serious trouble last year. The postmen made representations, so they told me, time and time again, and they did not get any satisfactory answer, so they went on strike. We came down here in the interest of the city to try to get the Government to consider their case. The Government did consider their case; they went into it very thoroughly and exhaustively. I had hoped that they had kindly and generous hearts in the Council, but unfortunately when the returns came in, we were disappointed to find that the Government had given an increase which I think was given with a very mean and stinting hand. I am convinced that it would be good policy to go through the whole Civil Service administration from top to bottom. Let there be a portion of the work of reconstruction applied to it. Let us weed out the useless rot; let us take out the weed crops; let us take out the old decayed roots from the structure, and let us revitalize that which is retained and give strength and character to the Service by paying a decent, generous, liberal wage to the men who have to assume the responsibilities of carrying on the government and administering the work which is, after all, for the benefit of the people. Let us in that way make them satisfied in the knowledge that when they devote their talents, time, energy and years to public trust in the public service, they are serving an honest and good Administration, and will not have to spend their declining days in a workhouse or a home. That is the policy which I would suggest to the Government if I were touching on the Civil Service question.

Unless we can use our public moneys in a proper manner, we may find that we are suffering from the troubles referred to by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), when he spoke of people who lived beyond their incomes, and some governments have in the past been very wasteful. I was impressed by the speech made by the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) last year, when he referred, speaking in connection with the Canadian Northern railway, to the tremendous, extravagant expenditures which were made to liquidate the liabilities which had been manufactured by Mackenzie and Mann. Let us exercise prudence, forethought and foresight. Let us economize by not assuming burdens that are unnecessary and that will undoubtedly be unprofitable. Let us economize so as to give what we all desire, namely, assistance to the soldier in every way. Let us rise and give him our place if need be. Let him understand that the country is not unmindful of his great sacrifices. We are apt to lose sight of the prospect of capitalizing the greatest asset we have from this great war, that is the patriotism and devotion to service which those men who went overseas, evince. They went without compulsion; they went voluntarily; they suffered, as we know; they come back imbued with the same love of country, if not more so, as they had before they went. They come back sure of their belief that Canada is of all countries the best place to live in, and we want by generous and kindly treatment to develop in that particular an asset of value in them, to make them emissaries and missionaries in every hamlet and town so that they may extol the great advantages of this vast country which belongs to us, the country we live in, the country we love.

Those of us who have had their sons and blood at the front know what I mean, when as I look back upon the war I refer to it as those four long years of hellish night, and we are apt to ask now of our watchmen upon the tower, "Watchmen, what of the night?" The answer comes back: if we have confidence, the night is not so black as it was; there are streaks on the horizon's verge; there is mist in the valley, the sun is rising, there is dawning upon this country and upon this people a new day, a day of peace, prosperity and happiness. Let us all join together with a united effort, without regard to party politics and their narrow divisions, and hand in hand, as one broad-minded, generous, devoted, energetic and hard-working people pray God to grant that in the new day now dawning Canada may be blessed above and beyond all nations, that glorious Canada may rise Phœnix-like from the fire of this great war, triumphant as our boys have been triumphant in Europe, and let us all as Canadians say, God be thanked.

Mr. AIME MIVILLE DECHENE (Montmagny) (translation): Mr. Speaker, among the hon. gentlemen who have paid a tribute to the memory of our beloved chieftain (Sir Wilfrid Laurier), few perhaps have suffered as deep a loss as we younger members of the House.

From our very youth we had grown accustomed to admire the noble and grand figure of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and to follow the advice he was wont to give our seniors; we had made up our minds to do as much, when our turn came, but unfortunately the fatal hour has struck; he has passed away and bid adieu to this world where

he played such a glorious role and we, the young members, are left alone to steer the course so well marked out by him, with those great principles of harmony, humanity, union and tolerance. We shall certainly be called upon to put those great principles into practice, and there will be no more striking tribute paid to his memory by the younger members than their faithful adherence to the virtues preached by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. We shall endeavour to follow in his footsteps by promoting the welfare of the country and helping our fellow-citizens, no matter what their language or their race, and to make of Canada a country worthy of the Twentieth Century.

Let us set to work, and to satisfy him of our sincerity let us remain faithful to duty to the very end; let us walk in his footsteps and history will tell that the broad-mindedness of the younger generation was worthy of the broad-mindedness of their beloved leader.

It is now my duty to tender to the mover and seconder of the Address to our beloved Sovereign my warmest congratulations for the manner in which they have performed their task. They have departed from the beaten track of their predecessors and shown real independence of thought.

They have shown themselves the fearless and gallant soldiers that they are. They are entitled to our congratulations and we, the younger members of this side of the House, are happy to express to the younger members on the opposite benches our appreciation of their courage and their eloquence.

Let us hope that in the future they will also walk in the footsteps of our great leader who has passed away; that their minds and hearts will be constantly attentive to the promotion of the welfare of this country and let me assure them that in following this straight and narrow road they will have us with them.

From the very beginning of this session, Sir, we have shown that we were willing to follow in the wake of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. We have accepted with enthusiasm the lead of our present chief and shall endeavour to prove to him that we are the worthy sons of that great patriot, Sir Wilfrid Laurier; we will follow him as thoroughly, as frankly and as fully as our English-speaking friends, for upward of thirty years, followed our great Chieftain who has passed away; we will render him the homage that he, in company with his English-speaking associates, tendered to our own leader by remaining with him through thick and thin. He can count on the younger members as well as on their elders; these last, moreover, have already shown their willingness to do his bidding.

After listening to the speeches delivered so far I have wondered—in company with many others—whether all the speakers were not quite of one mind in demonstrating that the present Government often lacked decision in the decisions it was called upon to make. It seems rather impossible to find a decision which is lacking in decision, but really we have had ministers tell us that they have given the greatest care and attention to our national problems, that they would give more care than ever to the problems brought about by the war. But, Mr. Speaker, during the present session we shall be called upon to work out the difficulties of re-establishment and to decide in what way we can help our returned soldiers to resume their status in civil life. The hon. ministers talked a great deal, for hours at a stretch, to tell us that they had accomplished a lot; unfortunately, they did not tell us what they intended to do later on.

We have not even learned from the hon. Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) how many acres had been granted to our returned soldiers; nor how many veterans had applied with the intention of settling on this wonderful land that was promised them. It is all very fine to promise the soldier land, to make a farmer out of him; but, Sir, the offer is conditional: the condition is that the soldier pay full value for what he gets; he will have to pay, in common with all other farmers, the biggest part of the taxes levied after his return. If my information is correct, the Government lends him, to start with, a few thousand dollars, payable in fifteen or twenty years; but the Government, of course, has the prudence to take, as security, all that the soldier-farmer has, so that even he will be unable to get under way immediately. Everything will be mortgaged. And that is their idea of re-establishment.

Have you ever considered, Sir, what it would cost the country if only one-half our returned soldiers asked the Government for the $7,500 it is proposed to lend them? Did you ever consider that the country would have to pay out, a few months hence, between $1,500,000,000 and $2,000,000,000?

At the time of the last Victory Loan the hon. Minister of Finance had many misgivings about its success; but he may feel sure that when he comes again before the country to ask for such fabulous sums he will meet with complete failure because he

will be unable to grant to the most exacting any exemption from customs duties such as the people of this country are clamouring for.

He won't perhaps be able to pass Orders in Council exempting from taxation the tractors required by the Western farmers for their ploughs or to enable the farmers of the great provinces which produce potatoes to export them to the United States; without which expedients the loan would have proven a failure in those provinces. It is all very fine for the Minister to have succeeded in financing his loan by such means; but when the question will be to borrow some hundred million dollars for rounding up the budget and the other hundred millions to be loaned to soldiers for buying land and stock and farming implements, do you think, Sir, that the country will still be able to advance so much money? If the Government intends giving effect to this programme of Soldier Settlement—in the West alone, I suppose—it will require at least half a billion, and we may very well ask ourselves if the financiers, if the agricultural classes will be able to supply these funds; with this mind, and in an attempt to shift the burden, the Government invited all the provincial premiers to a conference. They made a decision without deciding anything. This conference took place in Ottawa; it lasted for a few days. The papers informed us that a few of the great premiers had made formidable suggestions, that they were going to get the Government out of the mess it was in. We have as yet been unable to find out just what these suggestions were, or whether the Government saw fit to make use of them, for the reason that we have still to witness any result of this conference. The two hon. ministers whose speeches preceded ours in this debate, told us nothing about it. I suppose that the hon. Prime Minister of Ontario, as well as his hon. colleague from Quebec, offered lands for Soldiers Settlement, too. Mr. Speaker, can you see the position the returned soldier would be in if the Ontario or the Quebec Government gave him land to settle on? Can you see these men who for the last four years, in some cases only three years, have had to dig themselves a hole in the soil of Flanders for shelter against enemy fire, coming back to this country, where, thanks to the present Government, we'll change the spade for an axe and make our soldier into a pioneer; we'll put him into the forest where, on his arrival, his first care will be to throw up some kind of a shack to live in while he is waiting to spread out more and hoping that, after two years or so, he will be able to afford a little stable for his horse and a cow, yes, after two years! Isn't this, Sir, the acme of re-establishment. The Government is full of divine kindness towards the soldiers.

Were not the provinces consulted, Mr. Speaker, as to what they could do to accommodate returned soldiers at home, and if both these provinces—I am speaking of these two only—adopt the idea of giving land to the soldiers, the hero will shoulder an axe, exclaiming: "What a kind Providence we have in this Government."

But that was a neat trick, to have the provincial governments decide what was to be done for the soldier. Unfortunately, here in the east, we have no cleared land; so, the soldier will have to hie himself to the west. In the West, we hear, there are immense stretches of land held for years by certain companies for speculative purposes. We hear a great deal of talk about the generous idea of expropriating these holdings and putting them into the hands of the soldiers. But, Sir, isn't this merely a move to prepare public opinion for the expropriation of lands in the hands of notorious speculators whose gigantic shadow sometimes hovers over the Government. This shadow would leave the great railways and go farther north, towards Lesser Slave Lake, towards Bear Lake, I believe it is, so as to work other lands, not to work the surface—the surface is too remote to be worked in the ordinary way—but to work what is below the surface; and then perhaps we'll need a Minister of Public Health in this district, in accord with the wishes of my hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Sheard) so as keep an eye on the cases, not of shell-shock, but of shell-game, that would begin to develop on another scale.

I have just alluded to a word of my hon. friend from Toronto. There are likely many others that I should single out for attention.

In his opening remarks he used an expression so striking that I wish to repeat it here: he said that once more the Government had, during the present war, "played a man's part." I would have liked him to add just what the Government's part has been; probably that of a stripling and not that of a man. He was seeking to protect the Government which claims to have done so much for the soldiers. The morale of the soldier on the firing-line must be excellent, but it must be backed by the morale of those who remain behind at home. Evidently, if we are to judge the morale of

our troops at the front by the morale of those who stayed at home, those who supported the man behind the gun by supplying him with all he needed, this morale must needs have been excellent, for the hon. member from Toronto told us a moment ago that he had come across one of our greatest citizens, who, during these four years had amassed $2,500,000. There you have an excellent morale, the morale which supported the Government so as to uphold the morale of the man in the front trenches.

The hon. member also said that the Government had frequently to face herculean tasks. They have had to move the rock of Gibraltar out of the way in order to get anything done in the country.

Certain papers have spoken of a certain rock that certain people want to move, not out of the way, but into one of the important harbours of New Brunswick.

Some ministers refused to pass the contract; then, it seems, the present minister took a hand; we have got the rock as a wharf, the thing is done; and there you have a herculean task; the people pay.

Now, Sir, the hon. member said moreover that the development of this country does not require alien enemy hands; but I wonder where we are going to look for our immigrants if we turn away from the countries whose people we have been wont to consider as our enemies, but whom President Wilson asks us to welcome as our brethren. If we are to put into practice those great principles which are being applied to-day at the Peace Conference, these men, stranded in a ruined country, will want to move to some other country. Therefore if we continue to look upon them as enemies, then ours will be a closed country where only those already within our borders can prosper.

The speech from the Throne tells us that we must recruit immigrants. We shall get them from Europe or from the United States. We must not forget that we shall have to close our doors to certain American citizens whom we consider alien enemies. We can turn to England who has lost a great many of her sons at the front. Undoubtedly we shall witness no great flow of immigrants from Great Britain. There are so few Belgians left in Belgium that those who remain will not care to come to our shores. As regards Germany, her people would perhaps make dangerous citizens. France has never been much given to emigration. Italy might furnish a few; but Italy is entering upon a period

of self-development and she will need all her people. Where, then, are we to look for the immigrants mentioned in the speech from the Throne, the immigrants that the Government is after? This is a problem that demands very serious consideration and the hon. ministers in their indecision will either have to decide for once, or give the matter up.

Mr. Speaker, there is something else about our Government which must be brought to your notice; something which is a direct result of their indecision. When a man is at a loss where to turn he tries to get somebody else to decide for him and very often in so doing he has to observe certain niceties; the gentlemen who are at the head of affairs in this country, who make up the Government which exists theoretically if not actually, have found this to be the best means of governing Canada.

We have a great many commissions which exist for the sole purpose of being commissions—naturally, they can be nothing else—and commissioners are appointed so that they may draw commissioners' salaries. A great many of these commissions have shown, so far, that their usefulness went no further. There are no more political parties; everybody is a Whig or a Tory; we all belong to the same party; it is a pity, however, that nearly all the commissioners are Tories. No party spirit there. The Government is merely protecting itself.

Mr. Speaker, no doubt you will allow me to ask you a question: how comes it that in several of these commissions appointed for the promotion of Canadian trade, for the public administration of the State's resources, there are so few representatives of the different provinces?

There is the Canadian Northern Commission. I must admit that it no longer represents the Canadian Northern; but that it has become the Canadian National Railways Commission. The Government could not be so unmindful of the very great services rendered it by this railroad as to forget them in such easy fashion, and so as to have them ever present to the memory and constantly before it's paternal gaze, the Government could do no better than to give to this commission which administers these railroads as nearly as possible the same initials as those which still stand for this notorious railway. Hence the commission was styled C. N. R., or Canadian Northern railway. These things are all one; the same commission administers for others.

The thought was sublime; nothing better could be found.

There is another commission which has just been appointed. The supreme commissioner, the grand commissioner, is the man of petty measures. I do not mean to say that the measures he submits are not broad-minded; no, far from it!—in fact, I wish to say just the opposite: they are very broad. There was talk last session of bringing everything under the same system of measurement; of reducing everything to a general standard. There was to be a standard in this country for bags of cement; another for liquids, still another for wood. Well, Sir, this year we are introduced to another standard which had not been discovered last year. I refer to the standard measure for electricity and we have—this is likely to provoke laughter—we already have on the Order Paper of Parliament a certain thing which is styled about like this: "An act respecting the Units of Electrical Measure." Everything must be measured—the better to tax it later, I suppose. That is self evident.

If we want to tax properly later on, we must begin by knowing just what we have on hand. Well, when the electrical unit has been measured, I wonder just what tax will be levied on it? It is possible that it will suffer no taxation, for it is not the common people, it is not the helpless ones who own the unit; they pay for the unit, but it is the wealthy capitalists who sell electricity by the unit—an irresponsible way of not giving us what we are entitled to—they glance at all these little figures and then say: "Here's the amount of your bill." Exactly like the Government. Just like the hon. Minister of Public Works who was saying a moment ago: it's going to take a heap of money to run the railroads; here's what you owe; fork over.

Mr. Speaker, could you tell me, or some member of the Government in your stead and through you—for it seems that we must speak through the Chairman—just what boon the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is going to bring back to us when he returns with the remainder of the Government which is on the other side of the ocean? No doubt we shall learn that the Minister of Trade and Commerce has become enamoured of the metric system and that, next year, once electric units have been measured, he will impose the metric system on us so as to sell to the French things that he would not try to have them buy from us.

Isn't it surprising, Mr. Speaker, to see a Trade Commission leave for Europe so as to look after the commercial interests of this country while the Minister of Public Works was telling us yesterday that he was quite willing to do something for trade but that the commerce of this country should first of all take care of itself.

This Trade Commission, presided over by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce himself, intends visiting France and Belgium, finding out from these people what they need from us, and informing us what we can supply them with. But, Sir, to reach an agreement, in a matter of business, it is necessary to speak both languages; and haven't you wondered why, at least, in this matter, one of our French-Canadian leaders of industry in the province of Quebec was not chosen to represent the French people of this country, so as to allow the province of Quebec, a part of Ontario, even a part of New Brunswick, where French is spoken, the privilege of being represented on that commission by someone who could talk to the folks of these countries in their own language, who understands their way of doing business, and could thus have given an impetus to trade with France and Belgium for the period of reconstruction? Well, Sir, those who were sent can speak nothing but English. And how do you expect them to reach an understanding when they are concerned with systems of measurement with which our English speaking fellow citizens are more or less acquainted not having had to study them as we have?

Is this, Sir, a deliberate slight to those of our inhabitants who speak French exclusively and who go to make up three out of the seven millions of our population; is that the way to strike after the prosperity of our country and obtain for us the share we are entitled to in the trade of those foreign countries when it comes to supplying their needs for reconstruction and for building over their ruins?

Well, Mr. Speaker, I maintain that this is another instance where the Government lacked foresight and that those who represent it on that commission are there for the sole purpose of concealing responsibilities behind which the Government itself is trying to hide.

Mr. Speaker, while I am on this subject of overseas affairs you will doubtless, permit me to take exception to the words of the hon. gentleman who is our Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) yesterday when he said, with a good deal of emphasis, that without a doubt we would receive a war indemnity to bolster up our finances and enable him, our grand treasurer, to

meet his liabilities. That, Sir, was the last thing that I expected to hear on the floor of this House from the lips of the hon. treasurer of this country.

If the newspapers, if the Associated Press, if the Canadian Press, supported by the Government, if the correspondents whom the right hon. Prime Minister brought with him to Europe so as to keep us informed back here, if these people have really told us the truth about what is happening at the Peace Conference about what is happening in England, we must come to the conclusion that there will be no war indemnity unless it be, perhaps, the indemnity foretold by the official correspondent of the Canadian Press when he wrote that to fill the coffers of our hon. treasurer we would receive—Greenland and its fields of ice.

Well, Sir, let Denmark keep Greenland; we need no ice in this country save perhaps, to cool—oh, not altogether—to cool off the zeal of certain financiers who are constanly dancing attendance on the treasurer,—attracted by his handsome eyes, no doubt—maybe, by something else besides.

Sir, this brings me to another feature of the Government's policy. The hon. member from Toronto told us a moment ago that he had seen people make millions out of politics; others took advantage of the wholesale exemptions granted by our hon. Minister of Finance so as to entice them, in a roundabout way to loosen their purse strings; still others turn to their advantage the tariff barrier which protects their industries; but the common people have had nothing at all.

If, Sir, we wanted to delve deeper into this feature of our politics we would find, not a policy of partisanship—because the hon. minister has told us that such a thing does not exist—but, at least a policy of favouritism. Why was it, Mr. Speaker, that the Government took such pains to have the wealthy citizen, the man with bulging pockets, subscribe for the treasury bonds which were already paying a handsome dividend, and were so attractive that they persuaded everyone to subscribe, that had the whole country as security, and were supported by all our natural resources—which to-day we boast of as immense, as boundless--why was that little stamp affixed which exempted these bonds from taxation, if not to encourage the big financier to stuff his pockets with them? Because the plain people of this country, the toiler, the man behind the plough, because, Sir, the petty clerk behind the counter, have not been accustomed to buying bonds, because they do not always have a few cents to invest; but they knew, moreover, that our mighty business organizations, our high financiers who are well known to the Government—we are aware of that—would appreciate the value of a bond which could be tax-exempt for fifteen or twenty years and would subscribe to the limit so as to shelter their fortunes from the income tax while we, the plain people, while the farmer behind his plough, the housewife in her home, the school teacher in her class-room, the clerk in the store, the street labourer—who is despised in certain quarters—would continue to sweat taxes all of the time.

And the soldier back from the front who will work hard for his salary; when this, added to his pension, reaches $1,200, he will have to pay an income tax on all revenue exceeding $1,000. The returned soldier, I repeat, will have to bear a share of the taxes while those who stayed at home, making munitions and filling their pockets continue to rush into the money markets of our country to sweep into their vaults all the tax-exempt Victory bonds they can gather so as to enjoy their income in all security. The plain people are the ones who will pay; and the soldier will be called upon once more to bear his share. This man won the fight; he lived through filth and misery in the trenches; he is disabled for the rest of his life; and, Sir, once he has returned to this country and has put away his rifle he will have to get into harness with the rest of us poor people, us plain people, so as to ensure the success of future loans and especially to help pay the billions of taxes that the Government will exact from the people of this country.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. A. MIVILLE DECHENE (Resuming): Mr. Speaker, I was just saying, when you announced the hour of six, that the policy of the present Government is a policy of favouritism, I mean a policy which favours the vested interests and makes light of the wishes of the common people. The vested interests were given tax-exempt treasury bonds so that they could invest their tremendous fortunes to good advantage. Very few among the working class, very few among the farming class were able to invest a lot of money in these bonds and profit by this exemption. The income tax levied by the Government, and which was increased nearly one-third last year is borne almost exclusively, therefor, by those who are pos-

sessed of lesser fortunes and those who earn their livelihood by laborious toil. Since these wealthy gentry, these millionaires—and the Government has quite a few of them among its friends—are safe from this tax, are immune from paying this part of their income tax, the others will necessarily have to furnish the funds required by the country both for the expense of government from day to day and for the payments of interest and principal on our tremendous debt.

However, Mr. Speaker, it is not only—what a sorry admission to make on the floor of this House—it is not only those who work and who worked all during the war in this country, who will have to bear the burden of these taxes. Is it not unfortunate, Sir, that our returned heroes themselves will have to undertake a large share of these payments if they wish to enjoy certain privileges that the Government offers them and accept the loan of $7,500 that will be made them to set them up on a farm.

Have you ever figured out what enormous sums they will have to pay back in the course of the next 25, 30 or 40 years? We, and they, in common will have to pay not only the debts accumulated through the war, but they will also have to pay back the amount they borrow; and we shall all see ourselves forced to pay a national debt of nearly four billion dollars; this means, Sir, that those who won the war, those who shed their blood, will be worse off than if they had lost the war.

The big interests have been promised, so as to enable them to meet their liabilities, that the tariff, that barrier which prevents imported articles from competing with their products, would be strengthened. It is fitting that customs duties should provide enough revenue to permit the Government to honourably discharge its obligations; but these tariff duties must not be made into an impassable wall which altogether shuts out imports.

I remember one of the famous speeches of Mr. Thiers before the National Assembly of France, after the great defeat of 1870. The delegates to the National Assembly had been asked to find the necessary revenue for paying off the five billion francs demanded as an indemnity and to each and every proposition M. Thiers made answer: "But is this article you want to tax able to support even a penny tax without putting a stop to imports?"

We must always keep in mind when levying customs duties the fact that these should not put a stop to imports. M. Thiers' advice was to make each and every article pay to the limit of its capacity, but never to lose sight of the fact that if you shut out imports you kill the goose that lays the golden eggs. And this will be the inevitable result if the tariff is made still higher. If customs duties are increased merely to please a few big manufacturers imports will cease and instead of enjoying larger revenue we will be faced with a growing deficit.

Several of those who spoke before me talked of lowering the tariff, especially to the advantage of the agricultural class. We on this side of the House, Sir, are in favour of tariff rates which will allow the agricultural class to increase production and get some return for their efforts. But we are in favour of this reduction in rates, Mr. Speaker, merely because it pleases a few people. We advocate these reductions because we know, we have proof, that the wealth of the farming community, the wealth of the plain people is the only real wealth on which the country can rely in time of stress. What made France so strong, Mr. Speaker, during the war just passed? To what, in fact, do we owe our own strength, if not to the wealth of the people themselves?

It is not the millionaires, it is not the magnates of big business who are the backbone of the country; for, when a crisis comes, they stop, they stow their millions of dollars away somewhere and the country can't touch them. But when a crisis is upon us the country can always turn to the farmer, to the workingman, and ask him for money. And we are astonished—you yourself were astonished at the time of the last Victory Loan—to find that there was so much money in the province of Quebec, which is entirely an agricultural province; that Quebec had more money than any other province of the Dominion. You refused to believe it, Sir, when we told you on the floor of this House that Quebec was the only province which, during this crisis, had not availed itself of the moratorium; that it was the only province where you could always demand the payment of what was due you, whether it is a mortgage, a note, or what not. Why? Because the Government of Quebec, because the people of Quebec, ever mindful of their ancient origin, did not forget that they were the descendants of the sturdy French race and that the first care of the French peasant, the farmer of the mother-country, is to pile up money at home and not in the banks; not tremendous fortunes, but little savings so that when bad times appear and they are forced to tighten their belts, they always have gold in their pockets. There

always has been gold in the province of Quebec.

Mr. Speaker, if the Government wanted to be honest with the agricultural class when they published the report of the last Victory Loan, to show the proportion of subscriptions in our province which represents the farmers—they would have given us the amount subscribed by the city of Montreal, which they somehow never put into their statistics. Certain English counties were included and the figure of their subscription credited to Ontario. All this was done so as to cast a slur on the province of Quebec and in thus discrediting Quebec they are discrediting the entire agricultural class. This is an insult to the farmers and we wish to register an energetic protest against it.

Now we come to another consideration. We demand the revision of the tariff on all farming implements, on everything that is a help to farming and to the farmer; we must never forget that it is the man with the hoe who amasses the real wealth of the country, the wealth which does not scamper away to the other side of the ocean once the pockets are full, there to bask around the desks in the War Office or in the quarters of the big English cabinets. That kind of people run away with their millions; but Canada desires its real wealth from the pockets of its farmers. We do not want to see our wealth crossing the ocean. That is why we are criticising the Government to-day for its policy of favouritism towards the big capitalists. In the words of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) this policy is most pernicious for the country.

We have to do not only with a policy of favouritism, but with a policy of despotism. We work for the big fellows, we work for those who are well off, for those who have large fortunes, but what do the poor people get? Nothing. What are they promised? Bosh, soap bubbles. They are promised the moon, but they never get a thing. That is the lot of our poor people; that is what this Government's policy leads to.

Mr. Speaker, we ask the Government to put aside this notorious policy and to remember that the people exist; that these gentlemen are governing for the people and not for a few privileged interests.

Every means have been tried, during the last three years to turn our social fabric upside down, with this policy. We have seen a cataract of laws falling in such rapid sequence and with such suddenness, that we did not have time—even we who are accustomed to keep a close watch on our laws—to know just what was the law of the country, because just as soon as a law had been passed it was immediately succeeded by another law. And what a law! For instance, the notorious Conscription Act. Things that had never been seen, even in Germany, became a part of our life in this country where the Government showed more severity than the very potentates of Germany. Indeed, to our knowledge, the kaiser himself had never acted in such a fashion.

Mr. Speaker, if we want the people to submit it is high time that this state of affairs were a thing of the past; if we do not want the entire working class to rise up in revolt and have a repetition in this country of what is going on in England where strike succeeds strike, and one fine day wake up to find the country we are working for thrown into the abyss where the Bolsheviki have thrown Russia. If things came to that pass we would find in this House leaders who could very well call themselves Trotsky and Lenine.

Were I allowed to offer suggestion I might make a few, but the hon. Minister of Public Works told us that he has had so many that he doesn't want any more. The reason is magnificent! He doesn't know where to turn.

As the hon. member for Toronto (Mr. Sheard) said a moment ago: when these gentlemen are in doubt they play trumps. But, Sir, when they play "trumps" the people pay; there you have the biggest proof of their indecision.

The hon. member for Toronto—I feel bound to pay him this compliment—gave to the House some very pleasant and very useful notes that could very well have come from the few ministers who have had the floor.

Since the beginning of the session we have been told that a Department of Public Health is to be inaugurated. We all wanted to know what was meant, and what the emergency was now that the epidemic has passed, and someone made the guess that it was to prevent an outbreak of epidemic among the members of the Government, and that having seen the candle in the window of the Liberal stronghold and heard the murmur that so-and-so was thinking of leaving, some one guessed, I say, that this Department of Public Health is for the purpose of curing all those erring sons who are willing to return; curing them of influenza. Really if the "flu" should break out in their ranks they decidely would need an energetic Minister of Public Health to

prevent the complaint from spreading because they are already suffering from a rather severe attack and the Government itself might well be the first to die.

But this Public Health Department, as stated by the hon. member will cover many other diseases beside influenza, and after the epidemic has been stopped, they will have to watch its consequences. The hon. member also referred to matters which, at first sight, I did not think would come under the control of a department of Public Health.

The Minister of Agriculture is having considerable sums of money voted each year, towards checking certain plant diseases and destructive insects in our forests, but according to the hon. member, it appears that it will be within the functions of the Minister of Public Health to do away with all the insects which cause plant diseases. The hon. member may be a vegetarian and for this reason he would like the minister to look after the matter. Do you fancy our Minister of Public Health running through the fields to destroy all the little bugs which are eating up our crops and which, in some of the provinces where they grow a lot of potatoes, practically destroy the crop? Do you fancy him sending engineers in our forests to destroy all the flies that are liable to injure balsam, spruce or white pine trees? Mr. Speaker, is that what they call the public health. The plants as well as the bugs will have their Minister!

Before closing, Mr. Speaker, there is one of the remarks made by the hon. member for Toronto that struck me more particularly. Evidently the Minister of Public Works is not in luck's way. This afternoon somebody told him most disagreeable things which made him frown and grow nervous; now the hon. member for Toronto tells us that the Minister is all mixed up, mingling the assets with the liabilities and the revenue with the interest. But nobody told us where goes the money which we are paying.

Mr. Speaker, did you ever ask yourself, as some of the members of the Government, and specially of the Opposition do, what was the result of such policies? Of course the first conclusion we may draw is that this policy is one of demoralization.

Fortunately the war is over. There is no one, Mr. Speaker, who had a deeper sense of regret at the death of so many brave volunteers in his home town than I, and I must say that out of 45 of our young men who went voluntarily to the front, 42 were killed—forty-two dead who may have had no decorations, but whose death we mourn—and that those who came back are disabled for life. Hail these gallant men and the others who came from the surrounding parishes. Hail these farmers' sons who left the plough to fight in Flanders and died on the old soil of France whence came their ancestors. No one glories more in their supreme sacrifice than I do, neither does any one regret more than I do the futility of their sacrifice. Of what use is it for them to have gone and fought overseas, to have spilled their blood for the land of their birth and for Old France and for their country of adoption, Great Britain, if those who are coming back after winning the war have lost peace at home.

The policy carried on by the Government will necessarily bring about this demoralization. As to the promise made by the Government to the returning soldiers that they would give them the best positions or at least, as a last expedient, the positions which they held before enlisting, we know, at home, what that promise is worth. It means to the returned man that he is sent from one commission to another and delayed until the time when there is nothing to be got. Is it not regrettable to notice how vain are these promises?

I myself happened to apply to the authorities on behalf of a wounded returned soldier who was asking to be re-instated in his former position on a ship. It is with a deep sense of regret that I had to tell him: "My friend, the Government who promised you would get back your job say that they will give you another one on the new boats they will build next summer." Is this the way of re-establishing the soldiers? Here is a man who did his duty, and who is told when coming back wounded: "To fulfil our promise to you we shall wait until next summer when our boats are launched."

How many soldiers received the same reply! They are sent from "Dan to Beersheba," and the unfortunate ones have to struggle without getting anything. Will this help in strengthening the morale of these men? Or is it not rather calculated to raise their indignation against those who remained here and to whom they will say: "While we were working hard, while we were fighting and giving our blood, you were busy making money without providing for us; we had the promises and you had the real thing; now that we are back, we have not even the satisfaction to say that you intend to keep these promises."

A time will come, Mr. Speaker, when these gallant men will be able to speak out, and when that time comes, the hon. ministers who, to-day, are living happy,

will be glad to go back to their mansions. Indeed they will be fortunate if the soldiers do not fetch them there and force them to give an account of their conduct.

Hail the Canadian army which showed such valour in the fighting on the various battlefields! Hail the brave ones who have left us, who have sacrificed their all for the triumph of their country of adoption and of their mother country. But, Mr. Speaker, how will you ask them to respect the laws? How will you ask them to abide by the various Orders in Council, when they know that these laws do not represent the wishes of the people for whom they fought? They come from the people, they want the people to rule, or else they will have a hand in it. If they do, we shall help them and the people will have their revenge.

Mr. M. STEELE (South Perth): Mr. Speaker, if I make only some slight reference to the remarks of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken, I am sure he will not think me discourteous. I have no doubt at all that from his point of view he made a speech which was very excellent indeed, and with that reference I will say nothing more, especially, if I must confess it, because I could not follow the hon. gentleman very closely. I would like to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the reply to the Address. Seldom in this House has that task been better performed, but it is especially pleasing that this year it should have been performed by two of our members who themselves played a very important part in the conflict overseas. This is the first time for some years that the House has met under peace conditions, and while it is gratifying that we are able at this time so to meet, we cannot forget the war made glorious by the achievements of our gallant sons. At Ypres, there stood between the great German horde and Calais only a few decimated battalions from the shops and offices and farms of the Canada which they had left a few months previous; but with the Canadian spirit they stemmed the onward march of the German divisions, and Calais was saved. From that time until the last cannon was fired at the capture of Mons on the morning of the 11th of November, the gallant achievements of the Canadian army will pass into history as among the most brilliant that have ever been recorded on the pages of world history. We have to regret that in those achievements so many brave and gallant sons of Canada have fallen. But yet we have in our remembrance the spirit displayed by those men, and that is at least some recompense to the people of Canada for the sacrifices which they made. One of our Canadian poets very beautifully I think puts into a few lines the spirit of the men who in the early days enlisted in the Canadian army. In a brief poem entitled, "He sleeps in Flanders" he writes the following:

> He saw not where his path should lead,
> Nor sought a path to suit his will;
> He saw a nation in her need,
> He heard the cause of honour plead,
> He heard the call, he gave it heed,
> And now he sleeps in Flanders.

The Canadian sacrifice was great—sacrifice of lives which was felt by the mothers of the Canadian sons, the wives of the Canadian husbands, the children of the Canadian fathers; and to-night I am sure that every hon. member of this House joins in the sorrow of these friends of the departed whose memory lives and will remain with us for a long time to come. To our gallant soldiers Canada is deeply indebted. There is no argument on that point. We are indebted to those who have bled and died, and we are indebted to the dependents of those who have fallen. This indebtedness is a sacred obligation. It is a debt of honour that must be liquidated through the agency of this Parliament. We must not allow the dependents of the fallen to suffer. The disabled must be cared for and the returned men restored to civil life. At this point I would like to make a suggestion in connection with the matter of vocational training for returned men. I believe, Sir, that it would be appreciated and would be of very great advantage, benefit and assistance to the returned men if there was placed in the hands of every returned man a brief, concise statement of what the Government is prepared to do for them in the line of vocational training. I do not come across very many returned men, not nearly so many as some hon. members do, but I must confess I scarcely come across one who knows anything about this matter, and I think there are hundreds of young men to-day who would gladly take up the course, if it were brought to their attention and they were informed of the splendid benefits which it offers. The land settlement of the Government is a policy which, I think, should be commended by this House and should meet with the approval of the returned men themselves. It is not easy to carry out any policy of repatriation to the satisfaction of every person concerned. I believe, Sir, that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) will find just as great difficulty in carrying out his policy of repatriation to his satisfaction as the

Government may find in carrying out theirs, because, while the hon. gentleman has announced to the erring wanderers from his party at this stage that the light is in the window and the latch string out, within a few hours after that announcement the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), with perhaps the impulsiveness of immaturity, and quite abruptly, made the announcement in effect, "If you men don't think as we do, you can stay where you are."

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. STEELE: That is the first difficulty, I think, encountered by the hon. leader of the Opposition in carrying out his "repatriation" policy, and I think I can assure him that there will be many more difficulties met with before it is successfully carried out.

Our armies overseas faced difficulties and overcame them; our people at home during the four years of war have faced difficulties and overcome them. With our army returned, and with our people at home united, as they will be, after demobilization, I indulge the confident hope that whatever difficulties arise in this country within the next few years this combined after-the-war army will successfully cope with and overcome. It is gratifying, I am sure, to us on this side of the House, and, I believe to the great majority of the people of Canada, to know that demobilization, repatriation and reconstruction are being carried out by a Union Government. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) this afternoon made the statement that there was no one to look after the returned soldier. I would remind him that Union Government looked after the soldier before he returned and that Union Government looked after the soldier last spring when he was badly in need of assistance and reinforcements. The returned soldier is being looked after by that same Government now with the same spirit and the same success.

The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe also made a remark referring to the Liberals on this side of the House and compared them to fruit ripened and falling from the tree. I would like to remind him that the ripening of fruit is not the only reason for it falling from the tree. Fruit falls from the tree when the tree becomes blighted, fruit falls from the tree when the tree dies, and is unable to give the fruit that vitality that it requires in order to remain upon the tree.

We enjoy Union Government on this side of the House for many reasons. One reason especially is that we have the privilege of criticising the Government. Hon. gentlemen on the other side cannot appreciate what that means but I can assure you, Mr. Speaker, that the great majority of those who are supporting Union Government feel a freedom that they never enjoyed when they belonged to either of the two old parties. We are free to criticise and in so doing we are free to retain the freedom of men thinking for themselves. I believe that the day of the infallible governments has passed. We have had many of them in Canada. Every government, in fact, has been infallible while it remained in power especially in the eyes of its own supporters. We have not an infallible Government, I am glad to say, and I hope we never shall have another.

I want to refer to one question that is before the Government at this time and which was referred to in such excellent terms this afternoon by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard)—the Public Health Bill. The previous speaker (Mr. Dechene) made the remark, if I understood him, that a Public Health Bill was not warranted by the circumstances. I hope, Sir, that when the discussions which will take place on that Bill during the session are ended, my hon. friend will be fully convinced that the circumstances do warrant the establishment of a Public Health department. He also made the remark in connection with this Public Health department that when the Liberal influenza gets hold of the people it cannot be checked. That may be true, but when it gets hold of the people I believe it will prove just as deadly as the influenza that has passed over Canada during the last few months. I am rather gratified that the Government have at this session announced their intention of organizing a Public Health department. For two years I have brought the matter before the House and it is gratifying to know that at last the efforts that have been made in this House on many occasions are going to bear fruit and that we are likely to get the department which is needed. This is in line with what I believe this Government, as all governments in Canada, will have to do in the next few years—give greater attention to social problems. After all, the importance of our country is determined by our people, and unless we have a vigorous, virile, healthful people, we cannot have a

country of the first importance. Universal health conservation is, to my mind, the duty of the nation. Sanitary science has placed within the hands of the State facts which, if applied to the protection of the health of our people, will produce a greater and better nation. The physical care of our people determines to an important degree the mental and moral development; and all combined, the physical, mental and moral, are required to make the best citizens. In Great Britain much attention is being given to the subject. In his first speech of the campaign in the general election of last fall, Premier Lloyd George made this statement:

> The recruiting statistics have revealed terrible conditions as regards the physical health of the nations. This is due not to poverty but to neglect. The health of the people must be the special concern of the State.

The British Labour party have adopted as the first principle of their platform:

> The securing to every member of the community all the requisites of healthy life and worthy citizenship.

What can be done in Canada? In these days we hear much of the burden of taxation which is going to be put on the people of Canada as a result of the war. Every person is looking for a means by which taxation can be lightened. I want to give to this House a possible method by which the taxation of Canadians may be greatly lightened. Irving Fisher, in his work on "National Vitality," estimates that sickness costs each family in the United States on an average $110 per year. If that rate is applied to the people of Canada, it costs the people of Canada $220,000,000 each year for sickness and $100,000,000 at least of that can be saved, or the part of that cost which is due to preventable sickness; sickness which, under an efficient department of health, can be prevented. This tax falls heaviest on the working man.

It is estimated that on the average each working man loses nine days per year from sickness. In Canada we have a million and a quarter working men, which means that eleven and a quarter million days' labour are lost to the country on account of the sickness of the workingmen, a loss in wages alone of at least $35,000,000. Then there is to be added to the wage loss the cost of the sickness, and the cost of the deaths. Not only that, but sickness brings unemployment, which we are all striving to prevent. Unemployment is followed by poverty, poverty is followed by destitution, and destitution is followed by either charity or crime. In Canada, there are every year at least fifty thousand deaths which are unnecessary. This is a tremendous economic loss; let me give you some figures to illustrate. If ten thousand of those who die are wage earners, and each wage earner is worth to the country at least $10,000,—so it is estimated—then, Sir, the unnecessary deaths of wage earners occurring in this country each year means an economic loss to Canada of at least $100,000,000. There is an opportunity for a modern, up-to-date, live Government such as we have to-day in Canada to save that immense burden of taxation to our people. Not only have we great unnecessary loss among the wage earners from deaths, but every year in this country there are dying fifteen thousand infants under one year of age, who can be saved to the state. The blackest page in the records of Canada is the page which contains the records of infant mortality, because that record is due to the neglect, indifference and ignorance of the Canadian people. When a child dies people are often heard to say, "Providence has taken another little one home." It seems to me it is almost criminal dishonesty to place on the shoulders of Providence what our own ignorance and neglect are entirely responsible for.

We have talked of conservation for years, and along some lines conservation has greatly advanced, but we require conservation and yet more conservation. We have for years been applying conservation to our agricultural problems, but why, Mr. Speaker, may I ask, should we conserve the fertility of the soil and not conserve the tillers of the soil? Why should we conserve plant life and not human life? Why conserve animal life and not child life? Why conserve our forests, our iron, our coal, our water-powers, and neglect our people? Thousands are spent every year to destroy the parasites which prey on plant and animal life, but how miserly we become, how miserly the Government has been in the past, when asked to spend anything to protect from similar parasites the citizens of our land. Horses, cattle, hogs, fruits and vegetables, all receive due attention, but thousands of infants are allowed to go to early graves, thousands of wage-earners are allowed to die or become disabled, without any attention from the State, and so generation after generation the health of our people goes neglected.

We have for the past few years been fighting to maintain democracy in the world.

The Canadian Army preserved Canada as a democratic country. Our soldiers made their contribution for democracy; now it rests with the people of Canada to make their contribution by rendering Canada a democratic country fit for a democratic people to live in. Why expound the benefits of democracy to a poor citizen with tubercular chest, slowly fading, knowing well that within a few months, or a year or two, his little family will be left to depend for the essentials of life on the cold charity of the world? Can we interest in democracy the wife or children of a man who can leave as his only legacy to society another illustration that the sins of the fathers are visited on the children unto the third and fourth generation? The only democrat who can appreciate Canadian democracy is he of clear eye, pure blood, robust frame, and well-functioning brain, enabling him to fully enjoy the privileges and liberty which that democracy bestows upon him. To protect our people from the conditions which I have been describing, is to perform work of the highest and most patriotic character, work worthy of the attention of any Government.

To secure the greatest industrial production and development, it is necessary to maintain at the highest efficiency the health of the farmer, the industrial worker, the transportation employee, and all other workmen on whom depend the production and distribution of agricultural and industrial products. For this reason I think the Government is to be commended for its announcement that it is going to give aid to the highways of our country. Great changes have taken place with regard to the highways of Canada in the last thirty or forty years. In the pioneer days practically the only people who used the country road were a few farmers who lived within a mile or two of it. Then we reached the stage where the town or city dweller began to use the roads to a limited extent, and it was found advisable that the counties and the provincial authorities should come to the aid of the farmer in constructing and maintaining in repair the roads which he had previously had to keep in condition solely by his own taxation. But we have passed away from even that stage. The good country highway to-day is a national highway; it is used not only by the farmers living in the district through which it passes, not only by the citizens of the villages and towns or nearby cities, but by citizens throughout the whole country. It is even used by citizens from the land to the south of us, and therefore I say it is becoming that at this time the Dominion should step in and say: We recognize that the main roads of our country are national highways now, and therefore we feel it incumbent upon us to come to the assistance of the farmer in constructing those roads and keeping them in repair.

The speech from the Throne announced that a Bill would be brought in dealing with immigration matters, and I am glad of it. In this connection the Health department can be of very great service. I hope, Sir, that in future only the immigrant of healthy body and sound mind will be admitted into our country.

The great problem of the feeble-minded in Canada to-day has arisen chiefly because our Dominion authorities have been permitting great numbers of feeble-minded immigrants to come into this country. At the inspection of immigrants in New York City it has been found that four out of every 1,000 people applying for entrance into the United States are feeble-minded. I doubt not that the percentage of feeble-minded among those who have been applying for entry into Canada in past years has been quite as great. If so, it means that every year, for a considerable period at least, from 1,200 to 1,500 feeble-minded persons have been admitted into Canada. Let us pause and think of the enormous burden that this places upon our people. Remember, too, that 80 per cent of the offspring of these people will be feeble-minded. As we make this calculation we find that the Dominion, through laxity and carelessness, are admitting and have been admitting into this country every year large numbers of people who ultimately will be a tremendous burden upon each of the provinces. So that from a provincial as well as national point of view it is important that immigration regulations shall be stricter and the inspection of immigrants more efficient.

But in our immigrants we require not only healthy bodies and sound minds; we look for more than that. We have been entrusted with a great country. Perhaps in the past we have been allowing ourselves to run to commercialism. No question to-day would more readily excite a discussion than that of the tariff, and this shows that our minds are still largely centred on commercialism. To my mind, the tariff that was made for Canada in 1878 probably requires a great deal of remodelling in order to make it thoroughly adapted to the Canada of 1920. But this has nothing to do with immigration, about which I was speaking. As a result of the war and of our war

work, there is imposed upon Canada the necessity of making of this country a great British nation where the English language shall prevail and where law and order must be recognized. There is no room in Canada for Bolshevism, notwithstanding the apology made for it by the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) the other evening. I should like to read to the House a summary of a report which was made on some of the deeds of Bolshevism, as published in this morning's papers. In a despatch through the Associated Press from Copenhagen, February 26, there appears this statement:

An appalling narrative of inhuman crime is revealed in the official report of the Esthonian authorities on Bolshevik atrocities committed in Esthonia, especially Wesenberg and Dorpat.

The graves of those murdered at Wesenburg were opened on February 17 in the presence of the town governor. Three graves were found to contain 82 corpses. Skulls were shattered, bodies bayonetted and even eviscerated. An eye-witness of the execution who escaped, described the terrible scene when the victims were placed on the edge of the graves and shot indiscriminately, trampled into the graves and finished with the butts of rifles. The vicinity of the graves was littered with torn clothing, brains, fragments of skulls and hair, while the grass was covered with congealed blood.

Similar bloodthirstiness was evinced at Dorpat, where the murdered victims were dropped into the river through holes in the ice. Recovered bodies revealed many arms and legs broken and one with the eyes put out.

The prisoners captured were robbed of clothes and valuables, led to a cellar and killed with hatchets and bombs. Examination of the cellar showed bodies piled up thickly in unnatural positions. The walls were splashed with blood.

Bolshevik fury also raged against the peasantry many of whom were mutilated and murdered. Thirty women were killed at Narva by stones being tied round their necks and being thrown into the river.

Those are the deeds of the people for whom the member for Brome, the other night, tried to enlist the sympathy of this House, and for whom he made a partial apology. There is no room in Canada for Bolshevism, and if there are any evidences of it to-day, we are but reaping what we have been sowing in our immigration policy. We have seen people in Canada during the past four years who have been profiting by the protection of the Canadian flag and of Canadian law, whose hearts were turned against Canada during that conflict, and who were openly professing sympathy with our enemies. I hope that in future our immigration policy will be such as to guard this country against the man who comes to exploit Canada. In the past the desire of the foreigner has been the deciding factor; in future we should have the assurance that the foreigner desires, when he comes to Canada, to become a good Canadian citizen. We need immigrants, but we do not need them so badly that we must accept any one and every one who desires to come. I do not sympathize with the view that in future our immigration policy should be limited only to the Anglo-Saxon countries; I believe that there are many good people in continental Europe who will make most desirable Canadian citizens if our people do their duty by them when they arrive here. But in my opinion, none but those who are able to speak English or the French language should be granted the rights of citizenship until at least eight years after their arrival here. I believe also that every immigrant should be registered on his arrival and that he should be required to have in his possession a registration card such as our own people had to have during the last few months of hostilities, so that a check can be had on him at any time. The eight years should be spent as a period of probation, and if at the end of that time the immigrant has not been living as a well-behaved, law-abiding, industrious, loyal Canadian citizen should live, and if he has not in those years been successful in acquiring a reasonable knowledge of the English language, he should at the end of that time be invited to return to the land whence he came and not be allowed to carry with him all the wealth which he has made in this country. Every one who leaves the land of his birth to settle in another country should feel that by so doing he indicates a willingness to relinquish the language and customs and ideals of that land; and when he comes to Canada he should come with a willingness to adopt the language, the customs and the ideals of this country. Only by the recognition of this principle can we develop a citizenship which is one hundred per cent Canadian.

9 p.m.

We should not blame former immigrants for the condition of affairs which has been shown to exist in Canada of recent years. They came here on invitation; they were almost constrained to come. But when they landed here they were ignored. No further attention was paid to them. If blame is to be laid on any person, it should be laid on our Governments, on our municipal authorities, on our educational authorities, on our public men, and especially perhaps on our aspirants to public life who are too often willing to cater to the foreigner in our midst in order to get his vote. Perhaps a share of the blame could be laid on the

shoulders of every Canadian citizen, for we have all sadly neglected the newly arrived immigrant. Many of them have left their own countries and have come to Canada in order to escape oppression and to enjoy the liberty which Canada offers them. We desire that they shall enjoy that liberty, but the liberty which they enjoy in Canada must be Canadian liberty, they cannot be permitted to enjoy the liberty which they imagine they might enjoy if they had remained in the land of their birth. Canadian liberty entails a responsibility, and the immigrant coming to this land should be made to understand that. That responsibility is a responsibility to the State, and amongst the responsibilities to the State is the responsibility to defend the State when the State requires defence.

We are at this time emerging from trying experiences. Victory has come to our armies overseas. Victory has also come to our people at home, because we will all, I am sure, admit that the efforts of the Canadian people at home have resulted in splendid industrial and agricultural victories. The combination of these two forces will, I am certain, result in our people courageously facing the difficult national problems of the next few years. Together they will successfully overcome those difficulties, and the achievements of our after-the-war army in industry, commerce and agriculture will be such that there will result a greater and more prosperous Canada than the most optimistic at present can even hope for.

Mr. WILLIAM C. KENNEDY (North Essex): Mr. Speaker, the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me have extended their congratulations to the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Redman) and the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) on their speeches on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. May I be permitted to concur in those congratulations, feeling sure that the House will agree with me that in the speeches they have delivered they have given us information, facts and figures that will be not only of service to the House but of great service to the country.

The speech itself was a typical Union Government production replete with promises. If there is one thing more than another that hon. gentlemen opposite do well, it is to promise. In fact, it has been said that no government that has been formed in Canada since Confederation has been so long on promises and so short on performance as the present Union Government. There is, however, one promise that I hope hon. gentlemen opposite will implement, and that is the promise with reference to the War-time Elections Act. That Act should be repealed without delay. There may have been some excuse a year ago for hon. gentlemen defending that measure. They may not have had an opportunity of knowing all the facts and details in connection with the voting overseas, but surely there is in this House no hon. gentleman who has returned soldiers in his constituency who does not now know the disgraceful story of the elections that were held in England in 1917. I am not speaking from hearsay; I have had in my possession the documents dealing with the matter, documents that at all events some gentlemen on the other side of the House have been privileged to see; and I hope, before the session is over, an opportunity will be given not only to the members of this House but to the people of this country to learn the names of those implicated and the methods employed to place this Union Government in power.

The people of this country are to-day in no frame of mind to accept a franchise Act whose only object is to continue in power hon. gentlemen opposite. Not only the Government of the country but the form of government are on trial with the people of Canada. The people are seriously asking themselves if some other form of government would not be preferable, and if a form of government, which, through Orders in Council, permits a small coterie of men to impose their views and wishes on the people of the country, is not inconsistent with responsible government and the spirit of democracy so necessary to our national existence. Let me say—and I am only re-echoing the words of the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair), who spoke yesterday—that in so far as the people of my part of the country are concerned, no halo goes with the position of a Cabinet minister. The Cabinet ministers of this country are the servants of the people and not the masters, and that is a good thing for Cabinet ministers to remember. It is important in the interests of the people that the proposed franchise legislation should be fair and just, so that it will appeal to all irrespective of party.

Amongst other matters dealt with in the Address was one that I thought would perhaps have come in for more attention. I refer to the visit of our distinguished Premier (Sir Robert Borden) and his fellow diplomats across the sea. So far as I have

heard, no explanation has been given by hon. gentlemen who have up to the present addressed the House as to what has transpired in Paris or in Versailles, what the Premier is doing, or what he hopes to do for this country. All the information that the members of this House can obtain is what they can gather from the public press. Fortunately, it seems the Premier is well supplied with correspondents because we are able to keep to some extent in touch. I wish, however, to congratulate the Premier, as other hon. members have done, on his finally obtaining some definite standing abroad. I am free to confess that I am not aware just what that particular standing is. The fact remains, nevertheless, that it seems to be perfectly satisfactory as a matter for congratulation, and in these congratulations I desire to join. I notice that the right hon. gentleman is in Paris; I notice also that the President of the United States is in Washington, that the Premier of England is in England, that the Premier of France is incapacitated, and that the Premier of Italy is in Italy. We, therefore, really are represented at the conference, and I trust with credit to this country.

I should like to say just a word or two with reference to the personnel accompanying our premier on his trip across the sea. These gentlemen are probably, from years of experience, distinguished diplomats, and I have no doubt they will reflect great credit upon this country. But may I say that, in view of the trip overseas that was taken last spring by other hon. gentlemen in this House, there was not a little surprise, throughout the province of Ontario at least, that one other hon. member of this House had not been chosen to accompany the Premier on this trip. Those who read the newspapers must recall the magnificent work accomplished by the hon. President of the Council (Mr. Rowell) and the gentlemen who were with him when they were over there last year. I know the papers were replete with information as to what the President of the Council was doing, and how well he was doing it, and it seems to me there must be some very good reason for his having been left behind, or else some very great mistake has been made by the Premier in leaving him off this delegation. Many reasons have been advanced why he did not accompany the Premier. I have heard it said that when the President of the Council was over there last year his presss agents were perhaps a little too vigorous and there were times when the people were not quite sure whether the Premier was in England or in Canada. I likewise heard that he was being reserved for the leadership here in the absence of the Premier. But we see these were all mistakes. The matter did not disturb me at all, because I absolutely knew the reason through having read early in July last year a press despatch from across the seas dealing with matters over there, and I at once saw that it was out of the question for the gentlemen who accompanied the Premier last spring to return with him again this year. If the House will bear with me I will quote part of the despatch; I shall not read it all, as it might prove embarrassing to the hon. gentlemen who are mentioned, although I do not see any of them present at the moment. The despatch appears in the Detroit Free Press of Sunday, July 28th, 1918, and deals with the visit of our distinguished group of diplomats. It describes how busy these gentlemen were in London, and incidentally I am glad to note the landing in England of the Minister of Colonization (Mr. Calder) and the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). It is reassuring to see that they sailed and landed, because beyond that very little is said in the despatches about them. The despatch reads:—

> They entered into a self denying ordinance on their arrival here. They declined the ordinary social engagements except those directly connected with the operations of the war, refusing almost every offer to speak—

There, Mr. Speaker, was self-sacrifice of a high order. They absolutely refused every offer to speak.

> —despite insistent demands from every part of England. Frequently at the close of a laborious twelve-hour day the ministers would visit some hospital a considerable distance away, talk with the wounded, dine en famille with the staff, and reach home at midnight. Their appearance gives physical evidence of the heavy nature of their work. Mr. Rowell looks years older than when he arrived.

There, Mr. Speaker, you have the reason. Out of consideration for his colleague the Premier refused to add more years to the hon. gentleman's life. A few years, of course, in the young life of the Hon. Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), or the Hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) means nothing. The members of this House must surely be indebted to the Premier for his consideration for the President of the Council, and speaking for myself and on behalf of the Liberals of the province of Ontario I desire likewise to thank the Premier, because the Liberals of the province of Ontario are

anxiously waiting for the time to come when they may have an opportunity of showing their love and affection for the President of the Council. It seems fitting that the author of this despatch should have the privilege of being named in this House. I think the gentleman who could pen such a despatch is worthy of that distinction. I am sorry to disappoint my hon. friends, but the despatch was not written by Donald Hunt, it was not written even by Main Johnson, but by a gentleman who by a strange coincidence is named McKenzie, and if I am any judge of names he is a Scotsman. And yet there are people who say that the Scotch have no sense of humour! Mr. Speaker, Bret Harte is dead; Mark Twain has been gathered to his fathers; Bill Nye is no more; but as long as McKenzie lives there is one great humorist alive.

Mr. BURNHAM: What McKenzie is that?

An hon. MEMBER: D.D.

Mr. KENNEDY: No. I have followed with some interest the activities of our distinguished diplomats across the seas, and while I am anxious to do them every justice, yet as I said earlier in my remarks, it has been almost impossible to keep in touch with what they have done. However, in justice to them I wish to call the attention of the House and the country to just what they have been doing so far as we can gather from the press reports. The first really important matter with which the name of our Premier was associated was a dinner given in London on the 27th of December last. Hon. gentlemen may have read of it. It was a magnificent banquet. There were thousands of soft shaded lights. The walls were hung with expensive tapestries. Fifteen million dollars worth of gold plate were spread upon the banquet board. The lackeys were in the costume of the beefeaters of old, bowing low and moving backwards before the advancing guests. Our Premier was there, and he was described in the papers as wearing the Windsor costume, knee breeches and all—democracy pure and undefiled. By a strange coincidence, in the very newspaper that gave an account of this banquet attended by our hon. Premier was an account of the return to Canada of men who had fought in France and Flanders, men who had suffered, and who had put in three or four years in the trenches on the western front—the return of those men on the steamer Northland. Hon. gentlemen, may have heard of it. There were no soft and shaded lights, no priceless tapestries, and no fifteen million dollars worth of gold plate upon the table. No, there was maggoty soup, putrid beef, and foul and ill-smelling rooms for the men to sleep in. Sir, it seems hardly possible that, in the few short months, the hon. gentlemen so soon forget their rallying cry, to back the boys at the front. Let me say, in so far as the boys who have returned from the front are concerned, they have not forgotten, and they are not forgetting. I would suggest to some of the hon. gentlemen opposite that if an opportunity is presented to them of occupying a pulpit and preaching the glories of the Government they might easily find a text for a good sermon in these facts. It would be edifying to the people of Canada and worthy of consideration. Our hon. Premier has likewise received some attention in the papers these last few days, on account of the success that has attained his efforts to loan some $25,000,000 to one of the smaller European nations. The hon. gentleman deserves every credit for that, and I am quite satisfied there will be no difficulty in furnishing the manufactured products to take care of the $25,000,000, because it is a mighty nice arrangement for the manufacturers to have their money guaranteed. I have no doubt many of us regret we are not in some line of business where we would be absolutely sure of selling our goods at a fat profit and having our money absolutely assured, as is being done in this case. In this connection may I say, it is about time, Mr. Speaker, that hon. gentlemen should change the name of these trade commissions floating around the different countries. The business men of this country are not deceived about these trade commissions. These dollar-a-year business men who—perfectly legitimately of course (and I emphasize that point) have run their dollar into a million or more in the course of a year—are keen, smart business men and trade commissioners. These gentlemen are contract-placers, and they see that these contracts for manufactured products go to pretty much the same line of gentlemen in nearly every instance. You have only to take the connection of some of these gentlemen with these large manufacturing establishments, and take the directors, the vice-presidents and the president and see who they are, and you will find that there is not much going outside of a certain circle. The average business man in this country is not being very much fooled by what you call trade commissions. I think

it is about time that the Government took the matter in hand themselves. It is about time that the Government had a Department of Trade and Commerce that could look after the affairs of the country without the assistance of outside commissions. As to the Department of Trade and Commerce, I have not a word to say with reference to the right hon. gentleman who occupies the important position as head of it. He is overseas, and he has given the best years of his life to Canada. He is a gentleman for whom I have the greatest respect. He is entitled to anything he wants in this country. That is what I think about the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce. But I say he is not the man to occupy such an important position at this juncture in the history of the country. We should have a bright aggressive up-to-date business man looking after the trade and commerce affairs of this country at this time. To me the present system is simply nonsense. If we had such a man as I suggest, we could do away with all these absurd, foolish commissions which are floating about this country, with secretaries to burn, and keeping up offices here, there and everywhere. The Government themselves should take the responsibility of conducting their department, they should have men there who are capable of conducting it, and these men should conduct it. That is what responsible government calls for.

That is where the government of hon. gentlemen opposite is falling down in the opinion of the people of this country. In this connection, may I say, only the other day one of the important firms of the city which I have the honour to represent wrote to the Department of Trade and Commerce that they were anxious to do business in England and asked for an English tariff, so that they might know what competition they had to meet. They did not get it; the department did not have it. That is not the way to run the department. You talk about developing the trade and commerce of the country. There must be some intelligence in connection with a department, if you are going to be successful and business men are entitled to some consideration. They are paying taxes directly and indirectly and every way you can get them, and they are willing to pay them, but they should have something for the money they are paying into this Government for administration purposes. If hon. gentlemen will bear with me for a minute I will read a letter which I have received from the secretary of the Board of Commerce in our city in connection with this matter. He encloses me a copy of a letter received from Mr. F. C. T. O'Hara, Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce, which says:

> I may say that we have always had much trouble in supplying information with regard to the British and foreign tariffs, for as you know, all tariffs are subject to Treasury decisions and changes of which we frequently are not advised for months afterwards. From our own knowledge of the Canadian Customs Tariffs you will know that experts in the Customs Department of the country itself alone are able to give information in many cases. Since the outbreak of war all our International Customs Bureau publications which were issued at Brussels have ceased, hence many of our tariffs are out of date, and no means exist for obtaining this information at present for all the countries of the world, translated as before the war.

That does not apply to England. We have over in London paid officials of this Government. Surely there should be somebody there who would keep the Department of Trade and Commerce in touch with conditions over there, so that we could do business with that country. The letter continues:

> Personally I have relied largely on Kelley's Customs Tariffs of the world, which is published annually but this department cannot hold itself responsible for any tariff information supplied respecting foreign countries.
>
> We have another trouble to contend with, and that is lack of space and lack of a sufficient number of officials to compile such tariff information as we can from time to time.

It does not seem possible, if one goes through the buildings in Ottawa, to believe that there is any lack of officials. You simply fall over them, no matter which way you go. To me it is almost inconceivable that the business of the country should be held up because there are no officials obtainable in Ottawa. It is a matter I am sure the hon. gentleman will have no difficulty in remedying.

> All our Customs Tariffs as received before the War went down to the Bureau of Statistics when our Trade Division was transferred there, but I had had in mind, as soon as accommodation could be supplied in the West Block, to place the tariff matters under the Commercial Intelligence Branch, but up to the present there has been no room made available for that purpose.

Yet, the hon. gentlemen who spoke on the Address told us about the magnificent efforts that were being made to extend the trade and commerce of this country. Surely, Sir, I am justified when I say that the time has come when some bright, progressive, alert, smart, business men should be placed in charge of the organizations that we have in connection with the affairs of this Government and of the country.

The right hon. the Prime Minister of this country (Sir Robert Borden) seems to

have come into a good deal of prominence in connection with the Russians that were to meet on Prinkipo in Prince's Islands. In this connection I want to say a word in justice to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster). I listened attentively to his remarks the other evening, and I did not gather from what he said that he used language which could in any way be construed as denoting approval of the Bolsheviki. On the contrary, I understood him to say that there were possibly two opinions and to substantiate his argument he quoted from the Manchester Guardian, which took the side of the question opposite to that taken by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell). I have here the report of the remarks of my hon. friend from Brome, as contained in Hansard, and I think it is only just to him, in view of what the hon. Minister of Public Works said, and also in view of what the hon. member for South Perth (Mr. Steele) said this evening, that his words should be repeated. My hon. friend from Brome said:

> I am not sure whether the common view taken in this country of the Bolshevik is altogether correct. I think that perhaps there is another side to the question, and as this is the great forum where truth and exact knowledge should be brought before the people, I take the liberty of referring the House to some articles which are appearing in the Manchester Guardian from an eye-witness from Russia.

That is not endorsing by any means the Bolsheviki, and I think it is unfair that my hon. friend should be placed in that position. So far as I am concerned, may I say that I heartily agree with the Minister of Public Works. I have exactly the same idea of the Bolsheviki that he has, and it was a matter of extreme regret to me to see the Prime Minister of this country placing himself in the position of opening communications with them and inviting them to meet decent people. I thought it was hardly fair to the people of Canada that they should have to assume that role. Anxious as some of the great powers were that there should be a settlement in Russia, none of them was willing to assume the responsibility of accepting a rebuff from one or other of the Russian parties. But, the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada was made of sterner stuff, and, without a moment's hesitation, according to the despatch from Mr. Dafoe of the Winnipeg Free Press, he put forth the idea which he had conceived of inviting the Bolsheviki to meet at Prince's Island. Apparently the decent element among the Russians refused; so far there has been no meeting, and the matter has been dropped. I think it would be fair for the Minister of Public Works and the hon. member for South Perth to communicate with the minister and give him their views in reference to the Bolshevikis in order to prevent anything of that kind occurring in the future.

Of course, it may be that the Prime Minister was better informed with reference to the Russian situation than we were. It may be that he had some inside information in reference to the matter. I am quite willing to admit that it would have been a wonderful diplomatic victory to have achieved if he had brought peace to Russia. I can well imagine how the newspapers of the whole world would have acclaimed him as a great diplomat, and I believe that if he had been successful he would have been entitled to have been so acclaimed. It may be that the Prime Minister, with perhaps more vision than most of us possess, looked a little ahead and saw that in the event of being successful some recognition would come to him from the powers that be. In the olden times he would have been given broad lands, but now the League of Nations seems to have nailed the land down pretty well. There would be nothing left to give him but a title, and if he had been successful we in the Dominion of Canada could have had the pleasure and privilege of welcoming him back, not as the right hon. Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada, but as the Earl of Prinkipo, because he would be entitled to that proud distinction in view of the great diplomatic victory that he had achieved at that island. The time has about arrived in the history of this country when some of the right hon. gentleman's colleagues should tell him that he was elected, and selected, to manage the affairs of Canada, in Canada, and that the seat of Government is Ottawa, not London, not Paris, and not Prinkipo. Somebody should tell the right hon. gentleman on one of his intermittent visits to this country that it is far more important to the people of Canada to have the tariff settled satisfactorily than it is to have the boundaries of the Balkans settled. Somebody should tell the right hon. gentleman that it is far more important to the people of Canada to have the railway situation straightened out than it is to decide who is going to police Constantinople.

I would like to go further and say that the newspapers of Canada to-day are filled with stories of returned men who are not receiving the treatment they should receive. It is far more important to the people of this country that we should have

a government that is looking after Canadian affairs and far more important to them that the Premier should be here directing public affairs, which is his first and most pressing duty, than that he should determine who should have mandatory powers over the Hottentots. That is the position of affairs insofar as we are concerned, and the sooner the right hon. gentleman comes home, bringing his entourage with him, and permits the absent gentlemen to fill, even if only temporarily, the positions of Minister of Customs, Minister of Justice, and Minister of Trade and Commerce, the better it will be. Because that is what the people of the country are paying them for. The Cabinet ministers are paid officials. It is not necessary that a man should be a wizard to be a Cabinet minister; the day for that sort of thing has passed and gone. The duties of Government consist largely of taking the money of the country and disbursing it wisely and well, of administering the affairs of Canada in the interests of its people. That is where hon. gentlemen opposite are falling down. They are in the clouds, their minds are given to everything but the duties of their offices; and the time has about arrived when somebody should direct the right hon. Prime Minister of Canada to come home—he was elected for a specific purpose, and the taxpayers of this country expect him to be here and attend to his business.

The Acting Premier (Sir Thomas White) said the other day in the course of his remarks, that there was absolute need for steadiness amongst the people of the country to-day. I quite agree with him in that statement, but I desire to point out that the lead must come from the Government. The people must have confidence in the Government, they must feel that they are being governed intelligently and well. There must be a return to responsible government—not government by order in council, but government for the people by the people. That was the obligation undertaken in behalf of the Canadian people when Confederation was formed. But hon. gentlemen opposite have not been carrying out that obligation, and that is the cause of the unsteadiness and unrest which prevails throughout Canada to-day.

I wish to refer to the subject of the Siberian Expedition. Canadians have not been vouchsafed very much light as to why they are being represented in Siberia. I could understand, Sir, that if we were still at war there might be need for the presence of a Canadian military force in Siberia, but I cannot understand why, once the armistice was declared, our soldiers should still be sent from Vancouver to Vladivostok. The people of Canada are equally at a loss to understand this, and it is one of the questions that hon. gentlemen opposite will find very difficult to answer when they appear before the public. Personally, I do not believe we have any more business in Siberia at the present time than we have in Mexico. Why should Canada be the policeman for the world? As a matter of fact, apart from the humanitarian reasons that are actuating some of the Powers, a good many nations are influenced by the fact that they have loaned large sums of money to Russia at extortionate rates of interest. That being so, why should we be the money collectors for Europe? Surely it is up to the creditor nations to collect their own investments.

There are certain other matters I wish to take up, and one of them has reference to a letter which I received from a returned soldier. Unfortunately I do not know under whose department it comes. It is difficult for a comparatively new man to determine just who is responsible for the administration of the many public departments of this Government. However, Mr. Speaker, with your permission I will read the letter, and if there are any ministers present who are interested in the department affected I shall be glad if they will take cognizance of it. If not, perhaps they will mention it to some of their colleagues, if it so happens that those colleagues are in this country. The letter in question is dated, "Windsor, Ontario, February 12th, 1919," is addressed to "William C. Kennedy, Esq., M.P., Windsor," and reads:

H. A. B. Aikman,

Formerly No. 7109—1st Battalion Can.

Board of Pension Commissioners, No. 13314.

Sir,—I have the honour to submit for your consideration the following facts which represent an occurrence in which I figured in connection with the Board of Pensions Commissioners for Canada and the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Toronto.

In compliance with their request I reported in Toronto on Tuesday morning, February 4th, 1919, at ten o'clock at the latter department, from which I was transferred to the Military Hospital for medical re-examination, where I (with others), waited until about twelve-thirty, noon, when we were told to go away, get our dinner and report again in the afternoon. Two or three of us stated we had no money, so we were given our dinner there. Probably about four o'clock, I, with others, was told to report again next day. I said that I, for one, would not report the next day, as I had come from Windsor, had already lost two days and to Windsor I was going that night and requested

transportation together with my expenses. The officer who imparted the suggestion of reporting next day, did so in very crude language, had dishevelled hair, moved with uncertain gait and the expression of his eyes was such as I have seen produced by the immoderate use of liquor, and while I am not prepared to say definitely that that condition existed, his appearance implied such was the case.

It was then found possible to give me an examination, which occupied probably twenty minutes. At its conclusion I requested transportation and expenses and was told these would be supplied me at the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, where I had once before been. Reporting at this latter point again I was told that they could not supply my demands for transportation and pay and that I would have to go back to the Military Hospital for it.

I was suffering from lumbago, in addition to a shrapnel wound in the groin, the distance was between one and two miles and another trip was an impossibility for me. I thereupon flatly refused to do it. They then issued me return transportation to Windsor and, as is customary in the army, I signed a receipt for my pay and expenses, in advance. The clerk, who took my receipt, returned in a few moments, took my Windsor address and informed me cheque would be mailed to me the next day. This was eight days ago and I am still looking for this cheque, which I have already signed for, but have not received.

The amount involved is not large, but the principle of the thing, or shall I say, the lack of principle, is not only worth some consideration, but matters of this nature are things that we returned men in various stages of crippled condition, and impaired earning power, cannot financially afford to stand, especially when the amount is considered, of the pittance the Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada sees fit to dole out to us.

Let me say further, that at the time of this visit to Toronto, I was informed that arrangements would be made for my return to hospital (Whitby being suggested), for further treatment, of which I am in need.

I am likewise still waiting for these latter arrangements to be perfected as well as for repayment for money and time expended by me.

I have the honour to be,
Sir,
Yours respectfully,
(Signed) H. A. B. Aikman.

There is the story of a returned man, and that is one of the matters that I refer to when I say that there is a feeling everywhere throughout the country that the affairs of the people are not being conducted by the heads of the respective departments as they should be; that we are not getting the government that the people are paying for, and that the time has arrived when hon. gentlemen should take charge of the departments for which they are responsible to the people, administer them in a businesslike way, and do away with these useless commissions that have been sapping away the financial life-blood of the country.

Another matter that I wish to take up is, perhaps, local in a sense, but it has a bearing on what I have said. Situated on the border, I have known many cases where men working in the city of Detroit were drafted or volunteered for military service and whose positions in various business houses of that city were reserved for them. Their employers said: You are Canadians; you are going to fight for your country. We honour you for it; you shall have your position as soon as the war is over. It was generous, and it was decent; but that is the spirit the Americans have always evinced—I say that after having lived for years on the border. Well, what happened? The armistice comes. Many of these boys who were drawing from $1,500 to $3,000 a year in the positions which they held before they went on military service, are working at $1.10 a day in London, filling clerical positions, some unimportant, and some important, perhaps. Their employers write them as soon as the armistice is signed, saying: The war is over; your position is waiting for you and we shall be glad if you can come at once. In the meantime the American boys who gave up their positions and went overseas are returning to the United States and if the Canadians do not come back and take their old positions, the first thing we know the Americans will take them and we shall increase to that extent the unemployment in Canada which the Minister of Public Works told us we were to spend millions to avoid. That was a case not of half a dozen men, but of a hundred men or more. When that situation confronted me I immediately took the matter up with the Minister of Militia. In justice to that hon. gentleman, I want to say that he met me more than half way. He appreciated the fact that my arguments were sound. I maintained that if the Government needed clerical assistance they should go into the open market and engage that assistance, and thus avoid jeopardizing the future of these men by preventing them from taking the positions which they could never get again. The Minister of Militia wrote me very kindly saying that he had instructed the commanding officer of the London District to give heed to my suggestions, and, where possible, to meet them. I took the matter up with the Commanding officer of the London District, General Shannon, a very fine gentleman, and I found him kindness itself. He, too, was anxious to help where he could, and he wrote me to say that where it was possible to dispense with the services of these men he would be very glad to do it. But these

requests of mine were transferred from one department to the other and by the time the matter got back to General Shannon it was almost impossible to accomplish the object in view. In many instances I got the men released; in many others I could not, and in many cases the positions were lost. But picking up the paper one morning I read about the Repatriation Committee, and decided that here at last was a place when I could obtain some relief, because they asserted that they were anxious to find employment for returned men. I wrote to the chairman of the Repatriation Committee, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) telling him what the conditions were. He wrote me a very nice letter agreeing that my argument was sound and that what I had suggested was absolutely the right thing to do. He said that he was

10 p.m.

turning the matter over to the Secretary of the Repatriation Committee, who would write me later. In the course of a week or ten days I received a letter from the Secretary of the Repatriation Committee, in which that gentleman thanked me for the suggestion, saying that it was a very valuable one and that he would take it up with his committee and advise me at a later date. That was on the 20th of January, but unfortunately the committee, I take it, has not met since, because up to this time I have had no further word from the secretary. So you will see the way things are passed from one department to another. Nobody seems to be running the departments, and one can get no satisfaction from correspondence with them. You cannot get decisions and that is what the people want. What good is it to these boys who before going on military service had worked up to the point where they were of such service to their employers that they were getting $3,000 or $4,000 a year,—what good is it to them if I get a letter a month from now from the Secretary of the Repatriation Committee telling me that they are glad to comply with my request? The job is gone then. That is not what we want—we want action, and that is where hon. gentlemen are falling down in handling their departments.

I have other matters to take up, but I shall deal with them before the session is over when the issues with which they are connected come before the House. I shall not hesitate to express my views as to what I believe to be the proper thing to do in the interests of the country. I accept the statement of the Acting Prime Minister that it is the duty of everyone to assist the Government, and to do what he can in bringing our country through the crisis that prevails to-day. I have done my share in every matter that has arisen in connection with the war and I propose to do my share in the work of reconstruction. I want to help, but I want to help intelligently. The people want to feel that they are receiving intelligent assistance from the men who lead at this juncture and who compose the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot resume my seat without saying a word or two with reference to one who recently left us. Last year I had the first opportunity of serving under the stainless banner of our departed chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. To me it was a proud distinction, a distinction and an honour that I shall cherish to my dying day. His was always a fight for the people, and although he is gone, his spirit lives. In the words of Beecher on the death of Lincoln::

> Even he who now sleeps has, by this event, been clothed with new influence.
> Dead, he speaks to men who now willingly hear what before they refused to listen to.

Our Chieftain is gone; but Liberalism is not dead, and I very much mistake the temper of the people of this country if, when the opportunity offers and we appeal to them once more, they do not show their appreciation of Liberal principles.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (West Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I should like to join in the congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address. It is a long time since I have listened to what I presume we may dignify by the name of a speech by an honourable member such as we have just heard, because it strikes me as being an adaptation of the writings of the Fenian press of the United States in their attack on President Wilson for attending the King's banquet. I may, however, be doing the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) an injustice, and lest I should do him an injustice in the budding moment of his distinguished career, I should like to ask him if he disapproves of Sir Robert Borden's accepting the invitation of the King of England and of the British Dominions overseas to that banquet to which he so caustically referred. Will the hon. gentleman answer me that question?

Mr. LANCTOT: No.

Mr. BURNHAM: If he had, it would have been about the only original part of his

speech. The rest I have read in the flamboyant Fenian press of the United States which has been forwarded to me at different times to show me what they could do along the border. I am inclined to think, to do justice to the present leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), that he will administer some slight and significant rebuke for that display of politics. The light which has been held out by the Opposition is, I presume "The Light that Failed." To me it is a very singular thing that the sum total of the brilliance of the Opposition, the attraction indeed for all those erring ones, should consist in an old candle stuck in the back door of the Opposition cabin. That, to my mind, is not doing justice to the attractive power of the Opposition, and it certainly does not look well in this country, nor does it look well to leaders abroad who will suppose that all that can be handed out by way of an attraction is something stuck in the back door of an edifice of that description.

I wish, however, with your permission, Mr. Speaker, to turn to something more important. The chief question now before this country, and, indeed, before the world, is reconstruction. I will, however, confine myself to one phase of that, namely, to the standard of living, to the living wage, to that wage which the lowest, simplest form of honest labour should receive in order that it may maintain the standard of life to which we all agree it is entitled. The wage earner has evolved from a long historic post. In the early days of England, he was a member of the family, when the work performed by the family was done in the family. By and by he became a member of the clan, when the work was done by the clan, by the blood relations. Afterwards this was extended to the guild, to those associations of men who united for the purpose of prosecuting industry. And so it advanced from time to time until the period of the plague in England in 1346-47, when nearly one-half of the people of England died of the plague, and this so upset the industrial conditions of England at that time that the labourer as he was known then, wandered in an unorganized and indefinite way over the country, so much so that the Statute of Labourers was enacted which compelled him to root himself once more to one spot and to confine his exertions to that area and which also compelled him to accept a certain specific wage. As time went on, however, the consideration of the people for each other changed. What was regarded as strictly an economic question dawned upon the people as an ethical question. It was not so much a question of poverty as it was a question of life, and it has grown to be that more and more, so that we have to-day in England, in France, even in the United States, in Australia and in New Zealand, legislation of a character that has gone very far in elevating the condition of what is known as the common people. Canada has unfortunately hitherto lagged far behind. The reason of that is no doubt that we are a young country with great natural resources and much prosperity due largely to our abundance. That has probably not yet caused a condition which would warrant the measures that have been made use of in the older countries; but if the seeds of poverty, if the seeds of disintegration are here, it only requires time to bring them into growth, and it is well for us to provide against such a contingency by learning from the experience of other people. The most singular thing is that in a country like England, of such Conservative tendencies, there should have been such haste to remedy the errors of the past.

The British people are, of course, a kindly, well-intentioned people, and so soon as it was brought home to them that it was necessary for them to improve the condition of the people, and to show some interest in them, they hastened to do so. We had, first of all, the Notification of Births' Act in 1907, by which for the first time in England it was compulsory, in all cases of births, for notice to be sent to the district medical officer, in order that registration might duly occur and some notice be taken of the birth. This had the effect of enabling the medical official, and through him the Government, to know exactly the condition in which those children were born, and to render the children and the mothers some assistance. This worked a miracle in England. Thousands and tens of thousands of children who would have died at this period through neglect and ignorance were for the first time taken care of by an intelligent Government.

Then there was the Education Act, another far-reaching Act, under which the school children in the cities were provided for the first time with play grounds or breathing spaces. Then we had the system of national insurance, insuring people against unemployment, against sickness, and even against under-employment. I am citing these measures simply to show how very attentive the British people are at the present time to the elevation of the common

people from the low standard of life at which they have lived for so long. It is recognized now for the first time that the common people—the unskilled labourer, the man who is compelled to take what he can get—are entitled to something better. The lowest form of honest labour, if it is to be recognized at all, and it surely must be recognized, ought to receive some consideration on the ethical basis of a proper standard of life.

I have here a report of the American Federation of Labour which represents the most intelligent ideas of labour in America and, very largely, the ideas of labour the world over. Their ideas are summed up as follows:

> There is no such thing as good wages without the cost of living in decency and comfort equalize the wages received. There must be no reduction in wages; in many instances, wages must be increased. The workers of the nation demand a living wage for all wage earners, skilled or unskilled, a wage which will enable the worker and his family to live in health and comfort, provide a competence for illness and old age, and afford to all the opportunity of cultivating the best that is in them.

It seems strange indeed that anybody should rise in this House and endeavour to call the attention of hon. members to the simple principle here enunciated. The principle, it is true, has been acknowledged in theory, has been made use of in disquisitions in the pulpit, but beyond that it has not been made use of at all. The principle of a living wage, of a decent standard of life for the lowest form of honest labour, has never yet been recognized in this country as necessary recompense of all forms of labour, but when that day comes it will mean something new for labour. It will mean hope. There is nothing unreasonable in the contention of labour, because once this zero mark has been ascertained, they are quite willing that labour above and beyond that mark shall be allowed to take care of itself. Above that mark wages will be paid according to the skill and competence of the labourer. That proposition seems to me entirely reasonable. Those who are below that mark are either weak or wicked, and have to be taken care of. They come under the denomination of the unemployed, the under-employed, the criminal or the wastrel. What is to be done with them is another matter; that is a question of reform in connection with detention farms and kindred schemes for their improvement. But that is not the question I am considering to-night, since it involves the consideration of the weakness of the

people, and that does not come under a business arrangement. If it is once practically recognized by the people of this country that the lowest form of honest labour is entitled to such a wage as will maintain it in efficiency and in decency, then the point is gained, and the greatest stroke of reconstruction that could be accomplished with regard to labour will have been accomplished. Permit me to repeat that it is such a self-evident proposition that it seems singular anybody should wish to call attention to it, but, practically, the principle has not yet been admitted. But when that time comes, in that one simple fact as set out by the American Federation of Labour, and as set out by all the recent authorities on political economy which I have been able to consult, will be found the solution of the problem. Trades unionism up to a few years ago was a criminal offence; but that the people should have the right to combine for the consideration of their own affairs and for their own protection was so self-evident that at last it was allowed. Then the time came when, to the wonderment of our people here, there was introduced in the old country by no less a man than Lloyd George himself the revolutionary measure of imposing a tax upon the site value, the unearned increment of idle land being appropriated by a supertax to the use of the state, in order that the fundamental principle of the worthiness of work should be finally recognized.

One thing more is necessary. I have here a Bill passed by the Imperial Parliament prescribing a minimum rate of wages during a limited period and repealing certain provisions of the Act relating to workers on war munitions. A Bill of that description fixing a minimum wage would be considered in this country such a tremendous step in advance that it would cause a great deal of trepidation. The minimum wage, however, has been discovered not to be the solution of the difficulty, for if a man receives ten dollars a day that is of no consequence if it does not provide him and his family of three children which is usually taken as the unit, with a proper standard of living. On the other hand, if he receives only one dollar a day and that provides him with the proper means of existence, it is enough; so that a minimum wage has really nothing to do with the case. The sole and only contention is that the lowest form of labour, since we must begin from some definite point, shall be considered entitled to a proper standard of living. That proposition

is not only economically sound, but surely all decent and Christian people will agree to it; and when it has been incorporated in legislation, as it undoubtedly will be in course of time, labour will have achieved what it has been striving for. It is trades unionism that is the hope of this world against Bolshevism. The trades unions are fighting Bolshevism. The trades unions are an organization of sensible labour men doing their level best. It was the trades unions that furnished more than half the men who fought the battles of this war. The Bolshevik would upset all organized labour of any kind. Therefore, it is time for the Government to pay due and proper attention to the contentions of the trades unions and endeavour to place them as nearly as possible upon a thoroughly sound and economic basis. But that basis must have in it the pure ethical spirit, for if it is going to be simply an economic system, if it is going to have simply the principle of taking what you can get—the old system of plunder—it is simply the curse of modern and industrial conditions known as profit. It seems to be a very absurd thing that anybody should speak against profit as I have done so many times in this House, but profit is the taking of that for which no equivalent is given, and the man who takes that for which he does not give an equivalent is a Bolshevik. We are asked to eliminate from the world these conditions, and to do away with that spirit of plunder, and in our dealing to restore a fair equivalent in trade or exchange. The establishment of so simple a thing as a standard of decent living for all honest, sensible men—for all these have to be fairly considered units of humanity, units in the industrial world—and the doing away with the desire to take what we can lay our hands on without regard to the justice of the case, means the making of a new world.

On motion of Mr. Duff the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Reid the House adjourned at 10.37 p.m.

Friday, February 28, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READING.

Bill No. 11, respecting the Central Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 12, respecting W. C. Edwards & Co., Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 13, respecting the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 14, respecting the Lachine, Jacques Cartier, and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill No. 15, respecting the Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Annual Report of the Department of Immigration and Colonization for the year 1918.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Report of the Minister of Agriculture for the year ending March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Crerar.

Report on the Agricultural Instruction Act, 1917-1918.—Hon. Mr. Crerar.

Report on the Dominion Experimental Farms for the fiscal year ending March 31 1918.—Hon. Mr. Crerar.

Report of the Canada Food Board from February 1 to December 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Crerar.

Regulations under the Destructive Insect and Pest Act.—Hon. Mr. Crerar.

Copy of the judgment and reasons of the Supreme Court of Canada in the case of George Edwin Gray, habeas corpus proceedings.—Sir Thomas White.

Copy of Mr. Justice Hodgin's report on the Northland inquiry.—Sir Thomas White.

Copy of a general order of the Supreme Court adopted on October 8, 1918, amending certain rules of the Supreme Court of Canada.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Copy of a Parliamentary Paper (C.D. 9212) received by His Excellency the Governor General from the Secretary of State for the Colonies on the subject of the extension of the armistice with Germany; also copy of the terms of the armistice with Turkey and of the armistice with Austria-Hungary.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Fifty-first annual report of the Fisheries Branch, Department of the Naval Service, 1917.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

Eighth annual report of the Department of Naval Service (English and French) for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1918.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

ORDERS IN COUNCIL.

Copies of certain Orders in Council were laid on the Table by Sir Thomas White and Hon. Mr. Rowell.

SELECT STANDING COMMITTEES.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals) presented the following report

of the special committee appointed to prepare and report, with all convenient speed, lists of members to compose the Select Standing Committees of the House during the present session:

No. 1.

ON PRIVILEGES AND ELECTIONS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (*York*),
Blake,
Boys,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Cannon,
Carvell,
Copp,
Crothers,
Davidson,
Demers,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
Fripp,
Guthrie,
Jacobs,
Keefer,
Lapointe (*Kamouraska*),
Lemieux,
McCoig,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McMaster,
Meighen,
Mowat,
Nickle,
Porter,
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Sifton,
Tweedie, and
Vien.—32.

No. 2.

ON RAILWAYS, CANALS AND TELEGRAPH LINES.

Messieurs:

Allan George,
Ames (Sir Herbert),
Anderson,
Andrews,
Archambault,
Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Arthurs,
Ballantyne,
Béland,
Blair,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Boyer,
Boys,
Bristol,
Buchanan,
Bureau,
Cahill,
Calder,
Campbell,
Cannon,
Carvell,
Casgrain,
Chabot,
Charlton,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clements,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Cooper,
Copp,
Crowe,
Cruise,
Currie,
d'Anjou,
Davidson,
Davis,
Déchêne,
Delisle,
Devlin,
Doherty,
Douglas (*Cape Breton*),
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
Edwards,
Elkin,
Ethier,
Fafard,
Fielding,
Fontaine,
Fournier,
Fraser,
Fripp,
Guthrie,
Harold,
Harrison,
Hay,
Henders,
Hepburn,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Kay,
Keefer,
Lalor,
Lanctôt,
Lapointe (*Kamouraska*),
Lapointe (*St. James*),
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
Long,
Mackie (*Edmonton*),
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
Maclean (*York*),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McGregor,
McLean (*Royal*),
McQuarrie,
Maharg,
Manion,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Marshall,
Martin,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Mowat,
Murphy,
Myers,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson (*Algoma*),
Nicholson (*Queens*),
Nickle,
Pardee,
Pelletier,
Porter,
Power,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Richardson,
Ross,
Savard,
Séguin,
Shaw,
Sheard,
Simpson,
Smith,
Stevens,
Stewart (*Hamilton*),
Stewart (*Lanark*),
Sutherland,
Thompson (*Weyburn*),
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Trahan,
Tudhope,
Vien,
Wallace,
Wilson (*Saskatoon*),
Wilson (*Wentworth*), and
Wright.—124.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-five Members.

No. 3

ON MISCELLANEOUS PRIVATE BILLS.

Messieurs:

Ames (Sir Herbert),
Anderson,
Armstrong (*York*),
Ballantyne,
Ball,
Blair,
Blake,
Bourassa
Boyer,
Boys,
Brien,
Bureau,
Butts,
Casselman,
Charters,
Cronyn,
Douglas (*Cape Breton*),
DuTremblay,
Ethier,
Euler,
Fortier,
Foster (*York*),
Fraser,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauthier,
Glass,
Green,
Guthrie,
Harrison,
Hepburn,
Hocken,
Kennedy,
Lafortune,
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
McGibbin (*Muskoka*)
McLean (*Royal*),
Marcil (*Bonaventure*),
Martin,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Parent,
Paul,
Peck,
Pedlow,
Power,
Prevost,
Proulx,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Richardson,
Robb,
Rowell,
Scott,
Sifton,
Steele,
Stewart (*Lanark*),
Thompson (*Hastings*),
Tobin, and
Wigmore.—60.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 4.

ON STANDING ORDERS.

Messieurs:

Armstrong (*Lambton*),
Brien,
Burrell,
Butts,
Chabot,
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Cruise,
Deslauriers,
Doherty,
Duff,
McGibbon (*Argenteuil*),
McGibbon (*Muskoka*),
McIsaac,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Mayrand,
Michaud,
Mowat,
Paul,
Seguin,

Euler,
Gervais,
Griesbach,
Hartt,
Hepburn,
Kemp ,
Maclean (*York*),
MacNutt,
Stacey,
Turgeon,
Verville,
Wallace,
White (Sir Thomas),
Wigmore, and
Wright.—34.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Seven Members.

No. 5.

ON PRINTING.

Messieurs:

Bowman,
Brouillard,
Buchanan,
Burnham,
Cardin,
Charters,
Clark (*Bruce*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Crowe,
Currie,
Fontaine,
Hocken,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Keefer,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
Michaud,
Murphy,
Prevost,
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Richardson,
Shaw,
Verville,
White (*Victoria*),
Wilson
(*Wentworth*) and
Wright.—25.

No. 6.

ON PUBLIC ACCOUNTS.

Messieurs:

Andrews,
Archambault,
Ball,
Best,
Bonnell,
Boys,
Bureau,
Calder,
Cannon,
Carvell,
Chaplin,
Charters,
Chisholm,
Copp,
Crerar,
Crothers,
Crowe,
Davidson,
Devlin,
Duff,
Edwards,
Fripp,
Fulton,
Gauvreau,
Griesbach,
Green,
Jacobs,
Kemp,
Lapointe (*Kamouraska*)
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
Maclean (*Halifax*),
McCoig,
McCrea,
McGregor,
McIsaac,
McMaster,
Maharg,
Meighen,
Merner,
Mewburn,
Michaud,
Middlebro,
Morphy,
Murphy,
Parent,
Proulx,
Redman,
Reid (*Grenville*),
Ross,
Scott,
Sheard,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Spinney,
Thomson (*Qu'Appelle*),
Tobin,
Tremain,
Tudhope,
Tweedie,
Verville,
Vien,
White
(Sir Thomas), and
Wigmore,—64.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 7.

ON BANKING AND COMMERCE.

Messieurs:

Allan,
Ames (Sir Herbert),
Argue,
Baldwin,
Best,
Bristol,
Burnham,
Calder,
Cardin,
Carvell,
Casgrain,
Chaplin,
Charlton,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clements,
Cockshutt,
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cronyn,
Currie,
d'Anjou,
Davis,
Déchêne,
Demers,
Denis,
Desaulniers,
Deslauriers,
Douglas (*Strathcona*),
DuTremblay,
Edwards,
Elkin,
Fielding,
Finley,
Fortier,
Foster (Sir George),
Foster (*York*),
Gauthier,
Gladu,
Glass,
Halladay,
Henders,
Hunt,
Jacobs ,
Johnston,
Kay,
Kemp,
Kennedy,
Lang,
Lavigueur,
Leduc,
Léger,
Lemieux,
Lesage,
Loggie,
Maclean (*Halifax*),
McCurdy,
McLeod,
McMaster,
McQuarrie,
Marshall,
Meighen,
Middlebro,
Molloy,
Nesbitt,
Nickle,
Pacaud,
Papineau,
Pardee,
Peck,
Pedlow,
Porter,
Redman,
Ross,
Sexsmith,
Sinclair (*Antigonish*),
Steele,
Stevens,
Stewart, (*Hamilton*),
Sutherland,
Thompson (*Yukon*),
Tobin,
Tolmie,
Trahan,
Tremain,
Tweedie,
Whidden,
White
(Sir Thomas), and
Wilson (*Saskatoon*).—88

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twenty-one Members.

No. 8.

ON AGRICULTURE AND COLONIZATION.

Messieurs:

Allan (George),
Anderson,
Argue,
Armstrong (*York*),
Armsrtong (*Lambton*),
Arthurs,
Baldwin,
Ball,
Best,
Blair,
Bolton,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Brien,
Brouillard,
Burrell,
Cahill,
Casselman,
Chisholm,
Clark (*Red Deer*),
Clarke (*Wellington*),
Cowan,
Crerar,
Cruise,
Davis,
Delisle,
Mackie (*Renfrew*),
Maclean (*York*),
MacNutt,
McCoig,
McCrea,
McCurdy,
McGibbon (*Muskoka*),
McGregor,
McIntosh,
McIsaac,
McLean (*Royal*),
McLeod,
Maharg,
Marcile (*Bagot*),
Marshall,
Mayrand,
Merner,
Molloy,
Morphy,
Myers,
Nicholson (*Algoma*),
Nicholson (*Queens*),
Paul,
Proulx,
Read (*Prince*),
Reid (*Mackenzie*),
Robb,

Denis,
Desaulniers,
Douglas *(Strathcona)*,
Edwards,
Finley,
Fournier,
Fulton,
Gervais,
Glass,
Halladay,
Harold,
Hay,
Henders,
Hughes (Sir Sam),
Hunt,
Johnston,
Kay,
Knox,
Lafortune,
Lanctôt,
Lang,
Léger,
Long,
Mackie *(Edmonton)*,
Savard,
Seguin,
Sexsmith,
Shaw,
Sifton,
Simpson,
Sinclair *(Antigonish)*,
Sinclair *(Queens, P.E.I.*
Smith,
Spinney,
Stacey,
Steele,
Sutherland,
Thompson *(Hastings)*,
Thompson *(Weyburn)*,
Thompson *(Yukon)*,
Thomson *(Qu'Appelle)*,
Tolmie,
Tremain,
Truax,
Wallace,
White *(Victoria)*, and
Wilson
(Wentworth).—101.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Twelve Members.

No. 9.

ON MARINE AND FISHERIES.

Messieurs:

Butts,
Cardin,
Chisholm,
Clark *(Bruce)*,
Clements,
Duff,
Fielding,
Gladu,
Hartt,
Hay,
Lang,
Lapointe *(St. James)*,
Léger,
Loggie,
Manion,
Martin,
Munson,
McIntosh,
McKenzie,
McQuarrie,
Nicholson *(Queens)*,
Pelletier,
Read *(Prince)*,
Rowell,
Sinclair *(Antigonish)*,
Sinclair *(Queens, P.E.I.)*
Spinney,
Stevens,
Trahan,
Truax,
Tudhope,
Turgeon, and
Wigmore.—33.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members.

No. 10.

ON MINES AND MINERALS.

Messieurs.

Arthurs,
Blake,
Bolton,
Bonnell,
Burrell,
Cahill,
Campbell,
Cochrane,
Cockshutt,
Déchêne,
Denis,
Fortier,
Green,
Griesbach,
Harrison,
Hartt,
Johnson,
Knox,
Lalor,
Lemieux,
Loggie,
Long,
Marcil *(Bonaventure)*,
Nesbitt,
Nicholson *(Algoma)*,
Pacaud,
Peck,
Pelletier,
Prevost,
Reid, *(Mackenzie)*,
Sexsmith,
Smith,
Thompson *(Yukon)*,
Tolmie, and
White *(Victoria)*—35.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

No. 11.

ON FORESTS, WATERWAYS AND WATER-POWERS.

Messieurs:

Argue,
Baldwin,
Bourassa,
Bowman,
Boyce,
Bureau,
Campbell,
Carvell,
Casselman,
Charlton,
Cochrane,
Cooper,
Cowan,
Ethier,
Fafard,
Finley,
Foster *(York)*,
Fraser,
Halladay,
Knox,
Mackie *(Edmonton)*,
Manion,
Michaud,
Pacaud,
Parent,
Power,
Redman,
Stewart *(Hamilton)*,
Thompson *(Hastings)*,
Thompson *(Weyburn)*,
White *(Victoria, Alta.)*
Wilson
(Saskatoon.)—32.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Ten Members

No 12.

OFFICIAL REPORT OF DEBATES.

Messieurs:

Ballantyne,
Burnham,
Chabot,
Devlin,
Elkin,
Foster (Sir George),
Kay,
Lemieux,
McKenzie,
McLeod,
Marcil *(Bonaventure)*,
Munson,
Nickle, and
Richardson.—14.

And that the Quorum of the said Committee do consist of Five Members

No 13.

ON THE LIBRARY.

Messieurs:

Andrews,
Béland,
Borden (Sir Robert),
Boyer,
Chaplin,
Clark *(Red Deer)*,
Cooper,
Copp,
Cronyn,
Crothers,
Foster (Sir George),
Harold,
Lapointe *(Kamouraska*
Lemieux,
Meighen,
Myers,
Pardee,
Rowell,
Sheard, and
Whidden.—20.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the report was concurred in.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That the Select Standing Committees of this House shall severally be empowered to examine and inquire into all such matters and things as may be referred to them by the House, and to report from time to time their observations and opinions thereon, with power to send for persons, papers and records, with the exception of the Committee on Debates and that on the Library of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE PRINTING OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their Honours that this House will unite with them in the formation of a joint committee of both Houses on the subject of the Printing of Parliament, and that the members of the Select Standing Committee on Printing, viz.: Messrs. Bowman, Brouillard, Buchanan, Burnham, Cardin, Charters, Clark (Bruce), Clarke (Wellington), Crowe, Currie, Fontaine, Hocken, Hughes (Sir Sam), Keefer, Maclean (Halifax), Michaud, Murphy, Prevost, Reid (Mackenzie), Richardson, Shaw, Verville, White (Victoria), Wilson (Wentworth), and Wright, will act as members on the part of this House on the said Joint Committee on the Printing of Parliament.

Motion agreed to.

THE LIBRARY OF PARLIAMENT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That a message be sent to the Senate to inform their Honours that this House has appointed Messrs. Andrews, Beland, Borden (Sir Robert), Boyer, Chaplin, Clark (Red Deer), Cooper, Copp, Cronyn, Crothers, Foster (Sir George), Harold, Lapointe (Kamouraska), Lemieux, Meighen, Myers, Pardee, Rowell, Sheard, and Whidden, a committee to assist His Honour the Speaker, in the direction of the Library of Parliament, so far as the interests of the House of Commons are concerned, and to act on behalf of the House of Commons as members of a Joint Committee of both Houses on the Library.

Motion agreed to.

THE PARLIAMENTARY RESTAURANT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That Messrs. Douglas (Strathcona), Steele and Stewart be appointed to assist the Speaker in the direction of the restaurant, in so far as the interests of this House are concerned, and that a message be sent to the Senate to acquaint their honours therewith.

ALLEGED TRADE DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, I desire to draw the attention of the Government to a matter of national importance contained in a special despatch published in yesterday's Toronto Globe, and to ask a question with reference thereto. The despatch in question reads:

London, Feb. 26.—Overseas representatives are interested in John Bull's slashing article. "Shall We Lose Canada?" in which the editor protests against the price being paid for the support of America and condemns importation restrictions which give advantages to Scandinavia and the United States. The article contains a number of specific instances which apparently could be obtainable only through official Canadian channels, and which give point to the renewed attempts of the Trade Commission to have the restrictions removed.

Canadian Feeling Bitter.

The Globe correspondent finds that the feeling among some of the Canadians is bitter. They are urging Sir Robert Borden to take official action to bring the situation to a crisis and have a general clearing up. But there is still hope that this can be brought about without a quarrel in the Imperial family.

There have been some ludicrous incidents, such as the refusal to admit certain business calendars for free distribution, the printing of which had been refused here owing to war limitations, and which the authorities were consequently compelled to print in Canada. On their arrival the British authorities decided they could not be admitted for two years, and the matter is still under consideration.

There are other instances, such as Canadian boots, wallpapers, and other articles which are refused admission, but American and Scandinavian goods are coming in without stay. Canadians feel that if the regulations applied generally to all there could be no protest, but as now enforced there is real discrimination against them.

I desire to ask the Acting Prime Minister if the Government has any information regarding the matters referred to in the despatch, and if so will the hon. gentleman impart that information to the House?

Hon. Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would direct the attention of my hon. friend to my answer yesterday to a question asked by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb), dealing with the same subject. The Government has no official information respecting the matter in question, and I am satisfied, as I stated yesterday, that Great Britain has not discriminated and will not discriminate against the interests of Canada in regard to trade relations.

Mr. MURPHY: Has the hon. gentleman made inquiries since yesterday?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I despatched a cable last evening asking for any information that would bear on the subject but have received no reply.

DEATH OF AUDITOR GENERAL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Can the Acting Premier tell us when we may expect the Auditor General's Report?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The deputy minister informed me only yesterday that he has a letter from the Auditor General explaining to the House why it would not be possible immediately to lay the report of the Auditor General on the Table. I am very sorry to have to announce to the House to-day that we have received word that the Auditor General has passed away. He went to Florida a short time ago for his health and died there.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East) for an address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session resumed from Thursday, February 27.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg.) In rising to address the House, Mr. Speaker, on the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Redman) and seconded by the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), I feel my inability to deal with the subjects contained in the Address from the Throne, but as a representative of the people of this country I feel it my duty to call the attention of the House to certain facts. Before doing so, Mr. Speaker, if you will permit me, I would like to add my word of praise for the able, eloquent and moderate manner in which the mover and the seconder of the Address placed their views before the House. Before proceeding with the subject matter contained in the Address from the Throne, as delivered by His Excellency the Governor General, would you allow me on behalf of the loyal citizens of Lunenburg county, which I have the honour to represent in this House, to convey to His Excellency the great joy expressed by the people of that county on the success of the Allied armies at the front.

May I also place on Hansard the deep and profound regret of the people of that district at the loss to the country of that eminent statesman, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. As so many fine tributes have been paid to his worth and memory by all classes and creeds in this great country, it is not necessary for me to reiterate what has already been enunciated. As has been well said, his life has been an ideal which every Canadian boy should endeavour to emulate, and if they follow his illustrious example the next generation will be a higher type of men.

During the past few days I have received a number of telegrams and letters from different parts of Nova Scotia, asking me to convey to the hon. gentleman from North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) the congratulations of the Liberals of Nova Scotia on the honour which has been done them by his selection as leader of the Liberal party. In one of the letters which I received I find the following, which I think is worth reading to the House:

> How sweet the name McKenzie sounds
> In every Liberal's ears,
> It soothes our sorrows, heals our wounds,
> And drives away our fears.

There has been a good deal said in some of the reptile press of this country during the past few days as to what happened when the Liberal party assembled in caucus to select our leader. I do not wish to divulge the secrets of that caucus, but I wish to say that the stories in these papers are untrue. The utmost harmony prevailed, and I say—and I think I speak on behalf of the English speaking Liberals of the Liberal party of this country when I say it—that we feel that we owe to the French Canadian Liberals of this country a debt of gratitude for the action which they took at that caucus. I never shall forget the fairness, broadmindedness and sense of justice of these gentlemen, and I am pleased to call the French Canadian Liberals in this House my brothers.

Mr. Speaker, I now turn for a few moments to the speech delivered by His Excellency to the honourable gentleman of the Senate and the honourable gentlemen of this House and I wish for a few moments to discuss some of the matters contained therein. We are all in perfect accord with His Excellency's remarks with regard to the conclusion of the war. For more than four years the Empire was in the throes of the greatest war the world has ever known and the prayers of a thankful people went up to the Most High when the telegraph wires on November 11 conveyed to many anxious hearts the news that the armistice had been signed. Of Canada's part, Sir, in that great struggle, other honourable gentlemen have told us and I am in perfect agreement with the eloquent remarks on this subject as expressed by the Acting Prime Minister, Sir Thomas White.

The Acting Prime Minister, in his well timed remarks, paid just tribute to the work of the British, French and Canadian forces, and his remarks especially with regard to the Canadian Expeditionary force were in good taste. I was rather surprised

however, Mr. Speaker, that no mention was made by the honourable gentleman of the great part which another nation took in this struggle, and it seems rather strange indeed that the Acting Prime Minister, speaking as he really did not only for the Government of this country but the people of this country, that he did not pay a just tribute to our sister nation to the south. Without being caustic in my remarks, Mr. Speaker, I trust that the honourable gentleman has not gone back to the position which he took in 1911 when he did not desire "any truck or trade with the Yankees." The United States financiers treated the honourable gentleman with the greatest courtesy and respect when he was compelled to go to them a few years ago to borrow money to finance this country and her war effort and I trust his omission with reference to the United States' part in the war was not due to the fact that the financiers of that nation at last refused to grant us further advances. Since the honourable gentleman has not dealt with the great part played by the people of the United States in the last few years, might I, Mr. Speaker, for a few moments speak of what they have done. It is true there was some criticism of that great country, because she did not at once plunge into the war after the sinking of the great liner Lusitania with the loss of so many lives. Previous to that, however, the United States had been doing a great work and in the first two years of the war and in fact during the whole period of the war, if it had not been for the whole-hearted support that that country gave the Allies in supplying them with munitions, guns, food, etc., the issue might possibly have been settled in a way which none of us desired.

It is not for any of us to criticise the actions of that great man and that great democrat, Woodrow Wilson. He had a difficult task to perform and when the time was ripe and when practically the whole nation was at his back, he gave the word with the result that hundreds of thousands of gallant American lads were hurried to France to fight in the great cause in which the allied countries were engaged. We must take off our hats, Mr. Speaker, to that great country. I am not saying too much when I say that no other country in so short a time placed so many men on the field of battle. It is quite true that the first expeditionary force from England, the old contemptibles, was in the fighting line three weeks after war had been declared, and here I might also have a word of congratulation for a previous Minister of Militia for the expeditious manner in which he despatched the first contingent from this country. To show the appreciation of the English people for the help given by the United States, I have much pleasure in reading the following from the London Morning Post:

> The London Morning Post states that the arrivals of American troops during the past few days have eclipsed all records. It is a shipping feat which has never been equalled in maritime annals. General March, the Chief of Staff of the American Army, is the authority for the statement that there are now over eight hundred thousand American troops in France. That probably means that there are well over a million men overseas. The despatch of troops from the United States during the last three months has been limited only by the shipping capacity. Every ship that sails which is at all suitable for carrying troops is loaded down with soldiers. During a recent month, as many as two hundred and fifty thousand men were despatched from American shores, and American papers state that soon the last of the sixteen National Army Divisions will be overseas, or on the way. It is the knowledge the Germans have that this great army, the pick of America's young manhood, is on the scene ready to replenish the Forces of Freedom which is forcing Hindenburg to make his desperate and costly attempts to win a decision.

Hhe above, Mr. Speaker, is only a just tribute to the people of that great country, and I only regret, Sir,—

Mr. SPEAKER: I, with exceeding regret, feel it my duty to direct the attention of the hon. member to a rule of this House which is as old as the House itself, and which says that the reading of speeches is not permissible. I think the House will bear me out in saying that the Chair has always been inclined to be exceedingly lenient in the matter of copious notes being used by members, but the hon. gentleman is going far beyond the bounds in reading his speech verbatim. I must ask him to put himself in order and to adhere more closely to the rule of the House in this regard.

Mr. DUFF: I submit to your ruling, of course, Mr. Speaker, but I have only been following the example which was set by the hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), who read closely from his written speech, and also the example of the mover and seconder of the resolution, who did the same thing. However, I shall endeavour, Mr. Speaker, to carry out your wishes as far as possible. I am only sorry that my capacity for public speaking does not permit me to express my thoughts in a manner which would do justice to the American heroes of Chateau Thiery and the other battles in France and Flanders in which the American armies took part. We

are proud to pay a just tribute to these gallant men and the people of both countries feel that the blood which was spilt during the last two years in France has cemented the English-speaking people in a bond which will never be broken. Of the noble part played by our own heroes in this great war enough cannot be said. Their efforts were appreciated by every allied nation and Canada has taken her rightful position in the sun on account of their gallant deeds.

It is gratifying to me, Mr. Speaker, as it is gratifying to every Canadian, to know that steps will be taken to properly protect these heroes. Especially should this be true of the wounded and sick who are coming home now on every steamer. It is our country's duty to see that during the remainder of their lives proper protection is given them and Canadians will vie with one another in placing these wounded heroes in a position where they will not feel that Canada has not appreciated their noble efforts. As to the boys who are returning physically fit, Mr. Speaker, I would like to say that after conversing with a number of them I have come to the conclusion that they deeply resent anything which would tend to make the public think that they are objects of charity. These boys who have fought for four years in the muddy trenches of France have endured terrible sufferings and discomforts and are able to take their place in civil life with the best of us, and I feel confident that after they have been discharged and have returned to civil life that we may expect great things of them. "They have finished the fight, they have kept the faith," and they have made the world safe for democracy.

Before concluding my remarks with reference to the returned soldiers, I would like to address a word of advice to the gentlemen in charge of the department which has to deal with demobilization, and I do it not in a critical spirit, but in the best interests of the soldiers and our country. There is a great deal of complaining amongst the soldiers disembarking at the port of Halifax on account of the fact that they cannot get their discharge in a few days after their arrival on this side of the water, and this fact, Mr. Speaker, is creating more unrest than perhaps the hon. gentlemen of the Government realize. As a frequent visitor to the city of Halifax, I have come in touch with a number of the boys who have this complaint to make, and if you will allow me for a few minutes I would like to tell of one specific case.

[Mr. Duff.]

Five weeks ago a young man returned on the Aquitania. He got permission from the authorities at Halifax to go to his home for a week. He came to see me about a business matter and said that he had a chance to purchase a business and that he was going to Halifax to endeavour to get his discharge. About three weeks after that while walking on one of the streets of Halifax I happened to see this young man and he was still in khaki. I asked him why he had not received his discharge and he said he did not know. He explained that he had applied to the authorities four times but he had got no satisfaction. It seems that the men were paraded every morning at nine o'clock, the roll was called and they were then free to wander through the streets of Halifax until nine o'clock the next morning. The business that the young man was anxious to acquire was purchased by somebody else and to-day he is out of a position. Shortly after having spoken with this young man in Halifax, I happened to meet one of the officers who has charge of the demobilization and I made it my business to ask him what good reason there was for these soldiers being kept for three weeks or a month after they came home. His reply to me was: "In the first place there is too much red tape. In the second place, sometimes when a steamer arrives the necessary documents are not on board, and we have to wait until the arrival of the next steamer from the Old Country." I said: "That does not seem to me sufficient reason; is there any better explanation?" He replied: "There are other reasons," and he gave this as one of them: "Sometimes," he said, " the men when they arrive in this country have overdrawn their monthly pay, and they are kept by the Halifax military authorities in Halifax until such time as they have worked the overpayment off." Another case he told me was to this effect: A young man arrived, and when he reached the demobilization station he was minus his rifle, which was worth $35. The authorities kept that man there thirty days, and in addition to paying him so that he could reimburse the cost of the rifle, this country had to feed him. Mr. Speaker, is this not a ridiculous state of affairs to have in connection with the demobilization of our troops? I draw the attention of the Minister of Militia to these facts in order to see if he cannot speed up the present procedure.

The speech from the Throne announces that a Bill relating to the franchise for women, and conferring on them the privilege of sitting in Parliament, is to be in-

troduced. Such an Act as that, Sir, meets with my humble approval, and nothing will give me greater pleasure than to have at some future date one of the fair sex as a desk mate.

The leader of the Opposition in his remarks dealt in suitable terms with the War-time Elections Act. I submit, Sir, that this Act should be repealed before any other legislation dealing with the franchise is introduced. Regarding the proposed Franchise Act, I am entirely in accord with the remarks made by my leader when he referred to the Franchise Act which was in force in Canada for a number of years previous to the enactment of the War-time Elections Act. That law has worked very well in the province of Nova Scotia, and if you will bear with me for a moment, Sir, I will explain to you how voters' lists are made up in that province. The lists are compiled in the towns, cities and counties in this manner. In every town there are three revisors appointed, who may be one year in the proportion of two Conservatives to one Liberal, and in the following year in the proportion of two Liberals to one Conservative. In the rural districts the municipal council appoints a revisor for each district. As you know, Sir, in political matters in Nova Scotia we are pretty evenly divided, and consequently every year one party has as many revisors as the other. These men get together and prepare the voters' lists. When they have performed that duty the list is submitted and if there are any complaints, or if there is any person who wants redress, he can apply to the sheriff of the county, to have his name placed on the list, or to have other names, which should not be there, struck off. This system has worked very well in the province of Nova Scotia for the last twenty-five years. Indeed so satisfactory has its operation been that in my county I cannot recall any application in the course of twenty-five years to the sheriff for redress. Under the circumstances, Sir, to depart from such a system as that would, in my opinion, be a waste of public money. After the lists are made up by the local revisors they are placed in the hands of the municipal clerk for every county, from whom the Secretary of State receives a copy of the list for federal purposes. The county clerk receives for his trouble one-half cent per name, so that it is quite apparent that the prevailing system in Nova Scotia is a very cheap and effective method of preparing the lists, much cheaper and better than the method adopted in the last election. I respectfully submit, Sir, that a large amount of money will be saved for the tax-payers of this country if the federal authorities will adopt that system and I am sure that every citizen of this country, who is interested in safe-guarding the financial interests of the country will want to have this work done as cheaply as possible.

With respect to the announcement that a Bill providing for federal aid towards highways is to be introduced, I would like to say that any moneys to be voted by the House for this purpose should be gifts outright to each province, and that no string should be attached thereto. A year or two ago some of our newspapers were advocating the construction of a national highway. That, Mr. Speaker, might be a very wise thing to do under happier circumstances if the condition of the national finances permitted, but, in my opinion, nothing like this should be done at the present time. Any money granted by this Government to the different provinces should be expended on the present highways in order that the great farming industry might enjoy better roads on which to transport their products to the different markets.

The speech from the Throne declares that Canadian financial and commercial stability has been well maintained. To that statement, Mr. Speaker, I regret to have to take exception. I feel that a great many people in Canada are not at all satisfied with the way in which the Government has handled the public money. In their minds unnecessary expenditures have been made, and new departments created which have not been a benefit in any sense of the term. A previous speaker has referred to the fact that an hon. member from a Nova Scotia constituency was appointed Parliamentary Secretary to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, but resigned in disgust after holding the office for a few months. After tendering his resignation to the Government the hon. gentleman in question issued a statement which makes very interesting reading, and with your permission, Mr. Speaker, I would like to have that statement placed on Hansard. It is taken from the Halifax Herald, and reads as follows:

Why F. B. McCurdy, M.P., Resigned His Position.

Too much delay and too little Progress made in preparing for Rehabilitation of our Overseas Soldiers and Solving Problem of their Return.

Halifax, November 28.—F. B. McCurdy, M.P., returned yesterday from Ottawa where he has been serving the government in various capacities. Formerly Mr. McCurdy was parliamentary

secretary of the Militia Department. After the formation of Union Government his activities were transferred to the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. Mr. McCurdy tendered his resignation on September 17th last. Yesterday when asked for his reasons, he stated that in his opinion the department was not making sufficient progress in developing a comprehensive plan for dealing with the returned soldiers' problems and as the scope of his authority was indefinite and undefined, he could not consent to continue in a nominal office and be held at all responsible for the failures, if any, of the department that might result. In the opinion of Mr. McCurdy, the problems of the department, which are increasing daily, have not been sufficiently anticipated and provided for. Where the work of that department needed the co-operation and assistance of other departments, he believes, there has been insufficient co-ordination.

The Parliamentary Committee's report on Pensions, for instance, has not been heard of since it was presented to Parliament in May last, and "I doubt," said Mr. McCurdy, "if my colleagues on that committee will consider such inaction on the part of the Government as justified or in the best public interest. In resigning and registering my objections, I have felt that this view might be emphasized to the ultimate advantage of invalided and returning soldiers and the public generally."

Mr. McCurdy says that he fully recognized the grave difficulties and problems with which all departments were faced, and that in retiring, he had no recriminations or criticisms of a personal character to offer. He felt, however, that greater and more satisfactory results could be had by facing and promptly solving our problems with courage and despatch, and by anticipating the future more than has been the habit in some departments.

"One of the lessons of the war," Mr. McCurdy said, "has been the need of preparation in all public matters, but we now find that the problems of demobilization and reconstruction have come, after all, with embarrassing surprise to many departments, as will be evident shortly if our battalions are not to be kept unnecessarily long in public service and pay.

"The general preparation for peace conditions," Mr. McCurdy added, "has not, in my opinion, received sufficiently earnest attention at the hands of the Government, and this fact must be disturbing to business men and labour, besides being embarrassing to the Acting Prime Minister. In Ottawa, it is freely stated that the cabinet committee formed for the express purpose of trade development or reconstruction on a peace basis has not made progress. Now, taken by surprise, trade commissions are being hurried to London and other commercial centres but it must be disturbing to Canadian industries and business men generally that so much valuable time has been lost. As Dr. Cutten, of Acadia College, so well stated recently: 'In time of war prepare for peace'." It has been known that peace was coming; only its time and terms were at all uncertain.

In concluding his statement, Mr. McCurdy said: "While willing to serve in any capacity assigned me, I have come to the conclusion that I can in the circumstances better serve in a private capacity, and from the point of view of a citizen and a business man, it will be my duty to urge the Government to greater activity and courage in all things."

The foregoing is Mr. McCurdy's statement, Mr. Speaker, and there must have been something very wrong to have induced so strong a party man to tender his resignation. Under the circumstances, it seems to me that an explanation is due from the Government.

Another position, Mr. Speaker, was created, and another hon. member from Nova Scotia who was taken into the Government received that position and became known as the chairman of the Reconstruction Committee. To me the word "reconstruction," used in that sense, is a misnomer. Reconstruction means the rebuilding of something that has been destroyed; if a house burns down, it is reconstructed or rebuilt. Nothing has happened since this gentleman was appointed to justify the creation of such a position. The Acting Prime Minister referred to this position in connection with the returned soldiers. I can unde stand that there are conditions in the country which require readjustment, but there is no occasion for reconstruction, unless it be in connection with the explosion in Halifax, which was the result of the gross negligence and carelessness of the naval authorities of that port and which destroyed half the city and killed or injured from 20,000 to 30,000 people. If the chairman of that so-called Reconstruction Committee wants something to do, I would respectfully direct his attention to the fact that the claims of some of the people of that city are not being settled as fast as it is desirable. I understand that businessmen who suffered heavily through the destruction of cars of goods which were loaded to be sent out of the city and cars which had arrived have not yet had their claims adjusted. As every businessman needs every dollar due him, immediate steps should be taken by the Government to see that these claims are adjusted and paid. With reference to the appointment of that gentleman who is acting as chairman of the Reconstruction Committee it is evident that he is not worked very hard in that department. During the past nine months, or ever since his appointment, he has been acting minister in practically every branch of the Government. One newspaper writer referred to him as the maid-of-all-work. Well, I do not want to say anything about him quite so harsh as that, but knowing him as I do, I know that he is a good-natured gentleman and it is too bad that they have been taking advantage of his good nature by sending him from "Dan to Beersheba."

I wish to refer for a moment to another department of the Government—or another

branch of a department, I do not know which. My attention was directed to this by an advertisement which I saw in the Truro Daily News. When I received this paper I noticed that on the margin, close to the advertisement, the following words were written: "Can't you stop this nonsense?" I will read to the House this advertisement as it appeared in the Truro Daily News, and probably in every other Unionist paper from Vancouver to Halifax, at considerable cost to the ratepayers of this country. It is as follows:

The "Why" in Fish Prices.

"Why is the price of halibut so high?" The question is often asked.

The public is itself responsible. It has put halibut into the luxury class. Many people never bought red cod, flounder, plaice, witch or drill in their lives, nor asked for them.

Each of these is as delicate and as satisfying as the fish of their choice and habit.

From 30 to 40 per cent of the catch on halibut lines is cod that has to be thrown away. The cost of a sea fishing cruise has to come out of about 70,000 pounds, where it might be spread over 400,000 pounds if all fish taken were used and eaten. Retail cost would slump at once.

You cannot blame the fisherman for throwing away cod and other fish for which the public do not ask. He has to gratify the public: it is a fickle master.

The Canada Food Board aims to end this waste by making facts known to the people.

Meanwhile "there's plenty of good fish in the sea."

Canada Food Board,
Ottawa.

For the Government, through their Food Board, to issue such ridiculous nonsense is a matter of great concern. It shows conclusively that some person connected with the Canada Food Board has insulted the intelligence of the people of this country. Any one who ever heard tell of a codfish knows that it is one of the most valuable and most palatable fish caught in the Atlantic. The person in the employ of the Government who sent that notice to the public should lose his job within twenty-four hours; he is not fit to hold it.

I noticed also an editorial in the Yarmouth Herald referring to another statement sent out by this Food Board, and I think that this editorial should find a place on Hansard. The editorial reads as follows:

Recently a report was sent out, signed by a member of the Canada Food Board in which it gave the public the positive reason for the high cost of halibut and which displayed unpardonable ignorance regarding that fishery. It stated that the sole reason why the price of that food commodity held so high was due to the fact that the fishermen in the prosecution of the halibut fisheries were very sorely hampered by the smaller fish such as cod, haddock and other shack, all of which had to be returned to the sea. In consequence only small fares of halibut were taken at a trip and the high prices were necessary to assure the fishermen a paying return. That report was issued several weeks ago, and owing to the absurdity of the statement was probably thrown to the waste baskets with little or no comment. The report so published no doubt started a thought of just where the officials preparing such statements may have come from, for it is hard to conceive of a man of Canadian birth signing such a statement. Yet it was done, and only a few days ago the following statement was issued by the Food Board, which also shows that the department is gaining little or no enlightenment re Canadian Atlantic coast fisheries:

"As an instance of difficulties under which the fisherman of Nova Scotia are working this winter," says a Canada Food Board statement, "the loss of gear on the codfish banks by trawlers catching their trawl nets on vessels sunk by German submarines last fall may be cited. Many cases have occurred since fishing was resumed on the codfish banks off the Nova Scotia coast, and fishermen are very bitter, as while the sunken wrecks remain, these banks will be impossible to fish. When trawls are lost in this way, it means an amount of about $3,000. Despite this discouragement, however, Nova Scotia fishermen are endeavouring to increase production of codfish this winter, and the Canada Food Board urges a greater consumption of this staple Canadian fish."

Can any reader, with the slightest knowledge of the fisheries, see through such a statement? Of all the vessels which fell victim to the German submarines, there were not more than ten acually sunk directly on the fishing banks, and even if they were, what difference would their wreckage make to trawl gear? Absolutely none whatever, yet the Food Board in ignorance of the real facts allows such statements to be published and given to the public. With such reports going broadcast over the Dominion the fishermen, we feel, have a stronger plea than ever before for the appointment of a Fisheries Commission to be composed of men who have all their years made a study of the fisheries, not only from a scientific basis but from a practical standpoint as well. Not until such is done will it be possible for the ministers at the heads of the departments to be in a position to deal with the many difficult problems which from time to time confront them on the fishery question. It is also a matter which the fishermen should most urgently demand, for the publication of such absurd statements as the above makes a huge joke out of one of Canada's most important industries.

I contend, Mr. Speaker, that the Canada Food Board has served no useful purpose, except it be the fact that for the last six months it compelled the people of this country to eat a great deal of bran and middlings. It is also quite true that they made a poor Chinese restaurant keeper in this city pay a fine of $100 for placing a bowl containing sugar before one of his guests, while they took no steps to reduce the price of the bacon which the restaurant keeper served to the same guest. "One law for the Chinese, and another for the bacon hog."

Then there is another department which is known as the Department of Public In-

formation. This department, a great many people are of the opinion, was created to boost the Government, and to show what some of the people of this country think of the work this department is doing, I read the following clipping from one of the Toronto papers:

"The Department of Public Information is another fountain of wisdom which showers blessings on a large number of unattached or lightly attached journalists. It began with large ambitions which have been considerably whittled by circumstances. It had no less a purpose than to hand out all the news to all the newspapermen—scientifically predigested, of course—and thus to control the press of Canada. What upset this little scheme, which had its origin in the teeming brain of Leader Rowell, was the objection of certain newspapers to taking coloured news from anybody, and a similar objection by the Ottawa correspondents to this rubber-stamp way of doing their work. Moreover, jealousies arose in the Cabinet. The ministers objected to any one man, however pure, giving the thing his own slant.

So the Department of Public Information drew in its horns. Occasionally it makes a feeble gesture when it hands out a parboiled despatch from Argyll House, but mostly it contents itself with keeping a scrapbook for the Cabinet ministers and printing a weekly "Official Canadian Record" which nobody takes, although the subscription is nothing a year. The "Official Canadian Record" is made up of stale news scalped from the dailies, bum puffs of the Government, blue book hash, and rose-water statistics. Once in a while it offers a bit of owlish advice, as, for instance, the last number, which admonishes sufferers from the "flu" to keep their windows open. A good tip. Let us all keep our windows, our bowels and our minds open, and we shall be a happy, healthy people, Union Government or not."

Another costly experiment for the people of this country was the Canadian Registration Act. It was a useless expenditure of public money and had no beneficial results. This has been acknowledged by every well-thinking person in Canada, and I wish to place on Hansard the opinion of the Montreal Gazette with regard to this costly farce:—

The Canada Registration Act has been suspended. Announcement to that effect comes from Ottawa. It will no longer be necessary to carry a registration card. Any man or woman happening to have one of those interesting souvenirs is at liberty to destroy it. The Registration Act, like the no-strike order, has, it is assumed, 'served its purpose.' The value of this registration business was questioned at its inception. As an inventory of manpower it was as useless as the previous count made by the National Service Board, and for the same reason, namely, that it provided no means whereby the information obtained could be put to practical use. There was, it is recalled, the sapient suggestion that the registration would facilitate the enforcement of the Military Service Act. The hope that it would so operate was based upon the theory that slackers who had determined to evade the draft would walk meekly into the office of the nearest registrar and confess their eligibility. One hopes that this confidence was not misplaced. What is recalled of the registration is that it put the people of Canada to considerable inconvenience, that it created much confusion, that it imposed upon the population an extra and useless obligation at a time when necessary restrictions and regulations were sufficiently numerous, and that it involved the country in a doubtful expenditure when every dollar of public money was urgently required for war purposes. The people registered on the assumption that they were contributing to the country's war effort. They have yet to learn of any substantial practical purpose having been served by the registration. The suspension of the Act may have been necessary as a formality. It makes no difference otherwise.

This article, coming from such an important newspaper as the Montreal Gazette, a newspaper which supported the previous Government, that is the Borden Government of 1911 to 1917, and which has supported this Government since then, deserves serious consideration on the part of the Government.

The hon. member (Mr. Redman) who moved the resolution in support of the speech from the Throne referred to the fact that the Prime Minister was at present in France attending the Peace Conference. Conflicting reports have come to us as to the value of the services being rendered by the Prime Minister in this connection. I am not in a position to state as to what is the Prime Minister's status at this great conference, but it is quite evident
4 p.m. that some of the newspapers in this country are not carried away by the work which the Premier is supposed to be doing. There is a story in the Good Book which tells of a man who sat by a certain gate waiting for the "crumbs which fell from the rich man's table," and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that Canada has been placed in that humiliating position by the members of this Government who are at present in Paris.

I submit, Sir, that our case would be very much stronger if it had been submitted in writing by the Prime Minister to Premier Lloyd George, setting forth our claims, and that after he had discussed the matter fully with the Premier of Great Britain he could have returned to Canada and looked after and attended to the government of this country.

A short time ago a report was published in the newspapers that the Premier was engaged in settling the boundary lines between Greece and Rumania. That, to my mind, was no compliment to this great country, and it is to be hoped that the day is not far distant when the different members of the Government, who are at present

in a foreign land, will return and look after the business of their departments.

I was greatly interested, Mr. Speaker, in listening to the statements made by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) in his speech on Wednesday, relative to public expenditures which are proposed by the Government. It is certainly a very large order, and in the expenditure of such large amounts I trust that the minister will act as the "watch dog" of the treasury. Part of the programme as outlined by him, is one of shipbuilding, and I wish to protest strongly on the floor of this House against the Government's going into the shipbuilding business. It seems to me that they are developing political hysteria, as they would never think of such a project in view of the fact that it is doubtful if there is one member of the Government who has any practical knowledge of this great industry. I also doubt if there is one of the members of the Cabinet who knows the cathead of a ship from the dog watch, the cow's tail from the horse pipe, the ring stopper from the wheel box, the port watch from the chronometer, the jump stay from the stop water, the royal yard from the foot ropes, the ratlines from the mousings, or the cats paw from the thoroughfoot; and yet these hon. gentlemen propose to enter a business, a knowledge of which it takes years to acquire. Then, again they should remember that when the war started and when Lloyd George told us that the demand was for ships and more ships, in addition to the shipyards already in Canada, old shipyards were re-opened, and the business men and shipwrights of Canada proceeded to do their bit in winning the war by carrying out the wishes of the Premier of Great Britain. They did not ask for any favours from the Government, but they have established their businesses on a business basis, and have sold their ships in the open market. Is it fair, Sir, that after these people have invested large sums of money and established their business, the Government should now come in and propose to interfere with them? I would think that the bungling and the gross extravagance on the part of the Naval Department in the last few years, in purchasing ships, should have sickened the Government when one of their members made such a ridiculous proposition. I can only say, Sir, that "they know not what they do."

The Minister of Public Works, in outlining his policy, declared that his own idea was to provide work for the labourers of Canada. It is evident that he has had a change of heart since August last when he threatened the mine and steel workers of Nova Scotia with the importation of coolie labour. The following is an extract from the Halifax Herald of Tuesday, August 30, 1918, from which it is quite evident that the labour people did not agree with the Minister of Public Works:

Halifax, August 30.—The labour leaders' attitude towards the pronouncement of Hon. Frank Carvell favoring the introduction of coolie labour was emphatically stated to The Herald last night by Tom Moore, general representative of the United Brotherhood of Carpenters, who is in the city acompanied by P. M. Draper, secretary of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada: A. Bastien, union organizer, of Montreal, and H. J. Halford, of Hamilton, vice-president of the Barbers' Union of America. They had just returned from a thorough investigation of conditions at the mines in Cape Breton.

Our answer to Mr. Carvell, said Mr. Moore, is that coolie labour is not needed, and the minute a Chinaman or Coolie enters a mine to work, that moment the miners of Cape Breton down tools and walk out. Continuing, Mr. Moore said, that Hon. Frank Carvell should have informed himself of conditions at the mines before as a public man, condemning the miners as unpatriotic. Mr. Moore said we have personally visited the mines in Cape Breton, and discussed the situation with hundreds of the men. We found that in the smaller mines of the Dominion Coal Company that the men claim there is sufficient help to work to capacity the present rooms. In the large pit head, known as Dominion No. 2, more men could be employed. The situation there, however, is that owing to lack of transportation, the coal at present being produced cannot be handled and taken away, and unless something is done immediately the possibility is that a very large proportion of the present help will have to be laid off during the winter months when there is no water-borne freight.

The labour leader explaining the reason for this serious outlook, said: At the present time there is between 200,000 and 300,000 tons of coal banked at the mines, and considerable fear is entertained by the management that it may become a total loss through spontaneous combustion, and measures are being taken to open up the heap so as to ward off disaster if possible.

What this enormous pile of coal means may be gathered when it is understood that the average production of a miner working at the face head is from 7 to 12 tons per day, but when the surface help and other labour is included, the coal produced does not represent more than two tons per day per head of the men employed at the mines.

Therefore, if you take 200,000 tons as the minimum of the pile, and it certainly is more, that represents 100,000 working days for one man, or 100 working days for 1,000 men. In other words it represents the output of 1,000 men for over three months. In the past this pile has always been cleared away in the summer when there was plenty of transportation by rail and water—and then the men were kept on all winter producing coal for another pile, which would be moved in the spring, when navigation was resumed. If the present pile is not removed the outlook is that the mines will have to close down this winter, and instead

of importing coolie labour, Hon. Frank Carvell will have to find employment for the miners of Cape Breton.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that we were all interested in the address of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), and it was certainly a work of art for fence straddling. Following a course not unskilfully indicated by the Acting Prime Minister, the Minister of Immigration deprecated party politics. As I understand his attitude, politics is a game which, when the country is progressing favourably and peacefully may be indulged in, but which is out of place in times of stress and strain. It is to be regretted that this minister of the Crown, with such a long experience in public life, has such a low idea of politics. It does little honour to himself and surely less than justice to the political atmosphere in which for a number of years past he has lived and moved and had his being, of which indeed he receives the credit of having been in large measure the mainspring and the real, if not the apparent leader. He does less than justice to that atmosphere, I repeat, because during the last few weeks we have seen a minister of the Crown in another province, Mr. Motherwell, leave the responsibilities and emoluments of office and resume the rank of a private member, rather than remain among those from whom he differed on public questions.

No, Mr. Speaker, the old ideas of public life are not dead. Some men will inevitably welcome, and others instinctively shrink from, reform; others by nature love, and others distrust, liberty. The ideals of honesty and sincerity and loyalty are as dear as ever they were in the mind and hearts of the Canadian people—perhaps all the dearer since the ugliness of the lack of these qualities has so recently been so clearly demonstrated.

We are somewhat amused on this side of the House by the assumption of superior political virtue by the Minister of Immigration, and his lofty superiority to the political game. May we, Mr. Speaker, from this side of the House say this to him: He may regard, if he likes, the strife of political parties as a game—if so for many years he has been a player—but that is not the view of those sitting on your left, Sir. We believe that we are here for the purpose of advancing the public interest along principles which we hold in common, principles dear to the heart of Baldwin and Lafontaine, of Howe and Brown, of Mackenzie, Blake and Laurier.

We regret that these principles are poor outworn things to the Minister of Immigration, but we venture to assert that notwithstanding the loss of his adherence thereto, their longevity will not be impaired.

The Minister of Immigration regrets that there has been considerable internal strife. His remedy is that the public men of this country use their heads and hearts for the purpose of putting an end to these conditions. Noble sentiments, certainly! But the minister omitted to place the blame for this internal strife where it really belongs, and that is with a section of the press of Canada for the attitude they have adopted. Was his omission due to the fact that that portion of the press has been largely subsidized and is controlled by the present Government?

After his confession of faith and the reason given by him for the retention of his portfolio, although the war is over, it is quite satisfactory to the gentlemen on this side of the House if it is satisfactory to his Conservative friends of the Union Government. My own view of the matter is that "Ephriam is joined to his idols, let him alone."

We on this side of the House, Sir, await with interest the information to be submitted by the Government containing the accounts of last year and the estimates for the next fiscal year, and I can assure you Mr. Speaker, that as far as we are concerned on this side of the House, we will vote any moneys necessary to carry on the business of the country in connection with the soldiers and their dependents with the mobilization and the other necessary services of the Government. Let me, however, say to the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), and the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) that the strictest economy must be practised and that owing to the regrettable financial condition of the country at present, we must ask them to go slow. Eternal vigilance should be their watchword, and we will hold them to strict accountability for every dollar spent which is not necessary.

We are living in serious times, and it behooves every member of this House to safeguard the interests of this country, and when we have done this, Sir, we can return to our constituents for the summer recess and they will say to us "Well done, good and faithful servant."

Mr. WILLIAM FOSTER COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address on the very creditable manner in which they have acquitted themselves. I

also desire to concur in all the encomiums that have been passed upon our departed friend, the late leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier).

This is an after-the-war assembly, and we are called upon to deal with present-day conditions. We have won the war, and the boys are coming home, and bringing with them problems that will have to be dealt with in a manner which will require the best thought of all political parties and of all members of this House. We have many causes for rejoicing and thanksgiving when we remember the cloud under which we foregathered a year ago and the auspices under which we now meet. A year ago the horizon was dark and forbidding as a result of the most strenuous campaign of the four years of war. The enemy was not only as strong as ever, but according to report was stronger in man-power than at any previous time during the war. An immense army had been mobilized during the winter, and the Canadian boys along with our Allies were facing a foe ready for all eventualities, it was supposed. It was indeed a time in which our cause, so to speak, hung more or less in the balance. Thanks to the valour of our troops and to the Divine help that we believe was vouchsafed to our armies, things soon began to brighten, but we certainly had to pass through dark days. It is not many months ago that the famous message of Field Marshal Haig rang out to his troops and to every part of the civilized world—"Men, put your backs to the wall. Die at your post rather than retire." That message will be handed down through the ages with the great message of Lord Nelson a hundred years ago at Trafalgar—"England expects that every man this day will do his duty." Both these messages are in the same high rank. The traditions of our forces and those of our Allies certainly justified all the faith we placed in them. They won out. But at what a price! While we mourn the departed statesman to whom I referred a moment ago and one or two others whose places are empty in this House, I want to offer a word of sympathy particularly to those members who have had their family circle broken by this terrible war. There is many a vacant seat around many a splendid fireside in the Dominion of Canada to-day as a result of this war. Our young men have died, however, for a noble cause, and had they lived a thousand years it is a question whether they could have died in a greater cause.

They displayed heroism, devotion and self-sacrifice. Those are among the highest qualities that humanity can display. They are taught in the good Book, and I can only say to those who mourn the broken family circle, that they have good cause to believe that the great Master who gave His life for others will not forget the sacrifice of the boys of Canada who gave their lives in so great a cause—humanity, civilization and religion. Some people, it is true, have been worried about the final destiny of those who have been called to leave the earthly house of this tabernacle and pass to the great beyond. We know not, but we believe the Judge of all the earth will do right, and I, for one if it is any satisfaction to gentlemen whose family circles have been broken, am prepared to say that, so far as I read the Scriptures and interpret them, the Judge of all the earth will see that those men who have given their lives, who have not hesitated to lay down their lives for others will be found at the right hand, "where loyal hearts and true stand ever in the light, all raptured through and through, in God's most holy sight." I believe that we can leave those heroes in the hand of the Judge of the earth, knowing that he will do right. We know, Mr. Speaker, that this war has only been won as a result of great efforts. It caused a great deal of trouble in this land to raise the army that was raised and keep it up to strength until the finish, but that was accomplished, Mr. Speaker, and it was only accomplished by great sacrifices and denial of one's own inclinations in sending to the front the splendid boys who went there, and keeping them up to strength. That, however, has been done and when the war came to an end, be it known and be it spread abroad to all the earth, that Canada was going just as strong at the finish as she went at the outset. The guns that spoke at Mons commenced the war, and the guns at Mons finished the war, because if you take it from Mons to Mons you have the whole history of the war. That is where the British guns first spoke. But they came back to Mons, thanks to the splendid generalship and heroism of men in the providence of God, though driven from Mons and kept out of the battle line there for four years. The Canadians were back in Mons when the last gun was fired. The Canadians were there to fire it, and we have the testimony, not only of laymen but of military men who know whereof they speak, that the one division or the one army corps that Canada had at the front was the strongest fighting unit not only of the British Empire but of all the armies of the Allies, none was equal to the splen-

did fighting Canadian boys that were left at the front the day the last gun was fired at Mons. That is something to be proud of, and that is some reason to rejoice, but I say this has only been accomplished by self-denial not only on the part of the members of this House but of the people of Canada, and of the sons of Canada, both those that were at home and those abroad. All this has been accomplished by immense effort. During this debate, Mr. Speaker, we have had remarks addressed from the other side of the House to our separated brethren. Perhaps it would not be inappropriate for me to say a few words as a counterpart of that, and address myself more particularly through you, Mr. Speaker, to the united brethren. We have separated brethren and we have united brethren.

Mr. MULLOY: Manufacturers.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Yes, manufacturers and farmers all sitting happy and contented over here at the present time. Separated brethren! How you must dislike that word, hon. gentlemen—"separated." Indifference, lost friendship and all such things come back to you, whilst on this side of the House you see united brethren. You behold them smiling. See how happy and contented they are here, and we are making them welcome. We are giving them a home of which they will take full advantage, and I, for one, trust they are going to stay with us for many a day. It is far better to speak about unity than it is to speak about separation, and I cannot but think that our friends on the other side that invented that term, "separated brethren," will hear the echo ringing down for weeks and months and years, in such a way that they will wish they had not thought of separated brethren, because the separated brethren are united with us, and we are inviting them to stay, and we believe they are going to stay. We have much more to offer them than friends opposite have, and for a very good reason. What was the reason that your separated brethren left the doctrines you preach? It was because your doctrines were not sound. It was because you were preaching a doctrine that would not save the country and the Empire and that would not win the war. These gentlemen who came from the other side and united with us came over for a reason, and that reason, Mr. Speaker, was to win the war, and the best answer we can give to you to-day is that the war is won, and that those men had something to do with winning it, and if they never do anything great in their lives in the future history will not forget every man jack that came out and became a separated brother for a short time. But he was taken into a far better fold, at any rate, and their names will be handed down as men who sacrificed something in order that the war might be won. The war has been won, and what has been the result of the winning of the war? The winning of the war, Mr. Speaker, is the greatest thing that has ever been done in all the ages since Adam delved and Eve spun down to the present time. Never was there so great a cause. Never was there so much at stake, and never was there more brilliancy won than that which has been won on the battlefields of Europe in the last four years. It was worth while. Humanity has been saved. Christianity has been saved. The right of small nations to live, the right to enjoy justice, freedom and order, not only in the great lands, but also in the small lands, has been achieved, not only among great people, but also among the minor classes. Those are only some of the things that have been won. Why, Mr. Speaker, the prophets and kings have desired long to see the sight that we see now and have not seen it, and to hear the things that we hear this day, and have not heard them. We have to-day practically a ransomed world as a result of this war, and those gentlemen who came out from the Opposition have given up what we all know is very dear to them, party unity and party ties. I have been a strong party man myself, and I know what that means. I say, all honour to these men, who, in the face of all this, were ready to come over to us, who are ready to sacrifice, it may be, their own outlook and their own advantage in order that the best effort of the Dominion of Canada should be continued and that our troops at the front should be increased. That has all been done and the result justifies the means. In addition to all these things which have been saved to humanity, I may point out a thing that has not often been mentioned in this House, and which is too frequently overlooked in the country, and that is not only has civilization and Christianity been placed in comparative safety as a result of the war, but the great Holy Land which, for a thousand years has called for the best efforts of the nations of Europe, for which many a crusade was undertaken, for which many a spear was sharpened, many a sword ground—the land of Palestine, with its capital, Jerusalem the Golden, the Holy

City, has been wrenched from the hands of the Turk, the infidel, and to-day the British flag floats over Jerusalem, the ancient city of the Jews, about which so many promises have been made and about which cluster so many glorious memories. The Holy Land and Jerusalem have been saved to civilization, and I trust that, after all the blood and treasure that have been expended, never again will these holy places pass into the hands of the Turk and the heretic. That is something that has been accomplished by the war. All honour to the men who came out from the other side and joined us in order that the best that Canada could do should be done in the interests of civilization and humanity.

It is true, Mr. Speaker, that mistakes have been made, and, no doubt, have been made by the Government. It is true that some things might have been done that call for criticism. I am not so strong a party man, even a Unionist or a Conservative, that I do not see there are some things that might be different. I am not going to spend much time in criticising the speeches of hon. gentlemen opposite, but before passing from this particular part of my address, I want to take exception to some remarks which were made by at least two hon. gentlemen opposite, both comparatively new members of the House, and who, I am sorry to see, are not in their seats at the present moment. I am not going to say anything in their absence that I would not say if they were here, and I want it to be understood that any references I make are more to the matter of their speeches than they are personal with regard to the individuals with whom I am called upon to deal. I regret to say that one of these hon. gentlemen, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), made what I conceive to be one of the most damaging statements that was ever made in this House, and that is a good deal to say. I believe that perhaps he did not intend that it should be considered as seriously as I look upon it. But, his reference to the Bolsheviki and his defence of them, in my judgment, was the most serious offence that has ever been committed in this House in my hearing.

I think it is time that this country knew the danger of the Bolsheviki and their doctrines. It is time that they should be put down. It is time that the laws of Canada should be enforced against those who have come over from the old lands, have found sanctuary here and do not appreciate it any more than to preach doctrines so subversive of all law, order and decency as the Bolsheviki have done in Russia, and as they will do here if permitted. In a free country like Canada no such doctrines as those are justified. In a free country no such company should be introduced, and I regret that the hon. member for Brome found it necessary to enter into a defence of a doctrine that I conceive to be absolutely indefensible.

An hon. MEMBER: What is their doctrine?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: You have it there in Hansard, and you are a better authority probably on it than I am. I understand that the hon. member for Brome draws his inspiration from the Manchester Guardian. I am a bit of a Lancashire man myself, I know the Manchester Guardian fairly well and I tell the hon. member for Brome that I consider that he is drawing his inspiration from a very bad and unsafe quarter

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Oh, yes—I say a very bad quarter and a very unsafe quarter if he is guided by the Manchester Guardian. The Manchester Guardian up to August 4th was pro-German and if the Manchester Guardian had had its way Britain would never have sent a man across the channel. That was the doctrine of the Manchester Guardian. The Manchester Guardian has had a hard job to keep straight even under the Defence of the Realm Act. It is an unsafe guide for gentlemen opposite to pin their defence of the Bolsheviki too. I am going to take the risk of saying that I do not believe that this country will ever lie down to such a doctrine as the Bolsheviki preach. What have they done? Did they get elected to power? Not at all. They seized the reins of government. Seized the reins of government, by what?—by the ballot?—no, but by force—absolutely by force, and where do they draw the line? They announce a doctrine which says that you shall shoot down every man who wears a white collar, or a white shirt. They attack women, carry off everything valuable, and disrupt the country. In what way do they convert a man? At the point of the bayonet and at the rifle's mouth. Strong arguments indeed! Yet, we find in this Parliament some hon. gentlemen uttering a defence of that doctrine. The people of Canada will never allow such a doctrine as that to prevail here. You may try to cause a rift between capital and labour, between the so-called classes and the so-called masses, but I tell you that in my

judgment there are enough level-headed men in Canada in the working classes, in the fields, in the mines, in the factories, everywhere, who will say you may count me out if you want to make a distribution of this world's goods on the basis of the Bolsheviki. It means the absolute denial of every law of God and man. If I could conceive that the men of this land will not save us from the doctrine of the Bolsheviki I will tell you who will and I think I know what I am talking about. If the men will not defend us from the Bolsheviki doctrine, the lately enfranchised women will save the country from it. The women know what it means, you had better believe. The women have read the history of recent events in Russia. I am glad that the hon. member for Brome has come in. I am just endeavouring to elucidate the doctrine of the Bolsheviki which I understand the hon. gentleman was backing. I say that that doctrine will never prevail in Canada. I say that if the men of Canada will not defend the country against Bolshevism the newly enfranchised women will. The women know when they have got a fairly good thing and they are not going to let it go until they have got something better. Bad as some husbands are, irreconcilable, unconvertible as some of them may be, the woman with a fairly good man in this country and that she can exercise her influence upon is not going to give him up. The women are allowed to rule in this country in a way in which they could not rule were the doctrines of the Bolsheviki to prevail and they are going to say: "While we have some evils at home, we had better bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of." The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) may rest assured that his defence of the Bolshevik will not prevail in this country, because that doctrine is one of the most dangerous and seditious that could be formulated here.

That brings me, Mr. Speaker to a point where I have to criticise the Government, and I am sorry to be compelled to do so. The Government has passed a good many Orders in Council, perhaps too many.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That of course, is a dangerous fault.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: But there is another fault, far more dangerous, in my judgment, and that is to pass more Orders in Council than are carried out. The Government has passed an Order in Council declaring that to put out seditious literature of the class prepared and distributed by the so-called Bolsheviki in some of our large cities and towns merits punishment by fine and imprisonment, and yet when these penalties have been imposed by our magistrates in accordance with law, the condemned men have been released long before their sentence was completed. I say that this is wrong, and in that respect I condemn the Canadian Government. The Minister of Justice is absent, and therefore I do not know who is responsible for this leniency; I do not know who should shoulder the responsibility. I desire to say that the release of those fellows who were in possession of Bolsheviki literature, and distributed it in this country over and over again—we had this thing in our own town as well—should have been punished to the utmost limit of the law, both by fine and imprisonment, and they should not have been set at liberty until they had served their sentence. That is my opinion of the Bolsheviki. I now call upon the Acting Prime Minister to see that in future when a man is condemned under the Order in Council referred to he shall be kept in custody until his sentence is served, which sentence is all too short for a man holding and spreading such dangerous doctrines.

I am sorry to have to call my good friend the hon. member for Brome to task, because he is the essence of good nature, but I hope that he will accept these criticisms as good-naturedly as I have endeavoured to make them.

I cannot pass over without criticising the remarks of another hon. gentleman, who I regret to see is not in the House. This hon. gentleman is a particular friend of the member for Brome, and defended him in his references to this same vile doctrine last night. I refer to the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy). The hon. gentleman was elected to this House only recently, and last session made a very favourable impression. I was not in the House when the hon. gentleman spoke last night, but I have his speech as reported in Hansard. I want to say that the hon. gentleman made a very grievous mistake in that speech, and, if I am any judge, it is one that he would like to-day to recall. The hon. member for North Essex not only defended those who upheld the Bolsheviki, but he went further and delivered what I call a "sneering" speech. Such a speech as that never gets a man very far, and never secures him a following of the best

class. The hon. gentleman sneered indirectly at His Majesty the King, the Ruler of the British Empire, and sneered indirectly at the Prime Minister of Canada for attending a function that was given by His Majesty, and which was also attended by President Wilson, perhaps the greatest democrat in the world to-day. I ask, Mr. Speaker, is that a great offence, or is it a matter for ridicule? While the doctrine of the Divine right of kings, and all that rule and are in authority, does not obtain here, I want to say, and I do so without the slightest fear of contradiction, that among the kings, rulers and emperors the world over no better example of heroic Christian duty, fortitude and regard for the welfare of his subjects was given by any ruler than our splendid King George V displayed during the last five years. It is not necessary for me to enter upon any defence of His Majesty. The King is above reproach; he has been a man of the people; he has not failed to go to the front, to the extent even of exposing himself to and receiving injury there, and his sons have served in the danger zone the same as any of the King's subjects. The King had led us in a noble way, and his devoted Queen equally so, and I say all honour to these rulers of the Empire that they have displayed such splendid and noble traits to their people. I therefore think it ill became the member for North Essex to cast any slurs in that direction. I am very sorry indeed that this incident has occurred. The King was giving a banquet to President Wilson, I am reminded.

Mr. McKENZIE: I rise to a point of order. It has always been a rule observed in the House that no comments should be made about His Majesty the King or the Governor General. I am sure that no member of the House would say anything that would reflect in the slightest degree on His Majesty, or his representative in this country. Therefore, I think in his remarks the hon. gentleman is getting very close to forbidden ground, even if he has not actually encroached upon it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Mr. Speaker, I think I know the rules of the House fairly well, and I do not think that I have violated them in any respect whatever. I am only endeavouring to refute an imputation that was indulged in on the floor of the House, and which appears in Hansard respecting a function at which His Majesty the King was the host, and at which President Wilson and others were guests.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Read what was said.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The words to which I object are to be found in Hansard, and if I have placed any false interpretation on them I am willing to retract my criticisms. But as far as I am able to gather such was the language of the hon. gentleman to whom I refer. I desire to go a little further. I regret the occurrence of this incident, but we cannot pass it over unnoticed. We had a right to expect better things from the hon. member for North Essex. He represents the city of Windsor, which enjoys the same name as the King's palace. We have a right to expect that the hon. gentleman should live up to the loyal traditions which that name suggests, and if the hon. gentleman's remarks accurately reflect the sentiments of the people whom he represents, that community should change its name to something more suitable.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Change the member.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That would be a good deal easier. I think that is probably what they will do—change the member; but I am saying that if the inhabitants of North Essex hold the same views as their representative enunciated here last night, the name of Windsor should be changed to a more suitable title. That name was doubtless bestowed upon the town by its founders to commemorate the historic Windsor over the sea, and the great palace that exists there, the place where His Majesty the King frequently takes up his abode. If there is one place more than another that should live up to Windsor traditions, it is the people of Windsor, and the member they send to Parliament. Nevertheless it is the very gentleman who represents Windsor who comes here and makes a sneering reference to a function given by His Majesty.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: It is all in Hansard —the references to the Windsor uniform, and the flummery——

Mr. McMASTER: Does the hon. gentleman suggest that loyalty is increased by love of a Windsor uniform?

Mr. COCKSHUTT: A Windsor uniform does not always consist of gold trimmings. A Windsor uniform may be composed of other materials, but it ill befits any hon. gentleman to utter such sentiments as those to which I have alluded. Whether a man is wearing a plain brown coat made in

Windsor, or a Windsor uniform, such language ill becomes any man coming from that city, and I believe there are a great many people in that community who will tell the hon. member for North Essex when they next see him that they do not approve of his language last evening. Futhermore I have this to say, I do not believe the hon. gentleman will commit the same offence again.

Mr. GAUVREAU: He will have a chance to be knighted now.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I think he will be benighted rather than knighted. It is never pleasant to make references of this kind, but I do so without any personal animosity or bitterness against either of these gentlemen. The remarks, however, to which I have referred, are objectionable as being uttered in the House of Commons; not only are they damaging to our reputation as intelligent legislators—but they are calculated also to do a great deal of injury in Canada. For that reason I felt called upon to refer to them.

I regret that, among other things, some slight reference was not made in the speech from the Throne to labour conditions, the hours of labour, and the wages paid in this country. I am often accused of being a hard-hearted employer, but in my judgment the very best that we can do for labour and for the working man should be done. In order to do that, we must have conditions that justify giving these shorter hours and these high wages. I do not think that either of these things can be brought about in the way the member for Brome suggests. The member for Brome has a tearing down rather than a building up policy. It is easy to criticise. It is easy to pull down the old structure, but it takes a better and a stronger man to put up something better in its place. While we may deplore the difficulties surrounding Canadian trade and Canadian labour conditions, after all, Canada is a fairly happy country for the workingman, and conditions have materially improved during the war. Personally, I trust that we shall not go back to where we were before the war; getting back to pre-war conditions is not my conception of living up to all that we should do. We should stay where we are in so far as we have made advances; we should not make a retrograde step. At any rate, I for one hope that wages will never get back as low as they were. I trust that labour conditions will be modified and that if it is possible to grant a seven or eight hour day, that will be done. I trust that the captains of industry and all those employing great forces will see to it that the workingman is relieved so far as possible from adverse conditions.

Our trade and commerce has been flourishing during the war; the tremendous strides that have been made have far surpassed our most sanguine expectations. But we have come to the end of the war; and in order to deal successfully with after-the-war conditions we shall have to be pretty sound in judgment; otherwise we shall strike snags. If there ever was a time in the history of Canadian trade when the best judgment should be used, it is now. Many tremendous problems face us which it is going to be very difficult to meet successfully. We must not be pessimists, but optimists. I heard a pessimist desribed the other day as a man who, having the choice of two evils, took both. There is a good deal in that; some pessimists choose both evils; they see nothing but blackness and darkness and tempests before them. Canada is all right. We have a big debt, and it is going to be bigger, but we can take care of it. We have enough resources and enough wealth in Canada to take care of it; all we want is a satisfactory method of reaching the people who have the money. If the member for Brome wants to write a bigger cheque next year, I shall be glad to accomodate him. I am glad to hear that he is ready to write a bigger cheque for the Minister of Finance next year. His suggestion in that respect is a good one; we must pay bigger taxes individually. We must pay bigger income tax than we have been paying. We have not been paying under the income tax very long. I suppose it has worked out all right, but I want to say to the minister who enforces it that there is room for improvement. There should be a date on which all men should pay. I had the privilege of paying my income tax nearly six months before some people got their papers. I do not know whether the hon. member for Brome, when he spoke of paying his income tax, was writing a cheque for last year or for this year. If he was writing his last year's cheque, he was six months behind the time; if he was writing this year's cheque, he was a little in advance of the general public in his own province.

Mr. McMASTER: It was last year's cheque.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Well, my hon. friend is six months behind the times. In view of the intelligence and generosity of the

member for Brome, I think that he should pay up the seven per cent interest that the rest of us were threatened with if we did not pay on time.

Mr. McMASTER: If my private affairs are to be looked into, I may say that the time at which interest accrues has not yet arrived? I assure the member for Brantford that if I am late I will add the seven per cent.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: The hon. gentleman has been dealt with very leniently. I hope he is appreciative of his being forgiven the interest that a great many of the rest of us were told we would have to pay if we did not send in our income tax earlier.

Taxation is never very pleasant; it always causes pain. I am sure, however, that our good friend sitting in the front benches (Mr. McKenzie) will back me up in this; that as long as a Scotchman does not have to pay any more than his share and does not have to pay it ahead of the other fellow, he is ready to do his share as well as the rest of them. In passing, may I say that in my opinion not as many bouquets have been bestowed upon the new leader of the Opposition as there should have been from this side of the House. I suggest that the gentlemen who follow me throw a bouquet to our good friend. He is not so bad; he is all Scotch—

An hon. MEMBER: And no soda.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: A little soda. However, we may be able to say more about that after we have dealt with the prohibition measure that is to be brought down.

Having dealt with taxation and trade and commerce, I suppose I would be accused of shirking the issue and not being the valiant man I profess to be if I did not say a word about the tariff.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I see that my friends are all beginning to sit up and take notice. Now, I shall try to be very circumspect in the few words that I say in regard to the tariff.

To begin with, I do not think that the tariff is very far wrong as it is. I do not say that it is perfect or that in some respects it might not be pared down. I do not think that in all the years I have been in this House any hon. gentlemen have asked me to give it any particular boost. Though I am called a high protectionist, I have never asked, so far as I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that any great amount of protection be passed over to any industry with which I have been directly or indirectly connected. But if, as a general policy in this country, you are going to rip up the tariff and to unhinge everything now when the boys are coming back, you are going to have not only unemployment but absolute stagnation. There may be those who do not agree with me, but I think I know something about tariff and trade matters as I have been engaged in that line for thirty or forty years. I know that the tariff has inequalities; I know that it can be improved in some respects and I for one am ready to make concessions. I do not expect to get all I want. The whole world goes on compromise. The members of this House are really only a board sitting down here managing the affairs of the nation. Any one who has served on a Board—I am speaking now of an Industrial Board—knows that every matter that comes up is dealt with by that body analytically, it is thoroughly discussed and often men disagree strongly on the smallest point, and a compromise is reached on matters of policy in regard to directing a small company. If that be the case, is it not likely that in a body such as we are, sitting in this House to debate the affairs of the nation and to decide on what is the best policy to pursue, we shall not all see eye to eye. That is not to be expected, but with that fairness and liberality that are to be found in the average man if he is approached aright, I believe there is a way out of all those difficulties and that a wise solution can be arrived at. I would, therefore, not be surprised if after the Minister of Finance has presented his Budget Speech and after he has had the sage advice of the members of the Opposition as well as of hon. members on this side, he will bring down a tariff that will be suitable to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) who I know is one of the hardest men to please on that side of the House because he thinks everything about a tariff is wrong. The tariff may be considered a plague by some, but it is going to stay with us for a long time. We must have revenue; we must have a lot of revenue in order to pay our way. It is, therefore, up to those who do not like this method of raising revenue to point out a better method by which that object may be attained. I think we are going to have a severe shortage of revenue for some years to come; but we have resources, we can handle it and we will handle it. What has been done before can be done again and I believe that the Minister of Finance after he receives the advice of his friends on both

sides of the House—because I believe all the critics on the other side are his friends in the bottom of their hearts; they do not want to be hard on the minister although they may hold divergent opinions—he will bring down a tariff that will suit everybody.

Before I sit down I want to make a brief reference to the Peace Conference. That may be considered a little aside of our functions in this House—

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. COCKSHUTT:—but as it is a matter of such great moment, I think I would be justified in venturing just a very few remarks upon the Peace Conference and its likely outcome. Sir Robert Borden, the leader of this House, is over there and is, I believe, trying to represent Canada to the best of his ability at one of the greatest gatherings that has ever in the history of the world been assembled. The destinies of nations hang upon it. The map of Europe is being changed. The limits of almost every country in Europe are being defined. Questions of race, creed—everything of that kind are being settled. The whole of Europe is in the melting-pot, as well as a good deal of Asia and some of South Africa. Thank Heaven this continent is free, but the territories of a large portion of the nations of the earth are in the melting-pot, and the maps are being made. We are desirous that all things should be settled on the best and surest foundation, so that peace and happiness, truth and justice, religion and piety may prevail through coming generations. That is the desire of everybody, although it is going to be very hard to reach it. President Wilson of the United States has gone across the water—a thing that has never been done before by any President of the United States since that confederation became a reality. It has always been considered to be beyond the prerogative of the President of the United States to leave his country while occupying the presidential chair. President Wilson has broken through that rule on account of this being the most important call that any President of the United States has ever had and he has gone across the ocean. He has taken with him certain ideals. All honour to those who have splendid ideals, and President Wilson has really splendid ideals. I do not desire to belittle all that the United States have done in this war; the heroism with which their boys have acquitted themselves at the front, the splendid speed with which they got them across the water, the way in which they got out the arms and munition and equipment and furnished an army of almost 2,000,000 men inside of twelve months. All honour to the splendid effort they made, but President Wilson has an ideal and an idea that a league of nations can be formed that will preserve peace in the world for ever more. Far be it from me to cast any doubts upon the success of this great enterprise. I hope it will be all that is expected. I am free to confess that in my judgment it is too idealistic to meet the spirit of the times yet; that the millennium is not sufficiently near at hand to justify anyone in believing that we shall never have any more wars in the world. I understand that General Pau, who is in the city of Ottawa—I have not yet had the pleasure of hearing him—has made the statement that it is useless and idle for us to believe that all wars are at an end. That was my view before General Pau made his statement and his statement only goes to confirm my opinion in that respect that wars will yet be; that while the world exists wars will not cease. We are told so in the Scriptures. I believe that to be the case and that wars and rumours of wars will continue to the end as long as humanity is as frail as it is, and constructed on so frail a foundation as many of us stand upon. This is not an ideal condition, but I believe it is one that is going to stay with us, and believing that I submit that it would have been wiser for the nations assembled at the Peace Conference to frame a safe and lasting peace treaty and sign that first rather than to endeavour to make a league of nations which may take a few months or longer to work out and which may in the end not prove a success. I submit that only as a criticism of the work that is being done. I simply profess to be a poor, humble layman in that respect and cannot see so far as those men who are assembled there; but my desire is that a lasting peace shall be obtained and that we shall not be robbed by politicians of the work that our men have done in the field. Their heroism has done its share. I have pointed out in the beginning of my speech and I cannot do better than to conclude with the same words, namely, that the boys at the front have brought all honour and glory to this country by their splendid heroism on the field. They were acknowledged to be the spear-head of the armies at the front. They were saved for all the knotty points, for every critical occasion; the Canadian boys were there, and in the final stages they never went after anything that they did

5 p.m.

not get. I say that in this respect this House and the country have every reason to rejoice that our boys have displayed all those characteristics that make them physically, morally and mentally the equal of any people in the world. What has been accomplished by Canadians on the battlefield, what has been achieved by heroism, self-denial and devotion to duty on the field can be accomplished in this House and in this country if we are as alive to our duties as the boys overseas have been to theirs. If we are as loyal to our duties as the boys overseas have been to theirs, every one of these mountains in our way that now seem insurmountable will be swept away, and we shall stand a united, contented, and a Christian people that need take a back seat to no other nation in the world.

Mr. ETHIER (Two Mountains) (translation): Since prorogation of Parliament, last May, great and momentous events have happened through the world as well as in Canada. We have witnessed the triumph of Justice and Right, the crushing of Prussian militarism, Hun barbarism and German autocracy. Under the command of the illustrious Marshal Foch, the Allies have vanquished the Teutonic hordes, broken through the impregnable Hindenberg line, and forced the German armies to beg for mercy; they have brought about the downfall of the haughty and snarling kaiser and obtained, on November 11 last, the armistice ending the hostilities and putting a stop to the atrocities of this frightful war which appalled the world for over four years.

While at present holding a conference, the Allies are making use of all the talents and energies of their greatest statesmen, and are calling upon all the resources of diplomacy to lay the foundations of a durable peace, which shall open a new era of progress and civilization and make the renewal of the war an impossibility.

As mentioned in the speech from the Throne, none of the troops who took part in the struggle proved to be more valiant and daring than the Canadians. Their heroism throughout this war has won for their country undying fame.

I take pride in the bravery and gallantry of our soldiers; our men have behaved like heroes. Let us honour the memory of those who fell on the battlefield. May we respect and protect, without delay or faltering, those who were spared from the shells, shrapnel and gases of the Germans.

However, the glorious events which I have just alluded to have made way, here in Canada, to a very sad and sorrowful occurence, which our hearts and minds are loath to accept as an accomplished fact. The empty seat here before me, the laurel wreath which adorns it, are more eloquent than any panegyric of the undying fame of him who has departed. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is no more . . .

As one of the last survivors of the Liberal group elected at the time of Sir Wilfrid's glorious accession to power in 1896, I feel, it seems, more than any one else the immense gap which his death has created in this House. I find, however, satisfaction and consolation in the thought of always having remained true to him, through bright and dark days, in triumph and defeat, in power and opposition, and it is not for me to feel the pang of remorse at having, at the last minute, proved unfaithful to the greatest, most noble and illustrious Canadian in the social, economic and political history of Canada. Aye, great all through his life, he proved still greater in death; always and everywhere his actions and words were noble and generous; and impartial history will reveal his career to future generations as having been illustrious both at home and abroad.

May those who lived in his days and those who will come after him never forget the high ideal towards which were bent all his energies from the very beginning of his public life—the establishment of union and harmony between the two great races of this young country.

In his lifetime we loved him, we admired him and we respected him; under his wise direction the ship of state sailed clear of dangerous rocks put in the way by unscrupulous adversaries who were very often blinded by their hatred of all that is French and Catholic. Let us hope that death has disarmed those despicable foes and that the pact of Confederation, that our lamented chief has always safeguarded like the apple of his eye, will be maintained in all its integrity by all Governments to come.

The main idea that runs all through the Governor General's speech that is now before us, is that of the industrial, financial, commercial and economic reconstruction of Canada. In other words, Parliament is invited to solve the entangled problem of the after-war policy of this country. It is a problem the importance, of which the Government failed to grasp if we are to judge by what has been done since the cessation of hostilities and the signing of the armis-

tice. In the year 1917, the slogan of the Government was supposed to be "Win the war," but was in reality "Win the election." To day, that slogan is "Remain in power" —a power obtained over the ruins heaped upon the country by appeals to hatred and prejudice.

Not satisfied with having saddled the country with the iniquitous Military Service Act, in spite of all promises to the contrary; not satisfied with having administered the law with the utmost harshness, especially in one province, the Government has entrusted its high executioner, the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) with the task of persecuting the young men who, through ignorance, misunderstanding or oversight, failed to comply with the provisions of an act which got through Parliament only after the brutal application of the gag.

Even at this day, now that Parliament is in full session, the cabinet is still passing orders in council of the sternest nature, in order that the Government may keep on prosecutions and gratify their spite against young men who are anxious to work for their country and their family, and do their share in the upbuilding of the nation.

Under the circumstances, those who institute judicial proceedings under the provisions of an Act that has lapsed, and would impose a fine of $250 to $2,000, or imprisonment, are open to the suspicion that their motives are not commendable.

The tribunals have been sitting continuously for several months. Decisions have been given, under the Act concerning the deserters and defaulters. Part of these decisions are from the province of Quebec and have been given by Justice Langelier of Quebec and Justice Lanctot, of Montreal, amongst others. The public naturally supposed that the law had been complied with. But what happened in the meantime, if we are to credit current rumors? During the week, an order in council has been passed fixing a minimum fine of $200 and a maximum of $5,000 against those who failed to comply with the provisions of the Militia Service Act. In a certain number of cases judgments had been given imposing fines from $5 up to $25, and other supposed transgressors have even been discharged.

Under this new order in council, the decisions given by Justice Langelier, of Quebec and Justice Lanctot, of Montreal, are said to be null and void and the accused are to be arrested anew. Is that a proper understanding of the armistice? Is that the means of fostering feelings of brotherhood throughout the country? But such feelings the Government, as I said before, seems to ignore for reasons that we are not at liberty to state in this House. I think the general feeling of our people is aptly expressed in an editorial appearing this week in La Patrie, under the heading "The Defaulters." With your kind permission, Mr. Speaker, I shall read to the House the editorial in question.

The Defaulters.

Turning a deaf ear to the appeals of reason, the Government, if we are to believe the ministerial newspapers, are prepared to persist in prosecuting defaulters, making use to that end even after the war is over, of the extraordinary powers that have been temporarily delegated to them by Parliament, for the vigorous prosecution of the war.

A new Order in Council, it is said, has been passed by the Cabinet, providing that defaulters in every case shall be condemned to pay a fine of not less than $250 and not exceeding $5,000 and that the said order shall have a retroactive effect. That is to say that the defaulters who have already been dealt with more leniently, will be arrested a second time and put through the ordeal of this implacable justice.

As probably there will not be in the English provinces, as well as in Quebec, a defaulter in a hundred able to pay a fine of $250 or more, the Government will no doubt endeavour to put them all in jail.

Need it be said that in such occurrence those who govern us are not impelled by a patriotic feeling. We have proved already that society has nothing to gain by those drastic measures, that on the contrary it will be deprived of the productive labour of thousands of workers.

When so many serious problems claim their attention, as Mr. Calder and Mr. Carvell justly observed in the Commons, is it possible that our ministers will waste their energy upon a task so evidently fruitless as those punitive enactments applied to defaulters under the military Act.

Parliament is now in session. The need of remedying this ridiculous situation is pressing Parliament must understand that the country has been governed long enough by incoherent and arbitrary ukases.

And, by the way, that even the authorities of the department of Justice did not understand or were ignorant of.

The first duty of Parliament is to take away from the Government the plenary powers which they misused to such an extend.

And, as to the offenders against the military Act, there is a pressing need that Parliament settle their case once for all, and according to the dictates of common sense and reason by passing a general Act of amnesty.

Yes, if ever amnesty was justified, it is indeed in this instance. May I be permitted, Mr. Speaker, to pray the Acting Prime Minister to put a stop to such a state of things, to restore in this country that peace which the conference of the Allied nations strives to secure for the whole

world. Let us bring back confidence in the heart and mind of every citizen; let us forget the mistakes and faults of a few young men who defaulted, it may be, but who are Canadians above all.

Another question comes to my mind, although the speech from the Throne makes no mention of it. I refer to the censure which, it seems to me, is of paramount importance under present circumstances. Seeing that war is ended and truce has been signed, why do they maintain that system of stifling the voice of public opinion? Do the Government fear the disclosure of unspeakable and unavowable deeds; do they fear the outcome of inquiries which would throw light upon the administration of the several departments of the commonwealth?

During the last conference held at Ottawa, in January last, Sir Wilfrid Laurier demanded the abolition of the censure, and following the example of the great departed one, I pray the Government in the name of the whole electorate and, may I not say without exposing myself to criticism, in the name of the press of this country to free us from the censure and to rid of it those mouthpieces of public opinion.

A Bill concerning the franchise is to be laid before the House. Let us hope that the first thing to be done in that direction will be the repeal of the War-time Elections Act, that Act conceived in iniquity whose only outcome was the disfranchisement of British citizens duly qualified to vote, and which resulted in the avowed stealing of the last elections. According to the speech from the Throne, one of the purposes of this Bill is to allow the women to vote, to confer upon them the privilege of sitting in Parliament. I do not intend to deal now with its principle, reserving my right to do so when the proper time comes.

I shall only say that in my humble opinion women have a greater and nobler role to play, a part more worthy of them than that of lobbyist and politician, and I consider that their place is not upon the floor of this House or upon a husting, but at home and everywhere where they can practice mercy and self-sacrifice, qualities which are of their essence and of their nature.

The policy of the Government involves Bills concerning highways, vocational training, the creation of a department of public health, prohibition and public works to be carried on.

A better roads policy was inaugurated by the Quebec government and it was such a success that the other provinces were stirred up and included that plank in their programme. And the most eloquent testimonial to its efficiency and expendiency is to be found in the words of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) when he tells us :

> I had the pleasure last year of travelling over a part of the highway in the province of Quebec constructed by the Provincial Government in recent years, and I can only say that if we extend that class of highway through every province in Canada we shall have accomplished wonders.

I concur in that opinion of the Minister of Public Works.

The explanations which the honourable gentleman has given the House as to the fulfillment of his programme and the apportionment of moneys, have only been touched upon. We cannot yet, so far as I am concerned at least, pass judgment upon the expediency of special subsidies by this Government to the provincial authorities in favour of goods roads.

I understand that Parliament will place a sum of 25 millions at the disposal of the Government to be spent on highways throughout the various provinces of the Dominion; but will this amount be divided as provided for in the plan set forth by the Minister of Public Works, according to the census of 1915, in some of the western provinces? If it is distributed by the provincial governments themselves, without any interference or influence on the part of the Dominion Government for the political purposes, and if the works are carried out under the supervision and control of the provincial authorities, then I approve of the plan and I shall support the bill to be presented to that effect. Otherwise, I am against it.

We talk about giving employment to returned soldiers. The people complain about the ever increasing number of unemployed. Well! let us carry out that policy of good roads throughout the country, which will enable the respective provincial governments to give some work to the unemployed, and at the same time to supply the country with highways, thus promoting its advancement and the welfare of the people, particularly of the agricultural class. I am in favor of it, but only on that condition.

As regards vocational training and education, I trust that the measure that is to be brought before this House will not be along the lines of the resolution which I see on the Orders of the Day, under No. 16 in the notices of motion, in which the honourable member for Frontenac (Mr.

Edwards) expresses the opinion "that it is desirable that the British North America Act be amended with a view to establishing a system of national and non confessional schools throughout the whole Dominion of Canada."

I hope that such utopia will not appear in the bill to be presented regarding vocational and educational training. I wonder, Mr. Speaker, whether this question of education is well within the province of this Parliament or whether it is not within the scope of provincial jurisdiction, in virtue of the Confederation Act. This is a matter to be cleared up later.

The Governor General's speech also mentions the establishment of a Public Health department. At this particular time, following a war which claimed so many victims, the public health, in every way, certainly requires to be looked after, and the people should be protected against contagious diseases which are the outcome of such wars. History mentions outbreaks of plague following wars, which caused more deaths than the wars themselves. As Dr. Osler, a prominent physician, stated regarding the danger of contamination from soldiers returning from overseas, it may be advisable to look to the future and protect our young women and families. But again I wonder whether the establishment of a Public Health Department is within the purview of federal or provincial jurisdiction. Do you not think, Mr. Speaker, that such a department would conflict with the boards of health in the respective provinces, and with those established by the municipalities in the cities and in the rural districts. I fear so, and this measure suggests difficulties that invite criticism and which ought to be avoided.

I believe the only way out is to leave the matter of Public Health in the hands of the provincial and municipal authorities.

There is another matter which I was forgetting. The honourable Minister of Public Works announced that millions must be expended to procure work for the unemployed, namely $25,000,000 for the building of highways and $20,000,000 for better housing, the latter being connected with the Public Health department. These $20,000,000 for better housing will be loaned by the Dominion Government to the provinces at the rate of 5 per cent; then the provincial governments will distribute the moneys according to regulations to be adopted for that purpose, thus improving the health and comfort of the workers and their families. Furthermore, there is to be an expenditure of $75,000,000 for the building of new railway branch lines, in the western provinces only. In reply to a query from the honourable member for Antigonish (Mr. Sinclair), the hon. Minister of Railways stated that there was no provision for Nova Scotia. Everything is for western Canada. We are not jealous, but let us not forget that the Canadian Northern is running through that part of the country; that Mackenzie and Mann have large interests there.

Is there a nigger in the pile or are Mackenzie and Mann and others going to profit by this expenditure of $75,000,000, such as the profiteers, who made millions during the war—the bacon lords?

The hon. Minister of Public Works stated that considerable sums were to be spent in public buildings at Hamilton, Montreal, Toronto and Winnipeg. But I am surprised at the reasons which he brought forth in explaining such an outlay of public funds. Here is what he said in his speech in regard to these works which involve such enormous expenditure; he did not seem satisfied as to its usefulness:

> I want to say, Mr. Speaker, that so far as the Public Works Department is concerned I am adhering strictly to the principle which I laid down some few minutes ago, namely, that we are not constructing public works simply because they would be a good thing for the community, but we are constructing them primarily because they will provide employment for the unemployed.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I believe this is an added suggestion: It it not on account of the usefulness or desirability of such expenditure on buildings that millions are being squandered; it is simply to provide employement.

I realize that the view so expressed commends itself from a certain point of view; but is there no other departure more profitable to the country and of better service to the community than spending money just for the sake of giving employment? I say: yes.

I put a question to the hon. Minister of Public Works, the other day, whether the Government intented to resume the construction of the Georgian Bay canal. He answered negatively. The people and, I am sure, this House, expected to get an answer at least favorable to the idea that these works would be undertaken and carried on. No, absolutely nothing of the kind. However, is there a better occasion for our Government to achieve a good action than that of resuming the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, a national undertaking

which would procure work to the unemployed who are assailing the Government with requests and complaints? Is there a more fitting time to acquiesce to these requests by employing thousands of these workers in the construction of the great waterway—I would say the great national waterway—to be used for our national trade? In reference to the matter, I read this morning in Le Canada an appreciation of the building of the Canal, which I believe it is my duty to have inserted in Hansard, in order that the people may become acquainted with this great undertaking. The article reads as follows:

The Government who pretend to be taxing their ingenuity in order to find out the means of securing employment for thousands of unemployed have not far to go to find one.

The construction of the Georgian Bay canal which has been advocated for over a quarter of a century by all our public bodies, would have furnished employment to thousands of men and solved the great problem of restoring the welfare of the workingmen.

Then, the construction of the Georgian Bay canal, as set forth in a Senate report in 1898, would bring about the development of an immense lumber, pulpwood, and pulp industry and other industries. It would open up a new country to colonization and agriculture. It would be likewise the means of working out the problem of the re-establishment of our returned soldiers.

Moreover, as stated in the report of the Senate, the Canadian trade would be greatly benefited by the construction of the Georgian Bay canal; it would open up a new water route for the transportation of western freight to the seashore by way of Montreal and Quebec. "While being a shorter and more direct route, that canal would reduce the cost of transportation of those products." The western wheat and cereals would be carried by that route to the east. The eastern coal could be shipped that way and the cost of food and coal would be materially reduced.

The construction of the Georgian Bay canal would develop enormous waterpowers along that route for the purposes of electricity, for the mining of iron ore and other minerals that are plentiful in the Ottawa valley. Such development would result in reducing the cost of lighting, while furnishing work to many hundreds of other workers.

As will be seen, the construction of the Georgian Bay canal would help more than any other work in solving the great after-war problems.

Neither can the Government allege by way of excuse that the exchequer is empty, as the people have subscribed hundreds of millions to national loans, without mentioning all the other taxes which they are paying into the treasury. Besides, the Georgian Bay canal would yield millions of dollars to the Government, as stated by Sir Robert Perth in his paper of February 3, 1914, read before the Royal Society of Arts, in London. In his opinion, the traffic of the canal would yield, on an average, $9,000,000 to the Government. Then, how much revenue would not the country indirectly derive from the building of that canal? Just as the building of the Canadian Pacific railway has improved millions of acres of uncultivated land, so will the Georgian Bay canal improve the value of that territory. Moreover, western farms from what experts tell us, would realize a yearly profit of $9,000,000, on the transportation of their grain.

Truly, the Government have no reason to deny to the country the opening of the Georgian Bay canal, unless they prefer to give way before the opposition of the Yankees and the pressure from the large financial interests of Ontario which have always been alone in opposing the scheme.

And the newspaper goes on:

The future of our country and the fate of its population are at stake.

According to my feeble notion that is the most eloquent plea in favour of a national enterprise which by itself would almost suffice to solve the post-war problem of the idle and unemployed. And not only would we have the satisfaction of having employed men for the pleasure of putting them to work, but we would have the satisfaction of having endowed Canada with a national enterprise which would redound to her credit.

Now, Sir, the speech from the Throne touches upon another question—prohibition. I am for temperance, but against prohibition. And I hope that when the proposed measure will be submitted, there shall be in the Bill intended for every province of Canada a proviso authorizing the provinces to permit the sale of light wines and beer, if they are inclined to do so.

As the honorable senator Dandurand said yesterday in the Senate, as long as it is not shown to me that the consumption of beer and light wines is detrimental to humanity and injurious to my health, I shall go on drinking wine and drinking beer if I have a liking for them. I humbly submit that it is an attempt against individual liberty.

At this moment, General Pau entered the House and having shaken hands with Mr. Speaker, he was welcomed by Sir Thomas White, acting Prime Minister, and by honourable Mr. Burrell, Secretary of State and took a chair to the right of the Speaker.

The hon. members who were present at the sitting rose spontaneously and enthusiastically cheered General Pau.

Mr. Ethier, having interrupted his remarks, then addressed Mr. Speaker in the following words:

Sir, seeing that it is my privilege of having the floor when enters the illustrious man who hails from overseas, that worthy cousin from France, will you allow me to pause in order to greet the illustrious General Pau gloriously maimed in 1870, one of the greatest victors of the war that has just ended. The shades of our brethren of Alsace and

Lorraine who fell in 1870 must rejoice at seeing the man who defended them so gloriously then treading the soil of New France inhabited by the brothers and the sons of those for whom he fought so well.

With your permission, Sir, I will conclude these few remarks by shouting with you all: Long live France.

I have but a few words to add to the remarks I was making when General Pau came in.

I was dealing with prohibition in this country and I contented that as long as it is not shown to me that the consumption of beer and light wines is detrimental to humanity and to the consumer who uses them considerately, I shall oppose any drastic Bill purporting to prohibit the manufacture and importation of those wines and beer. As to importation, I do not know whether under the circumstances it would be expedient to put an end to, abrogate and annul a treaty signed by France, England and Canada at a time when that celebrated entente cordiale was entered upon by the two countries, France and England; I wonder whether it would be wise at this moment to prevent the importation of French wines into the French province of Canada.

Mr. Speaker, I have but a few more remarks to make, but I beg the permission to move the adjournment of the debate, which will permit me to conclude them later on.

Mr. ETHIER moved that the Debate be adjourned.

Mr. SPEAKER: There might be some question as to whether the hon. gentleman would have a right to proceed when the House meets again, but I think, under the circumstances, no question will be raised.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 6 o'clock.

Monday, March 3, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Statement of superannuation and retiring allowances in the Civil Service during the year ending 31st of December, 1918.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of Civil Service Insurance account.—Sir Thomas White.

[Mr. Ethier.]

Statement of Governor General's warrants issued since last session.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Royal Society of Canada for the year ended 30th April, 1918.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the National Battlefields Commission.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of expenditure on account of Miscellaneous Unforeseen Expenses from 1st of April 1918 to 21st February, 1919.—Sir Thomas White.

Statement of temporary loans outstanding.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Ottawa Improvement Commission for the fiscal year, ending 31st March, 1918.—Sir Thomas White.

Copy of the Treasury Board Overrulings of the Auditor General, and accompanying correspondence.—Sir Thomas White.

Public Accounts of Canada.—Sir Thomas White.

Copy of a cable (in extended form) received by His Excellency the Governor General from the Secretary of State for the Colonies on February 14, 1919, giving a summary of the League of Nations Covenant presented to the Peace Conference by the League of Nations Commission.—Sir Thomas White.

Report of the Secretary of State for the year ending 31st March, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I desire to communicate to the House a letter addressed to me by the Assistant Auditor General:

Auditor General's Office. Canada.
Ottawa, March 3rd, 1919.

Sir,—I am informed by the Printing Bureau that they expect to have the first three volumes of the annual report of this office ready for presentation as follows:—Vol. III, Wednesday or Thursday; Vols. I and II, probably next Monday.

As far as this office is concerned all the matter for Volume III. was signed off and returned to the Bureau on February 25th. All the proof for Volume II. was returned to them on the same date and the proof for Volume I. on Saturday.

I am writing the King's Printer again calling attention to the delay.

I am, Sir,
Your obedient servant,

E. D. Sutherland,
Asst. Auditor General.

Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa.

COMMITTEE ON PENSIONS APPOINTED.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council) moved:

That a special committee be appointed to consider the question of pensions and pension regulations and all matters pertaining thereto, and to prepare and submit a Bill dealing with pensions for the consideration of this House; and that Rule No. 11 be suspended; and that the following members be appointed to compose such committee: Messrs. Andrews, Béland, Clark (North Bruce), Cronyn, Devlin, Green, Lapointe (St. James), McCurdy, Nesbitt, Nickle, Pacaud, Pardee, Power, Redman, Rowell, Ross and Sutherland.

Mr. SPEAKER: This cannot be passed without the unanimous consent of the House, no notice having been given.

Motion agreed to.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I could not catch the names of those nominated to be members of that committee, but if he has not already been named I would suggest that Mr. Lang be added to the committee, as one who understands the matters to be dealt with.

Mr. ROWELL: I should be glad to accept the suggestion of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). But as this addition to the committee would probably necessitate another member from the other side, I would suggest that the arrangement be made through the whips.

STATISTICS ACT AMENDMENTS.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 16, to amend the Statistics Act. He said: The purpose of this Bill is to change the year for which transportation statistics are to be collected. The present Statistics Act makes the year for this purpose the same as the former fiscal year—ending 30th June. It is proposed to adopt, instead of this, the calendar year, thus making it conform with the year adopted for the gathering of our other principal statistics.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

UNITS OF ELECTRICAL MEASURE.

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 17, respecting the Units of Electrical Measure. He said: This Bill is very technical in its terms, and at the moment I can give but a brief explanation of it. The three fundamental units of electrical measure are the ohm, the ampere and the volt. These were established generally in 1908 by an international conference called by the British Government and attended by delegates representing all the great nations of the world. The purpose of the legislation is to give effect in Canada to the conclusions reached at that convention.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

MINISTERIAL CHANGES.

CORRESPONDENCE BETWEEN THE PRIME MINISTER AND HON. MR. CROTHERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): I would ask the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) to be good enough to lay upon the Table any correspondence he may have setting forth the changes that have taken place in the Government during the recess, and the reasons therefor. I have particular reference to the resignation of the former Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) and the resignation from office of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy). I think the Acting Prime Minister will agree with me that the traditional practice of Parliament calls for the laying upon the Table of such correspondence.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I think my hon. friend is correct in his statement of the practice of Parliament in such matters. I have under my hand the correspondence that passed between the former Minister of Labour and the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) with respect to the resignation of the former. I had intended to present this after the conclusion of the debate on the Address, but as the question has been raised I would ask leave to read the correspondence, and I may say that I have the permission of the Governor General to do so:

Ottawa, November 4th, 1918.

My Dear Sir Robert,—I hereby resign my position in your Government as Minister of Labour.

Faithfully,

(Sgd.) T. W. CROTHERS.

Rt. Hon. Sir R. L. Borden,
Premier of Canada,
Ottawa.

Ottawa, Ont., November 5th, 1918.

My Dear Mr. Crothers,—I beg to acknowledge the letter conveying to me your resignation as Minister of Labour which, under the circumstances disclosed to me at our interview, I must accept but with great regret. You told me some eighteen months ago that your health was not good, but that you hoped to continue your duties until the end of the war. I expressed to you my desire and my hope that your strength would prove sufficient for that purpose and I realize the unremitting labours which you have since discharged with great ability and devotion to the public interest.

During the period of more than seven years in which you have been at the head of the Department of Labour you have been confronted from time to time with many difficult questions; and this has been especially true during the past four years. It must be a matter of great gratification to you, as it is to me, that during that period there have been fewer labour disturbances in Canada than in any part of the Empire. This is a tribute not only to the moderation and patriotic spirit of organized labour, but also to the wisdom and ability with which you have discharged your duties as Minister.

May I venture to express my hope that the well earned holiday which you are about to take will prove most beneficial and that although you find your strength unequal to continuing the labours incident to the head of the important Department over which you have presided you will still take an active and energetic interest in public affairs.

Believe me, dear Mr. Crothers,

Yours faithfully,

Hon. T. W. Crothers,
Queen's Hotel,
Toronto, Ont.

I shall make inquiry as to the correspondence in the other matter referred to by the leader of the Opposition.

ALLEGED TRADE DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I desire to bring to the notice of the Acting Prime Minister a matter which has on two former occasions been brought up in this House—once by the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntington (Mr. Robb), and on the second occasion by the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy).

ALLEGED TRADE DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: This morning I received from London this cablegram which I wish to read to the House:

London, March 3,

Surprised cable statement acting-Prime Minister. Every one here knows trade regulations discriminate against us as compared with the United States. I assert this positively.

(Signed) Macdonald.

This cable was sent to me by a former member of this House, Mr. E. M. Macdonald, who is well known to us all, and I think it proper to bring it to the notice of the Acting Prime Minister.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) I may say that we had been dealing with this matter upon newspaper reports. Last week, as I recently stated to the House, I despatched a cable to Sir George Perley, High Commissioner for Canada, with the view of ascertaining the facts. I have not received a reply. When one comes to hand I shall make a further announcement to the House in respect to the subject. I observe from the cable which has been read to the House by my hon. friend, that surprise is expressed at the cabled statement of the Acting Prime Minister. My statement on Thursday of last week was to this effect:

I have no official information in confirmation of the report, and I must take the liberty of doubting that Great Britain would discriminate against Canada in favour of the United States or of any other country.

In private communications that I have received from time to time from the Prime Minister, I have been made aware that representations were made by him and his colleagues, and by Messrs. Harris and Jones, to the departmental heads and to the chairmen of important committees, in respect to the matter of the removal of war restrictions upon trade still existing. The restrictions referred to were general in their character. It has not been intimated to me in any of the correspondence which I have received that there has been any discrimination against Canada. I have had a good deal to do with the finance and trade of Great Britain connected with this country since the outbreak of the war. I have known of the great difficulties under which she has laboured and the situations with which she has been confronted from time to time, and I desire to say that I believe that to the utmost of her power she has endeavoured to assist Canada in her trade, and that in all matters connected with our commerce during the war her intentions towards us have been of the most friendly and generous character.

On the Orders of the Day:

FARMERS' SONS OVERSEAS.

Mr. MURPHY: Might I ask the hon. the Acting Prime Minister a question? Correspondence has reached me, as I have no doubt it has reached other members of this House, from farmers in western Ontario and elsewhere, pointing out that seeding time is only about six weeks away and that they are confronted with a serious shortage of labour. Only to-day I received letters from points in western Ontario in which, among other things, I am given an instance of one man with 200 acres and his only son overseas, and of another man with 250 acres, one son at home and another son overseas. This condition prevails in different parts of the province as well as in other parts of Canada. I am requested to

ask the Government if some provision cannot be made to bring these farmers' sons home in time enough to take part in putting in the next season's crop.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In answer to my hon. friend (Mr. Murphy), I may say what has already been said in this House in this debate, that every possible effort is being made by the Government to bring home, as speedily as possible, the Canadian Expeditionary force. I think that within the next few months very rapid progress will have been made—indeed, much more rapid than we and, I think, the people of this country, anticipated at the time of the signing of the armistice.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East), for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session resumed from Friday, February 28th.

Mr. J. A. C. ETHIER (Laval-Two-Mountains) (Translation) (Resuming): Mr Speaker, before resuming my speech which was so fortunately interrupted, on Friday last, by the visit of the illustrious mutilated hero of the war of 1870, General Pau and the distinguished friends who accompanied him I deem it my duty to convey to you, Mr. Speaker and to my hon. colleagues to your right and to your left, the expression of my regret at having perhaps been unable to rise to the emergency and to show myself equal to the task imposed by the circumstances; but let me tell the House that what I said was prompted by the heart and the sincere and frank expression of my feelings. My words conveyed the sentiments of a loyal British citizen and betrayed the love of a descendant of old France for his ancient mother country. I am fully rewarded for it and I am glad to avail myself of the opportunity which is afforded me of conveying to and placing before the House the expression of the emotions stirred in General Pau's heart, on the occasion of his visit to this House, the other day.

Allow me now, Mr. Speaker, to read a letter which I have just received from this illustrious man whom the country is acclaiming to-day.

French Mission. French Republic.
Montreal, March 2, 1919.

J. A. C. Ethier, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Dear Sir,

Allow me to tell you how happy I felt, the other day, in hearing you, when, together with the Mission, I was granted the honour of the sitting in the Federal Parliament. By good luck a French-speaking member was then addressing the House—

La Presse, of Montreal, in its issue of Saturday last, pointed out this very same circumstance.

—need I tell you how happy I felt in hearing our mother tongue echoing within the precincts of the House? Need I add how deeply moved I was by what you said with regard to me and respecting France? These are memories which will never be wiped out of our minds but will ever remain green in my heart and in the heart of my colleagues.

Believe me, Sir,

G. Pau.

There is nothing to add to such a letter and to the proof of esteem conveyed to me personally, Mr. Speaker; but my hon. colleagues are quite aware that those congratulations are a tribute paid not to myself but to all my colleagues.

When I had the honour of moving the adjournment of the debate, which is going on to-day with your leave, Mr. Speaker—and let me say, from the very outset, that I do highly appreciate the favour you conferred upon me in relaxing the Rules of the House and allowing me to resume the debate under such circumstances—I was dealing with prohibition. It is up to the Government to legislate on that question which is now being debated by the provincial assemblies, that of Quebec and the no less important one of Ontario. I hope that the Government, in approaching that question, will bear in mind the threat hurled across the line by Labour, which is spreading throughout Canada: "No beer, no coal." This is, a pregnant argument, and I hope the Government will bear it in mind, in proper time and place.

Labour and reconstruction seem to preoccupy the mind of the Government; and yet those important questions do not receive the degree of consideration they are entitled to.

The honorable member from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) in the course of a few remarks more or less expedient which he made on Friday last, has taxed his ingenuity in order to represent my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) in the shape of a Bolshevik. In his opinion, the Russian Soviets and Bolsheviks find in my hon. friend from Brome a zealous and doughty champion of their doctrine. He protested against the propagation and distribution of Bolshevik literature, without mentioning the names of those papers and while he was denouncing them, I wondered whether he had in mind the Orange Sentinel. I wondered if he meant the

Jack Canuck or the Calgary Eyeopener, which are protected by the Government and which are circulating under his paternal eye.

But employment must be found for the unemployed, we are told by the Government; public health has to be protected; reconstruction and the re-establishment of soldiers have to be provided for; and post-war problems must be solved. But what are you doing for the farmers? The tariff question is passed over in silence in the speech from the Throne. In his opinion, the tariff is a negligible quantity and you have but to do the bidding of the manufacturers and the capitalists and follow the lead of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt).

The other day, my hon. friend expressed a wish or rather suggested a compromise, in saying that he would be in favour of paying a bigger income tax. That is quite easy for him, as he derives his profits from the farmer, and so he will take in the pocket of the farmers the money he will pay to the Government.

In their recent Orders in Council, passed during recess, the Government have put the tractors on the free list. That is all very well but if the tractors are useful to the wealthy farmers of the West who can dispose of enough money to buy those implements, it is quite, quite another thing with the other provinces.

What does the farmer want now, if you really wish to protect him? Put not only farming implements on the free list but also raw material.

An hon. MEMBER: Take off the duty off ploughs.

Mr. ETHIER: Is my hon. friend from Brantford in favour of placing on the free list the agricultural implements which he is manufacturing and selling at such a profit? The hon. gentleman spoke smoothly, on Friday; he held out the olive branch with one hand, but with the other hand, he lays the burden of taxation on the farmer. My hon. friend lacks sincerity; he always advocated in this House high duties on ploughs.

My hon. friend from Brantford tried to bring into ridicule the hon. member for Essex (Mr. Kennedy) when speaking of "separated brethren" and with a gesture which he deemed eloquent, he pointed out the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who was approving him with a smile.

An hon. MEMBER: That does not mean much.

[Mr. Ethier.]

Mr. ETHIER: No, it is no great matter, because behind that smile lurks a mental reservation. Those "separated brethren" referred to by my hon. friend for Essex, who have been invited by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) to go back to the fold, saying that the door of the Liberal party was wide open, and who smiled approvingly at the remarks of the hon. member for Brantford, may not always smile, when the tariff question comes up. He did not tell us what transpired at the caucus of the hon. gentlemen, last Thursday; he did not tell us whether the smile was as sweet and as bright as the one he was wearing, when referring to the hon. member for Brome. I do not think so. And when the tariff question is brought forward, I shall ask the hon. member for Brantford what he thinks of the statements of the Minister of Agriculture and of the resolutions passed in the West by the Grain-Growers and approved by the Minister of Agriculture. The smile of the hon. gentleman may not be as sweet and pleasing as the smile of the hon. member for Red Deer, Friday last.

Such are the important matters which the Governor General's speech does not mention and which the Government does not care to deal with.

However, they have had taken great pains in spreading out the importance of the presence of the Prime Minister in Europe. When you read the Government's organs you would believe that Sir Robert-Borden's services there are primordially useful. The President of the Republic to the south of us is nobody, neither is Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain! Sir Robert Borden must remain in France. We see the President of the United States coming back to Washington to deal with the labour conditions and other questions of the hour. The British Prime Minister is crossing the Straits and goes to England to watch and endeavour to solve the labour problem which actually threatens the Imperial Throne. But Mr. Borden is of such consequence that he had to be assigned a position in which Canada is going to play a great part: they are sending him to the Marmorean Sea, to Prince's Island to confer with the Bolsheviks in order that he may become acquainted with their doctrine which the hon. member for Brantford thinks he has detected in the views expressed by the hon. member for Brome. But supposing, Mr. Speaker, that this mission, which I hold is of minor importance, were

justified, and that the Prime Minister of Canada would have-had to play a preponderant part in that meeting with the Russian Bolsheviks in Prince's Island, it is all over now that the Bolsheviks have refused to meet him. Why then should we not have the privilege, the pleasure and the great honour of seeing Sir Robert Borden in this House to-day? We would be pleased under the circumstance to behold his important and commanding personality as presiding over the proceedings of this House. Alas! no; he is overseas, and, according to press reports and rumors, seeking an embassy, perhaps in the United States.

The gentlemen who, in 1911, impeached the United States, and denounced a commercial treaty and reciprocity with that country and refused to make any financial or other transaction with them, now solicit the honour of being ambassador of Great Britain in the Republic which they so despised! This is a singular contrast.

The Government complain that they cannot, under the present circumstances, as stated by the hon. Minister of Public Works, answer all the questions and satisfy all the demands which are put forth with a view to solving the post-war problems.

The hon. Minister of Public Works says that we may expect each year from now on a deficit of $100,000,000. This year we are going to spend $20,000,000 for better housing; $25,000,000 for highways; $75,000,000 for new railway branch lines in the western provinces, and then after having increased the debt to $2,000,000,000, we shall still have a deficit of $100,000,000.

The Government seem to have a queer liking for the Bolsheviks. They allowed the Prime Minister to go and confer with the Bolshevik leaders in Prince's Island, then they sent troops to Siberia to fight the very people whom the Prime Minister was asked to pacify.

With regard to this expedition to Siberia —which the press has spoken so much about—may I ask what right had the Government to spend millions to send, without any authorization, that regiment there? Why were those soldiers asked to go to Northern Russia where, unfortunately for them, they are exposed to severe cold as well as retaliation on the part of the Bolsheviks ?

I believe, Mr. Speaker, that I have dealt with the different problems which concern public opinion. I may have gone beyond that which is mentioned in the Governor General's speech, but I could hardly leave aside such questions as that of the tariff, the censure and the enforcement of the Military Service Act as regards the defaulters. I thought it was my duty not to ignore them and to call the attention of the country and of the Government to that which the latter have probably deliberately left aside.

I trust that in the few remarks which I made I kept within the limits of parliamentary discretion, and that they will be accepted in the right spirit by the members of the cabinet and my hon. friends on the other side of this House. I believe that the unexpected visit of General Pau ought to be sufficient to let you forget the other part of my speech. At all events I submit it, with the hope that the Government will seriously consider the various questions which we are discussing and will consider my remarks in the spirit in which they were made.

Mr. GEORGE BRECKEN NICHOLSON (Algoma East): Mr. Speaker, at the outset may I be permitted to add my word of commendation with respect to the manner in which the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Redman), and the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), presented the resolution which we are now considering. I particularly congratulate the latter hon. gentleman on his declaration with regard to national unity. It seems to me that if there is anything to which men of all classes, whether in public life or out of it, in this country, should direct themselves, it is to an effort to break down the unnatural prejudice that exists amongst many of our people on racial, religious and social lines. I wish to say, Sir, that if this country of ours is ever to reach the position to which we think she is entitled, it will be when men who deem themselves to be patriotic Canadians get together, work out a common ideal, and go forward to the attainment of that ideal. As long as we are divided as we now are, we can never achieve real national greatness.

The speech from the Throne submits a programme which, if we give to it the attention and consideration it deserves, will provide this House with work for a very considerable period. It is not my purpose to go at any length into any of the specific problems before us. I would, however, ask the liberty of referring to one or two very briefly.

The first question has to do with the returned soldier. Personally I do not like to hear it referred to as the problem of the returned soldier: it grates on my ears to hear the returned soldier referred to in any sense as a problem. For my own part I

look upon the returned soldier as the greatest asset this country has, or has had. There is a problem confronting us in connection with our relationship to the returned soldier. The problem is simply this: it is our duty—it is your duty and it is mine—to see to it that every soldier who went overseas to fight the battles of this country in Europe, is given an opportunity to get back into civil life just as quickly as he can, and into a position at least as good, if not a little better, than he had before he went overseas. With regard to the returned soldier who comes back to us broken in body and mind, it is our duty to leave nothing undone that can be done to render his position in life just as good as it can possibly be made. We can never restore him to his former condition; we can never make the world for him the same as it was before; but we can, as far as we are able, alleviate his condition and make life at least tolerable. Then there are the dependents of those who have fallen, and in that regard I merely say this: If ever a woman or child in this country is permitted to suffer because of some Canadian citizen who has given his life in this war, then some one will be criminally responsible, and will be held to account for that responsibility.

Another point touched on in the speech from the Throne, to which I would refer briefly, is the housing question. I am aware, Mr. Speaker, that I am now treading on somewhat delicate ground, because I do not believe that the present policy is universally acceptable. However, I am not going to discuss the matter in detail, because when it comes before the House later on we shall have an opportunity of reviewing it from all angles; but before we make up our minds too firmly that the housing proposition is not a good one, let us just ask ourselves, and if we can do so answer the question, whether there is a town or city anywhere in Canada, of any considerable size, where a workingman, an ordinary workingman and his family, can secure a suitable house, such as a Canadian workingman and his family should be permitted to live in—one containing five rooms and a bath—at a rental that a workingman can pay? If there is such an one, I do not know where it is, and I would like to have the opportunity of visiting it.

It has been said, Mr. Speaker, many times during this debate that there never was a time in the history of this country—in fact there never was a time in the history of the world—when we were face to face with so many problems, upon the solution of which will to a large measure depend the kind of civilization that the next generation, at least, is going to have; and it behooves us all to approach these problems with calmness, and at least a measure of reasonable consideration.

There is the question of the labour problem—or the relationship of capital and labour, of labour to capital—of employer to employee, if you will. And let me say, notwithstanding the admiration that it would appear some members of the House hold for the system of the Bolsheviki, I am one of those who believe that the relationship between employer and employee will be a factor, so long as this dispensation lasts, in some form or other. It is our business therefore to try to work out a relationship between employer and employee that will be reasonable and that will give to every man without discrimination the right to earn at least a decent and respectable living. That is the basis of the whole problem—to enter upon a detailed discussion of the subject would occupy too long a time at this particular moment.

Another question that we must face in this country, and face in the very immediate future, is the final solution of the railway problem. We have gone some distance towards finding the solution, but we have very many difficulties to overcome yet, and the sooner we get busy and arrive at the best way of overcoming these difficulties the better it will be.

Another problem to be dealt with is the tariff, and again I almost feel as though I were treading on holy ground when I mention this particular subject. People will tell you the question is so difficult, that there are such diverse views of the tariff. That is perfectly true, but the fact that the question is a difficult one, and that people have diverse views of it, is one reason why we should tackle it. I am somewhat in harmony with the view of the hon. member for Brome that we should tackle the tariff problem now; that we should not undertake to reconstruct the superstructure that has been torn down until we shall have re-established the foundation. We shall not have industrial stability until we have determined what the fiscal policy of the country is going to be. I have my own views with regard to the tariff. If I and the other members of this House in turn took the whole afternoon in discussing the tariff we should all go away in just as much a state of chaos as we are in at the present moment. We shall never reach a solution of this matter by discussing the tariff across the floor of

the House; it will have to be taken hold of in a more scientific, businesslike manner. I do not believe that we could exist industrially under a policy of absolute free trade. Other hon. gentlemen in this House may say just as emphatically that we can; I am not going to quarrel with them; they have the same right to their opinions that I have to mine. But I do believe that there is room for a fair and reasonable compromise between the extreme views that are held with regard to the tariff. I have not even a glimmer of an idea of what may be in the mind of the Government or in the mind of the Acting Prime Minister with regard to this question. It may be that we shall find in the Budget a complete solution of the tariff problem—at least, I hope that will be the case. But I pass along a suggestion; it may be taken for what it is worth. It is that the Government appoint a commission—I hope that no hon. gentleman opposite will collapse in his chair because I use the word "commission"—to take hold of the question of the tariff; that the United Council of Agriculture, the Grain Growers of Western Canada, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the United Boards of Trade, transportation organizations and organized labour, be requested to appoint their own representatives to make up that commission; and that these representatives sit around a table and see if they cannot work out a compromise on the tariff that will stabilize Canadian industry.

I would like the privilege of referring briefly to some of the criticisms that we have heard from the other side of the House. First, I wish to refer to a remark made by the leader of the Opposition (Mr McKenzie)—I sincerely trust that he will pardon my presumption in doing so—with regard to the Department of Labour. If I understood him aright, he intimated that the Department of Labour was, to use a common phrase, simply lying down on the job and doing nothing to bring capital and labour or the employer and the employee together. I hold no mandate for the Minister of Labour (Hon. G. D. Robertson) although I have the greatest admiration for him and had the greatest admiration for his predecessor (Hon. T. W. Crothers). I would however suggest to the leader of the Opposition that he spend an hour some day in the office of the Minister of Labour. If he has not time to do that, I will undertake to introduce him to two or three representatives of organized labour in order that he may find out what was done by the former Minister of Labour and what has been done by the present Minister of Labour with a view to harmonising the differences between the employer and the employee. I wonder if the leader of the Opposition ever heard of Board of Adjustment No. 1, upon which is represented all the railway organizations in Canada and all the employees of railways in Canada, an organization under which such a thing as a strike on the great transportation systems has become a practical impossibility. It seems to me that we have gone a long way towards harmonising the differences between the employer and the employee, and if the lines that have already been laid down can be followed in the future, I have great hope that it will not be long before such a thing as a strike or a disruption between the workingman and his employer will be an unheard of thing in Canada. I know that that is the end towards which the Minister of Labour is working, and in that regard he is receiving a great deal of assistance from employers and employees.

4 p.m.

One other matter that was briefly touched on by the leader of the Opposition was the franchise. I am not going to go into that, nor am I going to discuss the War-Time Elections Act. I simply say this: if hon. members have it in their minds that by wiping the War-Time Elections Act off the slate they are going to enfranchise enemy aliens in Canada, they have another guess coming to them, because the people will not stand for it.

I listened to the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) in his reference to the Bolsheviki. I listened also to the hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Ethier) in his references to Bolshevism, but I regret that I could not follow him very closely, therefore I will not deal with what he said. But I was amazed and shocked to feel that any member occupying a seat in this House should so prostitute his privileges as to stand up and offer a defence of Bolshevism. When the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) was referring to this matter on Friday afternoon an hon. member on the other side of the House called out: "What is there in the doctrine of Bolshevism to which you object?" Let me ask hon. members what they think of the nationalization of woman, one of the doctrines of the Bolshevik, under which an innocent girl is torn from her home and turned over to some brute of a man—what for? For no other purpose but the express intention of propagating the species, and that the children

born of such an unholy union shall be not the God-given heritage of their parents, but the property of the state, the same as any other animal. Yet we are asked to associate the words "truth" and "justice" with the Bolshevik. It gives one a bad taste in the mouth even to utter the word "Bolshevik."

The member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier)—I regret that he is not in his seat—undertook to fasten on the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder) a charge of partisanship in connection with the appointment of medical officers to look after returned soldiers in Canada. If the member for St. Hyacinthe had contented himself with dealing in generalities he might have been able to make out a very good case, but unfortunately he became specific. I assume that I am correct in saying that if there is anything the matter with the appointments made under the regulation that was read by the member for St. Hyacinthe, it is that the proper persons were not appointed, or that improper persons were appointed. The hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville (Mr. Gauthier) read a list of medical men in the different towns and cities throughout Canada who had been appointed by the Repatriation Committee. Amongst the number he mentioned Dr. James, of the town of Mattawa; Dr. Bell, of North Bay, and Dr. Cook, of Sudbury, and as he mentioned each name he referred to him as a Tory political heeler. I do not know whether the hon. member for St. Hyacinthe-Rouville knows the town of Mattawa and Dr. James, or the town of North Bay and Dr. Bell, or the town of Sudbury and Dr. Cook; but I am prepared to pay the hon. member's expenses to each of these towns and to introduce him to each of these doctors for the privilege of seeing what will happen when he says to their faces that they are Tory or any other kind of heelers.

Mr. PROULX: I remember very well that the hon. member said that Dr. James was a Unionist.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: Hansard says "Tory." Dr. James is not and never has been a Tory. If he has any political affiliations, he is an out-and-out, strong Liberal. Dr. Bell, of North Bay, has never been identified with a political party of any description. Dr. Cook, of Sudbury, if he has any political affiliations whatever, is a Liberal. Let me say further that if the Government had fine-tooth-combed this country from Halifax to Vancouver, they could not have selected three men more outstanding in their professions than Doctors James, Bell and Cook. Yet these are the men who are held up to ridicule in this House as political heelers because they have been asked to do a work for the returned soldier. Since July, 1914, they have been spending fifty per cent of their time in the interest of the soldier, and they are willing to continue doing so.

You will remember, Sir, that I referred a few moments ago to the appointment of a commission. One of the parrot cries that we have heard from the beginning of this session—and we hear it also outside of the House—is this cry with regard to the appointment of commissions. The Government have been appointing too many commissions. The hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) went as far as to say that it was time for the Government to get rid of all these commissions, to take off their coats and get busy and do the work themselves. These are not the hon. member's exact words, but I think they are a fair implication of what he said. This leads me to the conclusion that hon. gentlemen opposite either do not understand the meaning of the word "commission," or do not understand the functions of government. To illustrate what I mean, let me put the matter in this way. If I employ a man to drive a team of horses for me in a log camp and tell him that I am going to hold him responsible for doing that work, he has my commission to go ahead and do it. If the board of directors of a business organization tell the general manager to look after their business, he has their commission to go ahead and do the work. If one of the railway companies sends out a superintendent to take charge of one of their divisions, he has their commission to do the work. I think that is a fair statement. What then is the function of government? Is it not that the members of the Cabinet, the ministers of the Crown, shall spend their time in directing the affairs of this country in the interest of the people; that they shall take charge of their departments; and that they shall employ whatever assistance is necessary to carry out the policy of the Government as expressed by Parliament in the interest of all the people? Are not these the functions of government? If I understand hon. gentlemen opposite aright, their idea of the functions of government is that the ministers of the Crown, to use the terms of the hon. member for North Essex, shall get rid of all these assistants, take off their coats and do the work themselves, and whatever they

cannot do themselves leave undone whether the people suffer or not. I purpose putting hon. members opposite to a test in connection with this. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), who was one of those who declaimed vigorously against these commissions, the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff), the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) and the hon. member for Laval, Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) are each of them, I am convinced, literally consumed by an ardent desire to place their services at the disposal of a needy, although perhaps, unappreciative State. There is an opportunity awaiting them. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) told the House a few days ago that he had in contemplation an extensive programme of public works involving some work to be done under force account. Supposing these hon. members who are so anxious to see the country get rid of commissions and who are also so anxious to serve the State would take the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) as padrone of the group and go up to the city of Hamilton and pull down some of those buildings which the Minister of Public Works wants to remove. They would be accomplishing two things at the same time by doing so; they would be proving the utility of their own theory with regard to the functions of Government and they would be serving the State to just about the limit of their capacity.

I would like to refer briefly to a statement made by the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains. I regret exceedingly that I was not able to follow the hon. member through the whole of his speech, because I do not understand the beautiful language of France. On Friday afternoon, we had the very great privilege of having with us for a few moments that grand old man, General Pau—a privilege that I believe every member in this House appreciated to the fullest possible extent. When General Pau entered this Chamber the hon. member for Laval-Two Mountains was speaking English and with fitting courtesy he ceased speaking in English and continued his address in French. I believe that I am well within the mark when I say that every member of this House felt that it was a very happy coincidence that when General Pau entered the Chamber there should have been on his feet an hon. member capable of speaking the French language. But what did the hon. member say when he proceeded with his speech? Did he utter any gracious compliment to that great country which General Pau represented? No, he entered a specious plea on behalf of the liquor interests of this country. He intimated that if we abrogated the Treaty under which French wines come into Canada we might disrupt the Entente Cordiale existing between the two peoples. There sat the battle-scarred veteran who has been the personal witness of the greatest vicarious sacrifices that humanity has ever been able to give to the world, listening to a declaration that it would require a traffic in intoxicating liquor to keep intact a bond of unity that has been cemented by the outpouring of the life-blood of sixty thousand Canadians and ten times sixty thousand Frenchmen side by side. Must that old veteran not have shuddered to his very soul at the utterance of such a sentiment? I am not going to pursue the hon. member's argument further than to say this, that if the interests for whom he was pleading have no better argument to put before the Canadian people than that, then their case is, indeed, a sorry one.

I wish to refer very briefly to something said by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) in his address the other evening. He apparently deemed it fitting to hold up to the ridicule of this House and of the country His Gracious Majesty King George the Fifth because of a complimentary banquet given to President Wilson at Windsor Castle; and judging by the applause with which his remarks were greeted by the hon. gentlemen sitting around him, I was forced to the conclusion that the sentiments he expressed were very largely concurred in by His Majesty's loyal Opposition. I have no means of knowing whence the hon. member derived his inspiration, but his remarks followed so closely along the line of a similar attack on President Wilson published in one of the pro-German organs in the city of New York that I at least was forced to the conclusion that minds with like ideals have an almost uncanny aptitude for finding expression in similar words. To refresh the minds of hon. gentlemen, I shall quote what the hon. member for North Essex said with regard to this banquet:

> It was a magnificent banquet. There were thousands of soft shaded lights. The walls were hung with expensive tapestries. Fifteen million dollars' worth of gold plate were spread upon the banquet board. The lackeys were in the costume of the beef-eaters of old, bowing low and moving backwards before the passing guests. Our Premier was there, and he was described in the papers as wearing the Windsor costume, knee breeches and all—democracy pure and undefiled.

I know nothing of the details of the banquet, but I venture to say this: bearing in

mind the splendid example of self-sacrifice and service His Majesty King George the Fifth and every member of his family have given to us during the last four years, the banquet was in perfect harmony with the occasion. What was that occasion? The hon. member for North Essex would have us believe that it was a mere vulgar example of medieval self-indulgence and flunkeyism; at least that was my impression. Mr. Speaker, since the days when the Pilgrim Fathers first set foot on the continent of North America there never was an event or an occasion fraught with greater possibilities for good for the whole human race than the occasion which the hon. member for North Essex held up to the contempt of this House and country. It was the occasion when for the first time in history the head of the great British democracy was permitted to entertain in his own home the head of the great democracy of the United States of America. What does that signify? Let hon. gentlemen cast their eyes back to the summer of 1914 and ask themselves what it was that saved civilization when the war lords of Central Europe opened the flood gates of Armageddon. We have heard a good many explanations of how the world was saved, but I say without the slightest fear of successful contradiction that the underlying reason, the only reason, in fact by which it was possible for civilization to save itself was the "Bonne Entente" between the Republic of France and the British Empire brought about by the matchless diplomacy of the late King Edward VII. Had it not been for that Bonne Entente the hon. member for North Essex would not have had the privilege of speaking in a free parliament in this or any other country. The Huns would have taken care of that. And if King George never does anything else but lay the foundation upon which can be built up a similar understanding that will draw together the English-speaking peoples of the great democracy of the British Empire, that commonwealth of free nations, and the great democracy of the United States of America, he will have given cause to mankind the world over to sing with a new meaning that grand old anthem "God Save the King."

Reference has been made to the absence of the Prime Minister from this House, and the matter was brought to a direct head the other evening by the hon. member for North Essex who demanded that the Prime Minister return to his duties and do the things which the Canadian people are paying him to do. That demand met with such apparent approval by hon. gentlemen opposite sitting around the Speaker that I was again forced to conclude his opinions were concurred in by hon. gentlemen opposite. That leads me to ask this question: Can it be possible that even at this late date hon. members have utterly failed to comprehend the true meaning of the times in which we live? During the past four years, sixty thousand of the flower of Canada's manhood have poured out their life's blood on the battlefields of Europe; one hundred and fifty thousand more are coming back broken in body, some of them in mind, bearing scars that will be to their glory as long as they live; two hundred thousand others have with them gone into and come out of the very jaws of hell itself. What for? Simply in order that the world might be made a fit place for decent people to live in. There is now sitting in Paris, the centre around which that holocaust raged, a conference of the heads of the allied nations. The first minister of each allied country is there together with such of his colleagues as he deemed necessary. They are meeting in Paris for what? In order that a constitution may be framed for mankind that will make it impossible for a similar world catastrophe to occur again. Yet we have hon. members in this House saying that the Prime Minister of Canada should leave all that, leave the things for which our boys bled and died, and come back to attend to some matter of parish politics. I will not pursue the subject further except to say this, that if the Prime Minister of Canada was anywhere else than where he now is or doing anything else than the business he is now attending to he would be unworthy of being the Prime Minister of Canada.

Before concluding, I desire to say a word or two with regard to what our boys did in France. We have heard described in accurate detail the position the world was in when this House rose in May last. At that time the hearts of our people were almost standing still in strained anxiety, watching the bulletins day after day, and hour by hour, to see what next was going to happen. Was that human line, extending from the North sea to the boundary of Switzerland going to be able to hold? It did hold. It bent in places, individual links were stretched, but it held. It held until that moment when the great General Foch, in collaboration with our own great General Haig, General Pershing, and the other members of the Allied high command, determined that the time had come to strike. And they struck. They struck with such effect that in four short months they rolled

up the German forces, brought the Hun to his knees and compelled him to cry for peace.

What part did our own boys take in these events? For the first time in the whole war the four Canadian divisions were brought together in one army, with the addition of one British division, and were held in readiness for a fixed purpose. Near the end of September the time came for them to strike. They struck, and the first blow broke the Hindenburg line and they crossed the Dracourt switch. I will not undertake to follow in detail their course from that to the end of the war. Suffice it to say, they covered more than one hundred miles; they released hundreds of cities, towns and villages; they met thirty-four German divisions, almost seven times their own number, and defeated them, putting four of them practically out of existence. They took more live prisoners than the total number of their own casualties; they captured 1,200 heavy guns, and over 3,000 machine guns. And they finally planted the flag of the Allies in the city of Mons on the very day the armistice was signed.

What spirit did our boys display through that terrible time? Was there any complaint? Never a word. May I be permitted to quote to this House one sentence from a letter written by one of these boys to his mother, written on the eve of the taking by the Canadians of Valenciennes: "Mother, as we pass through these liberated towns and villages, and look into the faces of the women and children who have endured four years of Hun barbarism, we feel that after all what we are doing, little as it is worth, is worth while."

I have listened, Mr. Speaker, to men on public platforms in Canada dilating on the wonderful country we have, the glorious heritage handed down to us by our fathers. And these orators have usually brought their message to a climax with something like this: Will the sons of Canada be worthy of their forebears? That question can never be asked again. But there is a question that you and I must ask ourselves: Are we, the fathers and mothers, the men and women of Canada, going to be worthy of the sacrifices that these boys have made for us?

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): Mr. Speaker, in the name of the county that I have the honour to represent in this House and which bears the name of "Laurier-Outremont" I wish to express our most sincere regrets and affliction and sorrow for the great loss sustained by this country through the death of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I am sure that in no part of the Dominion has his death created more sorrow and affliction than in this constituency bearing his name. He was admired and loved to the extreme limit. His name and memory will live forever. For my part it was a great privilege to have known this illustrious man for more than twenty years. I had the advantage of appreciating his kindness, his refined and princely manner. In politics he meant about everything to me. He was the wise adviser, the great friend, the Chief. He had all my confidence and respect. His sweet memory will be cherished in my heart and soul as long as I live. On this occasion may I offer to Lady Laurier our sentiments and expression of our sincere regret and sympathy for her immense and irreparable loss.

It is with satisfaction that I note that in the speech from the Throne mention was made of the glorious deeds accomplished by our gallant officers and soldiers at the front; they have rendered great services to this country and to the world during the four years of the war. The glory that they have cast on Canada is so great that I had anticipated that the speech from the Throne would contain a vote of thanks in the name of this Parliament addressed to the officers and to the soldiers, and some recognition offered to these officers and to the soldiers that have most distinguished themselves; a grant of money or a sword of honour could have been offered to the general in command, Sir Arthur Currie. Such a step has been taken previously in England and in the Congress of the United States. A nation honours herself in honouring her heroes and her great men; it has been done by England to Wellington, to Lord Nelson, to French and to Marshal Haig. I am sure that the people of this country will resent such an omission. I consider it is a mistake. While I am on this subject, I may say that I am surprised that this Government, through the military department, has not seen the advantage of presenting medals of honor to our soldiers and officers who so well deserved them; it is true that some of our men have received distinctions from England and from France, but surely this country should be in a position to recognize the services of our soldiers in this manner and necessary orders should be given at once and should have been given before. Also while speaking on these matters, I may

say that the people of my province and the soldiers of this country speaking the French language were highly disappointed by the refusal of this Government to organize a French Canadian brigade. You will remember that at the last session I had the opportunity to put this question before this House, and after hearing the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the Minister of Militia and Finance (Major General Mewburn) we had nourished the hope that such a brigade would be formed and organized in due course. We had in Europe all the elements to organize such a brigade, we had the officers and the men, we had more than enough men to keep at the full rank this brigade; it would have been a great stimulant and a great reward for these men and officers to obtain this recognition on the part of this Government. I have myself cabled to the Prime Minister of Canada while in England to again call his attention to this matter. For reasons unacceptable to me, this just demand was refused. It will be written in the history of this country that this Government, supposed to have been elected to take the best means to carry on this war, preferred to play politics and did not take the best means for the advancement of victory; it will be written that this Government was unfair towards the province of Quebec, has committed a great injustice to the men speaking the French language and who have fought bravely and gloriously with the other soldiers of Canada in this war. In their name, once again I desire to protest energetically against such a wrong done to my province.

As you are aware, this country is passing through a period of uncertainty and crisis. Industry is stagnating, a great number of labourers are unemployed, leaders of industry are looking around hoping for practical direction from this Government, the large class of agriculture—the basis with industry of our wealth and prosperity— are also looking anxiously toward the future. They fear a lack of markets for their products. Our soldiers are coming back by thousands from Europe. The present situation is unsettled and it is a dangerous one.

The future prosperity of the country depends on the legislation to be passed mostly at this session. The Canadian people were expecting, and they had a right to expect, that this Government, through the speech from the Throne, would bring forward, in plain language, solutions for these problems; that a direction would be given to promote the commercial and economical position of this country with the object of bringing about prosperity, reducing the high cost of living, and producing peace and contentment. The farmers are hoping for a market for their products. They know well that in the future the artificial markets due to the war will be closed for them. It is to be regretted that the policy, if any, mentioned in the speech from the Throne does not give us much hope. During the last two or three years the Government have been notified again and again to prepare for the time coming after the war, for reconstruction and readjustment. I am sorry to say that not much has been done. In fact I would be justified in saying that nothing very practical has been done for this country. While new markets have been prepared and opened by our neighbours to the south, new policies and new methods of business have been adopted in England and in France, while a new understanding has been arrived at in England between capital and labour which has given satisfaction to the latter, here in this country a great unrest exists; we are to-day unprepared for this big problem of reconstruction and readjustment, we have no new markets offered to us or proposed to us by this Government and no practical policy suggested.

The position of this country is quite difficult and we have an immense task before us. We have to be careful in what we do. Our net public debt, five years ago, was about 335 million dollars, it is now about two billion dollars. When the army is demobilized and our different obligations are met, it will be above two billion dollars, this not taking into account our responsibility for our railroad liabilities, which reach more than 500 million dollars. It is a large debt for a population of eight millions; more than $230 per head, and represents an increase of about six-fold as compared with the figure at which it stood before the war. To meet the interest and the sinking fund, we will have to exercise great economy in many departments and find large sources of revenue. We are thinking much too easily in hundreds of millions to-day and the public credit is endangered. Before the war the interest on our debt was about 12 millions, while to-day it will be about 100 millions. Then the military pension list may reach 25 million dollars or more, the deficit of the Government railways will represent another large amount, and over and above this amount is the cost of the general administration of the country,

which may represent 140 millions, and perhaps more. This brings the total expenditure on current revenue account to the enormous amount of about 300 million dollars, which represents about $37 per capita, or, for a family of five persons, it means that this family is taxed for $185. This will be met only if business activities and general prosperity continue. The last fiscal year has given us a public revenue of 261 million dollars. This amount will necessarily drop with the actual mode of taxation; prohibition of the liquor traffic will cut into both excise and custom receipts; prices of goods will recede and come to a reasonable price. To date, our revenue is based on, income tax, business tax, business profit tax, increased postage rates and additional custom and excise taxation. We have to reduce the custom tariff for the cost of living is too high. This Parliament has to remodel our system of taxation and revenue. At the same time, we have to carry out certain public works and spend large sums of money to put this country on a basis to compete with the outside world in foreign markets. I refer to transportation and promotion of home and foreign trade. We must also spend large sums of money upon soldiers' lands, settlement and re-establishment. The Government has to see also that there is if possible no unemployment of labour and of capital. The prosperity of this country is based upon its exports. Our exports are to come from agricultural products and manufactured articles; we have to look after these two items so as to keep prosperity at home. Capital, labour, resources, transportation and markets; these constitute the factors of trade and commerce. Business will have to go on as before. During the last two years of the war the value of our exports has increased to an enormous sum of money, due to the fact that the people of Europe needed at any cost our farm products and our war material. Canada was in the position of a firm that had a monopoly of certain goods and was selling those goods to a firm that had to buy and pay or otherwise go out of business. The price received for agricultural products and the market that we had were artificial owing to the demand due to the war conditions; but this market and these conditions will disappear with the end of the war. More than that, I would dare to say that it is likely that England will buy from us less farm products than before the war, because, as you are aware, they have increased enormously their capacity for producing farm products since the beginning of the war. They have improved their methods of agriculture and according to the figures shown to me, the agricultural production of last year in the British Isle was four times more than before the war. In England, the farms produced last year enough for forty weeks, while in the pre-war period they were not producing more than enough for ten weeks. There is no doubt that the English people, practical as they are, will continue these improvements which were new to them. You are aware also that great economy has been taught to the English people during the last war. They will therefore be disposed to buy less and live with less expense and luxury. The result of this will be that the English market, which was one of our largest agricultural markets, will be greatly restricted for us.

We have to bear in mind that under the present conditions Canada cannot manufacture for large export on a permanent basis, and this system has to be changed, for industry as well as agriculture are and must be the two main sources of our wealth. We should have always in our mind the fact that the basis of our wealth in this country will be the development and the selling of our agricultural products and large manufacturers' products. We have to produce more on our farms, we have to develop our agricultural lands; we have to put more farmers on our lands, and we have to find new markets for the agricultural production of the country. Where shall we find these new markets? We have one close to us, separated from our country by only an imaginary line. This market is the United States. It is our natural market. In consequence, I could summarize the new policy that this Government should follow, for one important part, and this is the revision of our tariff with the United States. We have to open new markets for our agricultural products; we have to encourage agriculture; produce more and more, and have more and more good farmers. Then the Government must from to-day, and to-day is the time, make a step further in establishing a new economical and commercial system. I submit that the basis of our economical system is entirely wrong and not adapted to our conditions, taking into consideration our geographical position, our population, and our raw material.

For a long time in this country it has been the custom to protect certain industries by imposing a high tariff. This meant that certain goods necessary to life, an-

alogous to those manufactured here—had to pay a high duty. The people of this country paid from their pockets for this protection and I say to-day, in this era of democracy and of justice for all, it is time that certain of these taxes imposed on the necessaries of life should disappear and a revision should take place.

To-day these manufacturers are not in the position they were some years ago. They are rich. I submit the principle that the industries that should be specially encouraged in this country, and what can add to the wealth of this country, are the industries that can work on raw material from our own country. Industries manufacturing on imported raw material cannot compete, as a general principle, with the industries of other countries that manufacture on their own raw materials. When factories manufacture and work upon imported raw material, the only practical market for the product is the home market and not the foreign market, because they cannot compete with other countries. Therefore the people of the home market pay high prices, according to the protective tariff given to such industries. If an industry cannot compete with foreign industries, it is bad for manufacturers, it is not sound for a country to have it; it is better that it should disappear.

Of course this policy of encouraging industries that work on our raw material is laid down as a principle and must be worked out gradually. A practical commission should be appointed to study these matters. What I am suggesting to the Government is a policy of reconstruction, not of destruction. The actual position of our different industries should be studied, taking into consideration the position also of the mass of the people, and gradually the effort of the Government should tend to the improvement of this policy. Many industries can support competition to-day. Maybe all the industries in this country, with proper management and reasonable profits, could support competition without protection. Competition will give life to these industries, they will be contented with less profit but they will produce more and probably they will get a better result. There will be more employment in this country because we will produce more; the cost of living will be less, articles manufactured here, and for which we pay high prices due to the high tariff, will cost less and therefore, the cost of living in all lines will be reasonable and within the reach of the ordinary people.

We all know, and it is not a secret, that the price of manufacturing goods in this country is fixed by the manufacturers according to the protection or tariff imposed. It costs a huge sum of money to the people of Canada every year. Hundreds of millions of dollars are paid by the consumers to allow the Government to receive 50 or 75 millions of customs duty. The Government should impose larger taxes on large incomes, and large fortunes, but only at the same time as they decreased the tariff.

It is to be deeply regretted that the Victory Loan Bonds are exempted from duties. It may prevent the Government to a certain extent from following this policy. This does not necessarily mean that we are, or will be, in a bad position. On the contrary, Heaven has given to this country immense resources of raw material, and what this Government has to do to-day, if it desires to bring prosperity and wealth and the proper business basis, is to begin anew. It is time to see and encourage industries that can employ our raw material so that we can sell to other countries these manufactured goods. People of this country have paid enough to protect those industries that will not bring wealth to this country. We have not the population, and we are not in a position to continue such extravagant and foolish methods. With this policy of encouraging agriculture, of developing our own raw material, of encouraging our factories working on our raw material for exportation, we will establish this country on a sound business basis; living will become cheaper, we will have plenty of work for our labourers and at good and permanent wages.

Establishing free trade in farm products with the States will open a large market, will encourage our farmers and will help to develop our unproductive lands. In connection with these principles and this policy, the Government could:

1. Bonus the agriculture.
2. Conserve and increase forest production. This policy is carried on in the province of Quebec, in France and in different countries of Europe with great success and much promise;
3. National supervision of water-power;
4. National supervision and development of the raw material in this country;
5. Bonus and assist factories that use our raw material;
6. Subsidize and build cargo boats and open markets for our agricultural and manufacturing products;
7. Develop an export trade in frozen meats and have refrigerator boats;
8. Open new markets in the United States and South America, etc.

Again, in connection with agriculture, we were surprised some time ago to read that this Government or commission appointed for this Government found out at the end that they had not sufficient land on which to establish the soldiers coming from the front. I must say that it is regrettable that governments in this country have seen fit to give to different private firms large tracts of agricultural lands. It has been said to me that great quantities of good land, untilled or badly cultivated, belong to private firms, railroad companies and so on. Some land is in the hands of investors looking for profits. I would submit that these lands should be taken by the Government by some legal means according to justice and equity. Those that retain these lands should not retard the progress of this country in the hope of making profits. Strict stipulations should be imposed, and if these lands are not put into bona fide activity, they should be confiscated.

I hope the Government will do its utmost to attract the soldiers and give them the advantage of establishing themselves on farms. It will be for their future happiness and prosperity. This Government must be careful not to buy lands that are not good for agriculture. Most of the lands in the West are in the hands of speculators and the expectation that the Government is to buy these lands from them is looked upon by them as a piece of great luck. The Government should be careful, buy direct and take the responsibility.

A very important question to be dealt with is the labour problem. A new epoch begins in the civilized world regarding the position of the labouring class, and after the splendid effort and sacrifices made by this class during the last war it is just and right, as it has always been just and right in the past, that these men should be dealt with and treated with more justice and equity: action along these lines should have been taken before. It will always be a stain on the civilized world that a better policy has not been followed in the past. I am in hopes that during this session some practical laws and regulations will be passed securing better relations between labour and capital. The capitalists and the employees are looking for a common ground of understanding, and while the employees claim a just compensation for their sacrifice and an amelioration of their condition, the employers understand that it is impossible that the present state of affairs can continue. It is hoped therefore that laws will soon be passed by Parliament permitting the employees, under certain conditions, and in accordance with the principles of justice and equity, to be represented on boards of directors so that they may have a voice to explain to these chiefs of industries their needs, not only from a monetary standpoint but with a view to moral and intellectual betterment. More effective results every one admits will be attained by conciliation and a better understanding between capital and labour. If this is done I am sure that capital will yield better results and labour will be better pleased. The Government must, however, face the problem at once and in a serious manner without delay. I had the opportunity some time ago to hear a very good address on this subject delivered by Hon. Mackenzie King at the Reform Club at Montreal. If the Government will refer to this address it will find all the necessary food for thought, and the elements and policy calculated to give satisfaction, according to my mind, to the Canadian labour world. Some such policy must be adopted; it is only a question of justice, and of good management on the part of the Government. The Government must also in this connection subsidize and open technical schools in this country, so that we may have in Canada skilled labourers to work in our factories. I know that at present, in many of our industries we have to hire skilled labourers from other countries. This should not be the case because it is detrimental to our trade. I would also warn the Government to be careful as to immigrants admitted to this country. Immigration is a very good thing if the newcomers are of a good class. They are very careful with respect to these matters in the United States where strict examination of each arrival is made. What we need here is farm immigrants and I hope this Government will see to it that men of a type likely to cause trouble and disruption are excluded.

We will need capital in this country and to obtain investment of capital, the Government should take at once proper steps to ameliorate our financial and trade relations with the United States. To attain this aim:

1. A Canadian commission should be appointed at Washington;

2. An advertising propaganda should be instituted to advertise this country as a source of raw materials; in short, to make us thoroughly known in the States, so that the investors from that country will know what prospects exist here in trade and finance. The Government was able to finance its war policy through the patriotic

good will of the banks of Canada and the people of Canada.

The Government last fall borrowed a huge sum of money, over 500 million dollars, in the Victory Loan. The undoubted security, the interest offered and the promise connected with it that no future tax would be imposed on it all contributed to making the response a great one; the subscription was over 600 million dollars. In this connection, I am sorry to say that this Government has offered such interest, 5½ per cent, and especially that they have promised solemnly and obliged themselves not to impose duties on these bonds in the future. This Government at the beginning of the war has helped many people, many of their friends, to enrich themselves, and to-day they are millionaires. We have many millionaires in this country now and in the first years of the war, if I remember accurately, in the second year, no duties or taxes were imposed on their profits. This country having to pay heavy taxes, cried aloud that the rich, those that had big revenues, large incomes, those that had made money out of the war, should pay, but the Government was there, and after having enriched those men, this Government wanted to help these friends again so that they could keep their fortune intact, and the Government found a way out for its good friends the millionaires in offering them bonds at a high interest, guaranteed by this country with the promise that they would remain intact, without for the future any tax to pay on their money. I say that this is a great drawback in this country for the future. In the States, no such promise was made, and still the Victory Loan was only at 4½ per cent. I say that it is a great injustice done to the majority of the population of this country. To pay our debts, our interests and to have the money for our needs, our public enterprises, the Government should in the future tax heavily those that have large revenues, because a day may come in this country with the Government that will succeed this one soon when the custom duties will drop considerably or disappear, when we will have free trade, which has given wealth to England, and when that day will come the Government may have to depend mainly on duty imposed on income, as is the case in England.

If this Government is really sincere in its reconstruction, it will act, I submit, according to the principles submitted, and I hope, nay, I am sure, there is a great prosperity and happiness in store for us in this country. If this Government continues to tramp on the same ground as it did since the armistice, I have great fear for this country.

There is another important question that I wish to deal with, and that is the war indemnity which this country should receive. Some days ago I read in the newspaper an alleged declaration by Sir Robert Borden that this country would not especially insist upon an indemnity being paid to Canada. If the Prime Minister said that, he did not voice the opinion and the desire of the people of this country, because I am sure that Canada wishes to receive an indemnity equal to the amount of money which she has disbursed in the carrying on of the war. Take into consideration, Mr. Speaker, the taxes that the people are paying to-day which were imposed by the Government after the outbreak of war. We are paying on income and on profits; we are paying extra postage on letters; we have to affix stamps to notes and cheques; we pay a tax on drugs; the tariff has been raised on certain commodities to the extent of 7½ per cent. Our debt has increased from $335,000,000, which it amounted to before the war, to about $2,000,000,000. This generation and future generations will be called upon to meet the heavy interest charges on this huge debt. The other day a member of the Government told us that we would have to find about $300,000,000 in order to carry on the business of the country during the current year, and that we owed about $2,000,000,000. We do owe about $2,000,000,000, and that does not take into consideration our liability in respect of our railways. The debt of Canada is about $240 per capita; but it costs about $140 per capita to carry on the affairs of the country. A man with a family of five pays about $200 a year in the way of taxes imposed by the Federal Government and about the same amount in the way of municipal and provincial taxes. That means that every family of five persons in Canada has to pay $400 a year in taxes. It is most important, therefore, that the Government insist on our receiving a proper indemnity from Germany. I was surprised that in the speech from the Throne no reference was made to any steps proposed to be taken by the Prime Minister through the proper channels to obtain such an indemnity from Germany. If we cannot get the indemnity direct, we could get it through the indemnity that the British Government may receive. Some of the belligerent nations will receive compensation or indemnity through

the annexation of territory or through the securing of advantages in trade or commerce. We shall not receive anything of this nature. We do not need territory; what we have here is enough for us. The only way to obtain compensation for our material loss is to receive an ample indemnity from Germany; therefore I hope that the Government will take this matter in hand, recognizing it as one of the most important questions we have to
5 p.m. deal with. I am sure that the people of Canada will resent any inaction on the part of the Government in this matter.

The speakers who have preceded me have made an appeal for union in this country. I am sure that they are sincere in their appeal, and I hope that such union will exist in fact. My last wish is that the leaders of this Government will look higher and seek a purer aim than hitherto; that they will endeavour to render justice to all the people of this country, to all individuals, all classes, all nationalities, remembering that we all belong to the same country; and that they will put into practice the sound policy followed and worthy example set by our great statesmen since Confederation. The real prosperity and development of this country can only be attained by Government action and Government methods based on mutual understanding and confidence. This is justice and true democracy. I hope that "rights to whom rights are due" will prevail; that racial appeals and prejudices will cease; that sinister influence for purely party ends which prevents national unity and obstructs the progress of this country, will cease. In this connection allow me to read to you the following short quotation taken from a paper, regarding the position existing in Belgium:

> Far different is the spirit of the Belgian rulers. In his speech from the Throne, King Albert of Belgium, on his triumphant return to his capital after an enforced exile of four years, set an example which Canadians might well emulate. Coming from the Yser, after passing through liberated towns and hamlets which have been swept by the war, King Albert's first thought was for the unity of Belgium. That part of his speech which deals with the differences in race and language in Belgium might well be applied to Canada, so close is the resemblance in the relations between Fleming and Walloon with those that obtain here between French and English-speaking Canada. His words should be printed in letters of gold and hung up in every school-room in the Dominion. It is as follows:
>
> The necessity of a fruitful union demands sincere co-operation and collaboration between all the children of the same mother country without distinction of race or language. In the domain of language the strictest equality and the most absolute justice will inspire the drafting of a Bill which the Government will presently lay before the national representatives. Thus will be brought about a concord destined to perpetuate the unity and indivisibility of the country, affirmed during the war by the sacrifice of so much precious blood.
>
> The Government, in every department, must be permeated by the reciprocal respect for the interests of Fleming and Walloon and bestow upon each the certainty of being understood in his own tongue, and, moreover, assure him full intellectual development, particularly in the higher branches of education. The interests of the whole country demand that each of our two peoples shall be able, each in its own tongue, fully to develop its individuality and originality in both industrial and artistic expression and production.

I hope that these noble sentiments, so well expressed by the ruler of Belgium when he entered his capital, will prevail in this country. I am sure that if the Government follows those principles and acts upon some of the suggestions that I have put before the House this afternoon, there will be in store for this country contentment, prosperity and happiness.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my congratulations to those that have been tendered to the two gallant young soldiers who have moved and seconded the Address. They have given us evidence upon the floor of this House that they are quite as able to serve their country here as they were brave and resourceful in serving their country at the front. It adds distinction to this session that two men who had gone overseas and taken all the chances that were involved in the service there should be those to open the debates during this session.

I also wish to offer my congratulations to the Government which has in my judgment, shown a great deal of courage and a good deal of wisdom in dealing with the difficult conditions that have confronted it during the past four years and particularly during last year. A certain amount of criticism has been levelled at the members of the Administration because it is charged that they have not been quite quick enough in providing for the demobilization and repatriation of our men. It may be that everything we desire has not been accomplished, but we have had an exhibition of good judgment, resourcefulness and courage on the part of the Government in facing and solving these problems. I believe I am within the fact when I say that, so far as demobilization is concerned, no country is in advance of the Dominion of Canada. While it is too much to expect that the

Government can please everybody, all reasonable men will, I am sure, agree with me that they have shown a real desire to meet all the problems confronting them in the same earnest way that they have succeeded in carrying this country through the war.

There is a great deal in the programme for this session, but there are some things that I am sorry are not there. Before, however, referring to that, I would like to make a very brief reference to the war as it has been presented to our attention by the remarks of the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt). In a very kindly spirit, the hon. member endeavoured to furnish some consolation to those who had suffered bereavement by the loss of some member or members of their family in the war, and he gave as his judgment that those who died would be looked upon with favour by the Almighty and that their future immortality was assured. I find myself unable to interpret the characteristics of divinity, as I understand them in any other light, for if ever men died in a high and a holy cause it was the gallant gentlemen whose bodies to-day lie in France. It is most repugnant to my mind to think that their sacrifices should go unrewarded; for as I see the great issue that was before the world, it was this: the Germans, during forty years, had succeeded in driving Christ out of their country, and if they had won this war they would have attained their ambition which was to drive Christ out of the world and all that Christian philosophy means for the welfare, happiness and prosperity of the people of the world. Surely the men who fought for such a cause as that, and especially those who were called upon to die for it, will have a reward that will compensate them for their sacrifices. I offer this thought to those who have suffered the loss of some one very dear to them.

The item, Sir, in the Speech from the Throne that impresses me most is that which promises us a Department of Public Health. The phraseology might be improved; and for my part I would like to see it described as "The Department of Public Welfare," which term would include not only health, but many other things that ought to come within the purview of this Government. There was a time not long ago,—and I think the idea persists still with some men in representative positions—that Government ought to deal solely with roads, bridges, and tariffs. That has been the idea largely in the past; but during the last decade, particularly upon this North American continent, an entirely new principle, and one which is going to be recognized more fully in the future, has been adopted by many governmental bodies. That principle is that Government is concerned not only with making roads to travel upon and providing other means of transportation, but in looking after the personal welfare of those who are left in such a position that they are unable to take care of themselves. You may call that paternal government—it makes little difference to me what it is called—but those who have done their part and have done it like men and like women are entitled to such aid as may be necessary to enable them to carry out to the full their duties as citizens, and especially those duties appertaining to their children and their home.

One of the things that I would like to see this Department of Public Welfare take up is the question of mothers' pensions. I think we are to be condemned that we have come to this period in the history of the world and still impose upon a woman who has lost her husband the necessity of going out to daily labour in order to earn money to provide bread for her children. She is suffering through no fault of her own. She has been a good wife, and she is a good mother or she would not go out at seven o'clock in the morning and toil until six o'clock at night that her children may have bread. All the circumstances surrounding her life proclaim her to be a woman to be admired. Yet by our social system or our governmental system, we place her in a position so difficult that I wonder it has been allowed to continue so long. I can cite instances of women of my own acquaintance, in my own city, who have four or five children, all of them too young to do anything for their own maintenance, and the mother left by the hand of death to take charge of them, to care for their physical comfort, and to try, in some way, to bring them up as good citizens. We have imposed on her a task that is practically impossible of accomplishment. If we should be concerned for any class of our people we should first of all look after the young, and if a mother has to go out and toil all day, leaving her children to their own devices, how is it possible that they can get the care needful to train them to be good citizens? How, under such circumstances, can she take care of their morals and look after them in all the thousand and one ways in which a mother does look after her own children? We have departments dealing

with neglected children in our provinces to take the children away from a mother who neglects them to find foster-homes for them, and to educate them; but except in the provinces of Saskatchewan and Manitoba no effort has been made to assist the widowed mother who herself does take care of her children. Surely she is deserving of more consideration than the mother who does not. Aye, Sir, such a good mother is deserving of every encouragement from the State, for she is carrying on the duties of both mother and father to those who in the years to come, and not very many years, will be the citizens and the voters of Canada. I hope, therefore, that a Department of Public Welfare will be put into operation speedily, and this particular phase of public duty undertaken.

There is another sphere of welfare work in which I think we should follow the example of our own mother country, whence we derive so much of our inspiration; I think we should establish an Old Age Pension scheme. Take the case of a man who has served his day and generation until he is sixty-five years old. At that age, because of the severity of his employment, he is perhaps an older man than others are at seventy-five; he is beyond the age at which he can find work and take care of himself. Is it fair that we should say to his children: You who are making only about enough money to maintain yourselves must assume this additional burden; all the service that your father has given to his country, in industry and in citizenship generally, shall receive no recognition from the State? I submit that a man who has worked as long as his physical fitness will enable him, and has used every dollar he could get through his labour to maintain himself and educate his family, when the time comes that he cannot take care of himself it is the business of the Government to look after him. That duty has been recognized in Great Britain and in other countries, and I hope the day is not far distant when it will be recognized in Canada.

I offer another suggestion, and that is that in addition to an Old Age Pension Fund, we should provide insurance against unemployment. There is no sadder sight in the cities and towns of this or any other country than to see a man who is able and willing to work, walking around the streets unable to find employment, until he and his are suffering the pangs of hunger; not through any fault of his, but simply because, owing to existing conditions, he is unable to use the only capital he has—his labour. This duty, too, has been recognized elsewhere, and I think a Department of Public Welfare, such as I hope to see established in this Dominion, should take the initiative in these things, and give a lead to the whole Dominion. If some of these matters ought to be looked after by the provinces, let that be arranged with the provinces, but at all events the present state of affairs should not be allowed longer to continue. I have known men to walk the streets seeking employment, until their last dollar was spent and then have to depend on the charity of their neighbours and friends. Surely there must be some remedy for this state of affairs, and it must be found if we wish the labouring men and artisans of this country to turn deaf ears to the appeals to unrest and Bolshevism which are being made to them by the foreign population of this country. We have to recognize the fair and legitimate demands of the workers of Canada, and I want to say that in no country in the world will you find men more sane, more sensible, and more intelligent than the men working on the lathes and machines of our factories in Canada. I am one of those who believe in trade unionism. It was my good fortune to belong to a trades union at one time, and I want to see the trades unions strong, for my experience has been that wherever a trade union is strong the particular industry with which it is identified is more likely to be operated with certainty and regularity than if the union is not strong. I happen to be engaged in a business which is regulated, so far as the employees are concerned, by the strongest international union on the continent of America, the International Typographical Union, which I think is the most closely organized and most intelligently managed of any trades union. As a result, that particular industry has carried on for nearly twenty years without strikes or lock-outs. I say that the views of these men who have intelligence enough to organize their free parliaments as they do must be considered, and I am glad to know that the capitalists of this country realize their responsibility in this regard and are showing greater interest in the welfare of their employees.

I wish to say a word on the Government's housing programme. One hon. member has said that in no city in Canada can a man get a house to-day at a reasonable price; and I think he was very near the

mark—at all events that condition applies to the city of Toronto. Up to a year or so ago, almost every artisan in Toronto was able to live in a self-contained home, with a front lawn, and back garden. But now these artisans have to rent out rooms, lessening the privacy of their homes, in order to meet the demands of the landlord. That is a state of affairs which it is the duty of the Government, of some government, aye, of all governments to rectify, and to rectify as quickly as possible. It was my good fortune at one time to be mayor of Toronto, and during my term of office many American visitors came to the city. The thing I had most pride in, and which I always took a visitor to see, were those streets, of which there are hundreds in Toronto, where our working people live; every man in his own self-contained home, where he was able to bring up a family under splendid conditions, and give them a good start in life so far as ideals are concerned. I was proud of the fact that more than half of the men who toil in the factories of Toronto are their own landlords, and because of that fact, are better citizens than they otherwise would be. Any man, no matter whether he is a clerk in a bank, or a book-keeper, or a blacksmith, who owns a little piece of land with a house on it—it matters little what the size of the mortgage is; once he can be called the proprietor of that property and is entered upon the assessment roll as the owner—has a very much better and higher outlook on life. Owning a home helps to develop the finest type of citizen. It conduces, Sir, to alert and honest municipal administration, and from that alertness in the municipal sphere must surely come greater alertness and interest in the citizens in provincial and Dominion spheres. I submit that nothing can be done for the working man that will tend to make him reliable and steadygoing, a steadying influence in the country, like giving him his own home. So I was glad to see that this Government, although the question of housing may be a little out of its realm, was prepared to take the action that has been indicated in the speech from the Throne. I think the Government has adopted a policy that is eminently sound from every standpoint. The responsibility for the spending of the money which the Government intends to lend rests entirely, in the last analysis, with the municipality, where it ought to rest, and where the expenditure can be most closely checked. The action that the Government has taken puts every municipality in a position to deal with the housing question. But for that assistance many municipalities would have found it extremely difficult to deal with that question at the present time. You will appreciate that when I tell you that in our city the people last year paid $4,000,000 in taxes on war account, and they are paying $3,500,000 this year on the same account. All of that, or nearly all, was spent upon objects that should have been financed by this Federal Parliament. With a load of debt like that last year and this year totalling something like $12,000,000, it can easily be understood that the finances of our city are somewhat strained. And what I say of our city pertains, I think, in practically every other city in the Dominion. Their credit needs assistance, and where shall we look for such assistance if not to the province or to this Government? The province itself has undertaken very large expenditures, and the natural place to look for the necessary assistance is right here. It has been a pleasure to me to see that the Government has risen to its responsibilities in this regard. I hope that Parliament, when this matter is worked out finally, will insist as far as possible upon the principle of personal ownership. I have no great sympathy with the building of rows of houses to be rented. That is better than nothing, of course. But I think that those who are in charge of this programme or plan should make every effort to render it possible for each individual to buy the house he lives in. That may require some extraordinary measures, but when you consider the advantages involved in the increased efficiency of the men as workers and their improved status as citizens, I think that extraordinary measures are fully justified. Take the man working in any of our factories who goes home to a crowded house—two or three tenants living under one roof as we find in many cases. It is impossible for that man to have the privacy and restfulness that he would have in his own home. He goes back to work next morning not quite so efficient a man as he would be had he been able to go home to his own little house where he could, perhaps, work in the evening in his garden, and where he could sit in the cool of the evening on his own doorstep without having tenants accompanying him. These are considerations in connection with the Government's policy on housing to which I would ask the ministers to give consideration.

We are promised legislation to deal with pensions and assistance to returned sol-

diers. What I think we need more than anything else is that the men whom we have appointed as commissioners to deal with pensions, or demobilization, or repatriation should be men with human qualities strongly developed. I find myself dissatisfied with hard and fast rules as to how much a man shall get. One man may find a measure of disability not nearly so serious a handicap to him as would another. I know that there are difficulties in dealing in a different way with two men whose conditions are superficially similar. I think that the men who have come back to us maimed and partly disabled should be treated more as the sons of the country and not as citizens merely. Suppose that a son, a very dear son, had come back broken, wounded, partly disabled—what would you do in your own home? That is the question that we should ask ourselves in this House, and in asking it we should see to it that the man who is given authority in this matter of pensions should have more than a merely official interest in the welfare of the men with whom he has to do. I would like, if possible, to have engraved before every man who is dealing with the soldiers the statement made by the Prime Minister of Great Britain. If we can keep in mind what our boys have done for us, if we can keep in mind the things they have endured, I think we shall not carp or haggle at generous treatment, and more than generous treatment. I would like to put upon record what Lloyd George has said concerning what our boys have done. He was speaking of the boys of Britain, but surely what he said of them applies to our own boys who were in the thick of it, just as much as to any troops that fought in this great war. He said:

> To this hour I cannot think of the heroism of our soldiers without wonder—without wonder and reverence. There has never been in the history of mankind such a courage as theirs. Never! Think what it was. The least of us is capable of a flash of valour. In a sudden emergency the meanest of us might be brave. Once or twice in his life a coward might do noble things. But think what these men did. It was not for an hour, nor for a day, nor for a week, nor for a month, nor for a year that they did fine things.
>
> Year after year their life was a fine thing. It was not valour they displayed; it was not even heroism; it was something so new and terrible, so undreamed of, that man has created no word for it. I try to find some word to define it, to suggest it; I can't. The nearest word I can get is Endurance. They were in hell every day of their lives; and they endured. They were in peril of death, and worse than death, day after day, night after night; and they endured. They were exposed to all the nerve-shattering rage of artillery, artillery which rived the soil like an earthquake, which hurled the bodies of the dead into the air, and flung the bodies of the living into a deeper sepulchre; and they endured. They went out into the darkness to storm the trenches of the enemy, to destroy machine-gun nests, to break a line of fire the very thunders of which deafened the men; and they endured. But something more. That is what haunts me. They endured for all these years a manner of life utterly unnatural—utterly unnatural, and horrible beyond the expression of words.
>
> Our people are the cleanest in Europe; to keep their bodies clean is one of their joys, a part almost of their religion; and think how they lived! They lived in mud, and worse than mud; they lived in unutterable filth, breathing an air that choked the lungs with disgust, their young bodies attacked by vermin, their feet sinking into squalor, their hands touching at every turn things which one dare not speak about. And our people are the most domesticated in Europe; our climate has forced us into making indoor life the very heart of existence; and these young men were exiled from their homes, were forced to live almost entirely without the grace and charm and consolation of women, were obliged to herd together in great companies in a foreign country, and not only a foreign country, but a torn and blasted country from which the sulphurous flames of Satanism had scorched the leaf of the meanest weed.
>
> There they lived, always in the presence of death, always in the midst of horror, always on a rack of torture, a rack which stretched and tortured not the muscles of the body, but every nerve, and the whole mind, and the entire soul, and they endured. Yes, they endured, endured inexpressible agony with patience, even with humour, and at the end flinging themselves upon the enemy, they drove him headlong, they drove him out of his trenches, sent him flying, beat him, beat him to his knees. There has been nothing like this in the history of the world.

Mr. Speaker, that picture should be in the mind of every person who has to do with the men of our Canadian regiments. If it is kept in the minds of those commissioners in whose hands lie largely the destinies of our broken men I will be satisfied that they will get good treatment. But if we forget what these boys have done for us, if we forget all they suffered and endured for us, we will be unworthy of the sons who fought and died for us. I want to express my agreement with the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) in one of his opinions. He said that at least $1,000 a year pension was little enough for a disabled man and that to offer him anything less than $1,000 would be a disgrace. You cannot get a mechanic to work to-day for less than $25 a week, and yet we are offering to men who have gone to the war, who have lost their ability to earn their own living a pittance of $600 or $700 a year.

I am inclined to go farther than my friend from South Toronto and to say that

$1,000 is not sufficient. A man who has lost his physical strength and is unable to earn his livelihood should at least enjoy an income equal to that of a mechanic, and $1,000 is not equal to a mechanic's wages in this country at the present time. There is no likelihood that the mechanic's wages will ever be decreased. Twelve hundred dollars is as little as any man can live upon, and if he is a totally disabled man and has a family of four or five children, a less amount will subject him to the pangs of poverty in addition to the suffering entailed by the loss of his powers. Surely, if there is any gratitude in this country, if we realize what these men did for us, what they endured in doing it, if we realize what they saved us from, we can afford to be generous and not pare down the amount which is to be paid to them as compensation for their losses.

Another matter of importance is the War-times Election Act. I want to join with my colleague from South Toronto there again and to say that, in my judgment, it would be a calamity for this country to restore the franchise to men who have shown themselves to be alien enemies during the war. If Canada is to realize its possibilities, it must be governed by men who appreciate British institutions and ideals. If you fill your voters' lists with men who come from Central Europe, and who will still tell you that blood is thicker than water, you will find that very shortly political combinations will be made that will place the government of the country in the hands of those who would have handed Canada over to the German tyrant. We have been very patient in the province of Ontario. We have been neighbours to thousands of foreigners, some from neutral countries and many of them from enemy countries, who laughed in our faces when our boys had to go and when the way was opened for them to take their places in positions in civil life.

If ever there was danger in Bolshevism in Ontario that was the time. I am glad that time has passed. There is no danger of a Bolshevist uprising in Ontario, but if ever we had a condition which would have justified some kind of a protest or uprising it was the condition that existed under the Military Service Act in our own city when men, young, strong, of military age and capable of bearing arms, came before our military tribunals and, with a smirk on their faces, said: We are not naturalized. And because they were not naturalized they were left at home to reap the profiteering rewards that were incident to this great war. Now that the war is over, now that our men are coming back, are we going to stand for that in the industrial centres of Canada? Are we going to allow these men who laughed in our faces when we could not help ourselves, when our first duty was to carry on and win the war, to usurp the places that ought to be filled by the men who went overseas, men who left their positions in factories and workshops and wages of $5, $6 and $10 a day to go out for $1.10 a day and live under the conditions I have just described. Are we going to allow the men who were left at home to remain in their places? If it is Bolshevism to put these men out and to put our own men in, then I am a Bolshevist, because I submit that no decent manufacturer in Canada will keep in his place men of that type while there are soldiers seeking employment.

There is an awful lot of unrest in this country. It could not be otherwise. Could you expect anything different? We organized our whole system of industry upon the basis of war and we have to suddenly turn around and organize for peace.

There are factors entering into this situation that we never had to deal with before, and I hope we shall never have to deal with again, but under the circumstances, which are apparent to every intelligent man, unrest is absolutely unavoidable. It is for us who appreciate the situation, and it is equally for the British-born artisans and workingmen of Canada to see to it, and they will see to it, that these foreigners who advocate dangerous doctrines get no support from the intelligent English-speaking, and I hope French-speaking, people of the Dominion. We have a right, Mr. Speaker, to make an appeal to labour, and to say to the man that works: The governments and the municipalities of this country are going to do for you the very best that can be done. What we want from you is that your efforts, individually and collectively, shall be applied to increased production. If labour responds to that appeal there will be no danger of lower wages, no danger of permanent unrest, and this country will go on to a period of prosperity.

I have a few more remarks to make, and they pertain to a matter that was discussed in this House last session. At that time I said that the Civil Service Act was badly conceived, and in its operation would work out in filling the Service with the friends of officials. I hardly expected, Sir, that in ten short months my prediction would be so fully realized. I have not the gift of prophecy, but I think that any man examining the Bill when it was before us last

year could realize that the result of its enactment that the Civil Service would be handed over to be filled by a group of officials with their friends. That is what has happened, and that is what is happening right along. My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Sheard), in his speech the other day, approved of the appointments to the Toronto post office. I want to associate myself with him so far as the choice of postmaster is concerned; the appointment was made promptly with the best man available. But when it came to the position of deputy postmaster, what happened? The postmaster, who had worked with the present deputy for twenty-five years, sent the recommendation to Ottawa for his appointment. That appointment was held up in this city for months. It was held up until I instituted inquiries to ascertain the reason for the delay, when I was told that it was due to the Civil Service Commission endeavouring to ascertain whether the official recommended was the senior man. It was none of their business, Mr. Speaker, whether he was a senior man or not—he was the one best qualified for the position. As it happened he was the senior official, but the Commission refused to accept the recommendation of the postmaster, who knew all the men that were available for the position, and spent some time before consenting to make the appointment. Why? Because the next man in seniority was a friend of a friend of the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission.

The same thing happened in regard to filling a position in the Custom House at Toronto. A hardware appraiser was needed there, and the collector of the port forwarded three names from which to make a selection. But, Sir, these three names were taken by an official in this city, and cast into the wastepaper basket, and the Civil Service Commission appointed a man in the city of Victoria, B.C., to come to Toronto to take the position of hardware appraiser. The commission passed over three qualified men recommended by the collector of the port, who knew each man's capability. He was aware that the three men nominated by him were fit for the position, and that the Toronto public would be satisfied with the appointment of any one of the three. But a friend of the official was appointed over the heads of the three qualified men recommended by the collector who had known the men and their qualifications for years. Does that instance prove what I said last year, that the Service would be filled by the friends of the officials, or does it not? The official to whom I allude is a very prominent man in the Civil Service in the city, but what did he care for the recommendation of the collector of the port? He had a friend, and even though his friend may be a good man—

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Were the members of Parliament, the men who are officially responsible for the riding, consulted in regard to that appointment?

Mr. HOCKEN: Not to my knowledge, but I have no grouch about the matter. I was not consulted, and I do not want to be consulted.

Sir SAM HUGHES: You should be though.

Mr. HOCKEN: Well, I was not consulted, and I was not aware of the circumstances until the appointment was made. Here you have a city of half a million people yet a man qualified to act as hardware appraiser could not be chosen there but has to brought from three thousand miles away. If that does not prove that friendship and not fitness is operating in filling appointments to the Civil Service, I do not know where you can look for evidence of it. To my mind there could not be a more striking proof of my contention.

But, Sir, the same thing is happening in practically every quarter, and advertisements are only sent out as a matter of routine.—A man is picked for the job before the advertisement of the vacancy goes out. He is picked by somebody in this city, some official in the department. Why, Sir, I have an advertisement here calling for a man to take charge of the fruit inspection for the district of Western Ontario, under the Department of Agriculture, the salary to be $2,000 per annum. The candidate is required to have a thorough knowledge and experience of fruits and vegetables, from the standpoint of both growers and consumers, and to possess the confidence of the fruit trade generally. The man who had been acting as the local fruit inspector in that district had recommendations sent down to Ottawa by the score and he was qualified in every way for the position, but before the advertisement was issued a man was selected. What kind of a way is that to make appointments? Is that the method of appointment we were led to expect would be adopted when appointments were placed under the Civil Service Commission? As I say a man was selected for this position and he was appointed temporarily. He was kept on for six months, then his term

was extended, and afterwards the advertisement was issued because the Act requires it. The man chosen had been an American citizen before the last election in Canada and could not vote in that election. True he was Canadian-born, but he went across the line and was naturalized there. He returned to Canada, and was not entitled, as I say, to vote at the last election, but he happened to become naturalized here since. Then he takes precedence of men who have lived here and have been serving this country, men who never ran away and were naturalized in a foreign country. This person is placed over qualified men because he is a friend of the officials. The understanding is that the late Mr. Johnson desired this man to be appointed. That is the way the Civil Service is operated.

An hon. MEMBER: Was he a returned soldier?

Mr. HOCKEN: He was not a returned soldier, and had never been near the scene of hostilities. He told a friend on the streets of Toronto that he had the job. "I have the position," he said, and that was sometime before the advertisement was published.

An hon. MEMBER: What was his profession?

Mr. HOCKEN: I do not know what his profession was, but the facts are as I am stating. This man came over from the United States, and was immediately taken on the staff of the Food Board. He worked on that Board as long as there was a job for him, and when the Food Board was dissolved, another position had to be found for him. He had some friends in the service and he was elected to the position in question. His name is Mr. J. R. Hastings.

We have over the signature of Mr. William Foran, the chief guide of the Civil Service Commission, the statement that when the time limited for receiving applications has expired, the applications will be submitted to a competent board of judges, who will select a man who is in their opinion the best qualified for appointment. Is that the way, Mr. Speaker, we understood that this thing was to be worked out? Are these commissioners Civil Service Commissioners, or are they not? Have they power to appoint a committee which immediately becomes an unofficial Civil Service Commission without any responsibility? We were not told, and I do not think any person believed when this matter was before us last session, that the Civil Service Commission could hide behind a committee of three whom they might name to make appointments. The responsibility of these three men to the House and to the country is just as little as it could possibly be; yet an appointee to the important position of Chief Inspector of Fruit for Western Ontario is to be selected by a committee. In the natural order of things, Mr. Speaker, who would form that committee? Would they not likely be friends of an official who was interested and who was close to the Civil Service Commission? If I appoint three of my friends to decide whether or not I am fit for a job, I shall have a pretty good chance of getting that job, and so would anybody else under similar circumstances.

And this is the very principle that was adopted when a Superintendent of Penitentiaries was to be appointed. The Civil Service Commission had not the knowledge or the intelligence or the courage to make an appointment, and they selected three men to deal with it, at least one of whom was known to be hostile to the best qualified man in Canada for the position of Superintendent of Penitentiaries. What chance did he have? Among one hundred applicants his qualifications were the best; but this committee says: None of these candidates are quite satisfactory; we throw them all out and we will advertise afresh. You see how they double-cross the soldier; how they whipsawed a qualified man who is a returned soldier, who fought with the Canadian army at Courcelette, who was promoted on the field of battle to the rank of Brigadier-General and who had had twenty-six years of experience in the very work for which applications were being sought. No one need tell me that the people are going to stand for that kind of treatment. That man's application goes in and it is thrown aside; he has not a friend on the committee; there is no official anxious for his appointment. Is there any other conclusion, Mr. Speaker? I do not think that any other conclusion is possible.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. HOCKEN (continuing): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose, I was directing the attention of hon. members to the method by which the Civil Service Commission delegates its functions to committees. I do not think that was ever intended by the Act, and it appears to me to be a most

reprehensible way of doing business. If my memory serves me aright, the Prime Minister last year promised or intimated in some way that it would probably be necessary to appoint provincial branches of assistance for the Commission. Our experience, as far as we have gone, proves the necessity of providing some kind of assistance for the Commission. When they have to appoint a special committee to decide so many questions on so many appointments, it is evident that they are not capable of performing the functions which the House expected them to perform when they were appointed. Perhaps that is not surprising when we face the fact that the chairman is a man who is not in very good health and that one of his fellow members is in the South and has been there for a considerable time owing to ill health. And then there is Mr. Larochelle. But if these men are unable to perform their duties, it is not proper that their duties should be delegated to some group of men who have no authority, no responsibility, and who may shelter themselves behind the Civil Service Commission. I hope the Government will take that into consideration and take some steps to see that if this Act is to remain in force, the men who fill these positions shall at least be responsible men.

I have another case that goes to prove just what I said before, namely, that there seems to be a man selected for every position before it is advertised. Let me read this advertisement which has been sent out by the Civil Service Commission. It says that they want:

> An Assistant to the Chief Clerk of Files and Records under the Soldiers' Settlement Board, at a salary of $1,600 per annum. Candidates must have five or six years' experience with files and records in a Government department, and must be thoroughly familiar with such a system.

That seems to be a most astonishing requirement. I am informed, and I believe, that a man can begin and complete his studies in medicine in five years; that a man can begin and complete his studies for the bar in four years; but to be an efficient and capable filing clerk, a man apparently requires five or six years' experience. Is there any intelligent man in this House who will say that that length of experience is requisite for that kind of a position? In the first place, it cuts out every returned soldier, because most, if not all of them, have been away for over four years. It absolutely eliminates that particular class of men to whom this country owes most; and yet this is a position that I venture to say at least a thousand capable young officers, who may be suffering partial disability, could fill. A man without a leg could fill that position. There are young officers coming back so broken that it will be impossible for them to take up their former avocations, and it is the business of this Government and of this country to see that they are offered opportunities of this kind. Let us assume a case. A young officer may come back who is fifty per cent disabled. Under the present scale he will get somewhere about $500 a year as a pension. Here is a position at $1,600 a year that he could fill, and it would give him, along with his pension, a decent livelihood; but such a man as that is cut out, he is prevented from even applying for such a job because it requires five or six years' experience to know how to file records.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What is the job, please?

Mr. HOCKEN: Assistant to the Chief Clerk of Files and Records. My deduction is, I think, reasonable, namely, that a man, who is now in the Government service has been picked out for that position. The job is practically filled before the advertisement is put into the newspaper. Is there any other possible conclusion than that? Not only officers, but privates by the thousands who will be on our pension list could fill a position of that kind, and it will take a good deal of argument, I think, to convince any intelligent member of this House that five or six years' experience is necessary before a man can file records properly. I venture to say there are young men coming back from the front who could learn that work in as many weeks, because many of those young men have had a liberal education; they have certainly had their powers of initiative and application developed by this war. If we have a Civil Service Commission that is going to cut men out of all opportunity of obtaining such positions what is the use of putting in the Act the statement that the returned soldier shall be given a preference? Is it not a fact that there is no place for the returned soldier except at the bottom? I presume they put a good many soldiers into such jobs as messengers or elevator men or some menial employment of that kind, but I stand here to protest against that sort of treatment for the returned soldier. Nothing is too good for him and, I care not how important the position is, if he has the qualifications to fill it, he should get it before anybody else. This Commission which was to produce such

reforms, in the filling of positions in the Government service, is being used to pay debts of friendship or something of that kind by putting into jobs men who are not as well or not better qualified than the men who are coming back. But what I protest against with the greatest vehemence is that men are selected for these positions before any advertisement is issued, and I think my contention is borne out by what I have said this afternoon and what I say now.

This afternoon, I gave an instance of a man who was so certain of obtaining a position as Fruit Inspector that before the advertisement was printed he told a man in Toronto that he had it. Here is a case from Halifax. On February 3, Mr. McCoy telegraphed to Michael Dryden at St. John advising him to return to Halifax as he had been appointed Superintendent of one of the employment offices. The applications were to be in the hands of the Civil Service Commission on February 18, but Mr. Michael Dryden gets a telegram on February 3, that he had been appointed. What do you think about that, Sir? That is just in line with the case of Mr. Hastings and practically in line with the case I quoted in connection with the Toronto Customs House. They select a man; in many cases they put in the advertisement qualifications that nobody else can fill and in some cases qualifications that no man can fill, as in the case of a publicity agent, and then they appoint some man who is a friend of some high official in the Civil Service or a friend of some one in the Civil Service Commission. We are in danger of filling up the Service with not merely unqualified persons, but dishonest persons.

I am credibly informed that in this city of Ottawa there is a certain school. Nobody knows where this school is unless he is directed to it. It does not advertise; the name is not on the door, but candidates who are fortunate enough to be directed to this school are always able to pass with the highest marks. The system has been explained by one of the pupils, a young lady, in this way:

"I was there three weeks and all my time was taken up being drilled in three subjects." And, do you know, when she came to write her examination, the questions were confined to the very three subjects in which she had been drilled. Now, is that a coincidence? Or has the man in charge of the school powers of divination? Does he use a Ouija board, or is he a spiritualistic medium or a clairvoyant? I do not believe he is any of these things, but I do believe that by some method he knows the subjects that will be dealt with in the examination. How he gets that information I am not prepared to say tonight, but it must be evident that if the only three subjects on which his pupils are examined are the ones in which they have been drilled there must be a nigger in the woodpile somewhere. I have been informed that the method is this. Let me say, first of all, that this process of getting through the Civil Service examinations has passed its primary stage, and is now at the second stage. I do not think it has yet reached a state of perfection, but I have no doubt it will, if given time. The first arrangement was for the party trying the examination to work out the scheme in the room where the examination was being held. The candidate carried into the room a book similar to the book given out by the presiding examiner, containing the answers correctly written therein. This plan, however, has since been improved upon to meet all the emergencies that might arise, and this improved plan has for its final act, if necessary the substitution in the Examination Department of the Commission of papers having the same number as that given to the candidate by the examiners in the examination, but with the correct answers written by an expert. If an expert wrote the answers he must have had the examination papers before him. We are not left in any doubt as to that being possible. In fact, we can speak with the utmost certainty; we say that it is not only possible, but that it has taken place. There was a case only last week where a Mr. Joseph Peticlerc was caught red-handed with examination papers in his possession by the chairman of the Civil Service Commission. Where did he get them? If there are no leaks, how can the papers get to him? And if they can get to him, they can also get to the principal of this school. The whole thing can be worked out in a scientific manner and a regular tarffic set up in examination papers. According to Mr. Peticlerc's own statement he was to pay $310 for the papers, but he was not to pay that sum for two months. The reason for that is that all examination papers are kept by the Commission for two months and then destroyed. After that, there is no possibility of getting evidence against candidates, and it would therefore be safe for Mr. Peticlerc to pay the $310 when the two months had expired. Strange to say, although Mr. Peticlerc had been caught red-handed, when the facts were brought to the attention of the secretary of the Commission, Mr. Foran said,

"Now that is very singular, because recently a young lady passed an examination with the highest marks, and her success was so astounding that the nuns of the convent told me there must be something wrong, because she was their most backward pupil." These good sisters were amazed at the proficiency of their most backward pupil, and no wonder, when we know that some of their brightest pupils also wrote on the same examination. One would have thought that when this case was brought to the attention of the secretary of the Commission he would have done something more than make a cursory examination. But all that was done was to bring the young lady before the Commission, and as no proof could be secured the case was allowed to drop. Now that young lady is a next-door neighbour to the man who was caught with the examination papers in his possession, and if that case does not arouse suspicion I shall think this a very credulous House of Commons. When Mr. Peticlerc was caught, he said, "I got the papers from General Delivery at the Post Office." Now, if a candidate can get the examination papers in advance from General Delivery, why any person can pass the Civil Service examination. I have no doubt I could pass it myself under such conditions, at least, I would venture a small bet on it. But afterwards, Peticlerc tells a different story. He says, "I got these papers from Mr. Robert" who is also a clerk in the Service. When this story became current, newspaper reporters went to the Civil Service Commission, and whom do you think they saw? One would have thought that they would go to the chairman of the Commission, but I assume they knew that there was some person even more influential and more likely to have the information than the chairman. So they went to Mr. Foran, who made a long explanation, in which he said:

> We are doing all we can to get at the facts of the case, and I am satisfied that the leak is not here in the Commission. The only man who handles them is our confidential printer, and he keeps the papers in a vault, of which he alone has the key. When they are sent to other parts of Canada they are despatched in sealed boxes by express when the quantity is large, and by registered mail when the quantities are small.

One explanation offered by the secretary of the commission was that the examination papers must have been taken out of the registered mail. That is an accusation about which I think the postal authorities should have something to say. It should be established whether or not it is possible to tamper with the registered mail of this country. I do not know whether Mr. Foran still adheres to that view, but that was the view he expressed when the case was brought to his attention.

What did Mr. Foran do in the way of investigating? He had Mr. Robert arrested, and he was charged with handing the papers to Mr. Peticlerc. Let us assume the case goes into court. The evidence of Mr. Robert would probably be that he did not hand Peticlerc the papers, and the evidence of Peticlerc would probably be to the contrary. The chances of getting a conviction when conflicting evidence is given by two witnesses is practically nil, and the result would be that the man under arrest would be discharged and the case would be allowed to drop. That would be the end of it, except that the conspirators would go on to perfect their system, so that such a bungle would not occur again. But if the Commission had arrested the man who had the papers in his possession they could have secured a conviction against him, because he was caught red-handed. But they did not want that. I say here, Sir, they wanted to close the matter up without getting the facts. I submit that if that were not the case they would have arrested the man whom they knew to be implicated and from whom they were likely to get better evidence than from any others. I do not know what has been said to him, but I am sure the Commission will not get anywhere under the form of investigation they are holding now. I make that prediction with the same confidence as I made the prediction last year that it would work out as it has done.

Where are you going to place the responsibility for this? Surely it must be upon the secretary. He is the chief executive officer of the Commission and the custodian of the examination papers. If there are clerks under him who are handing out these papers for a consideration—they would hardly do it if there were no consideration—he is the man who must be held responsible. If in your own business, Mr. Speaker, you had a man upon whom you depended, a man whom you had placed in the chief position of responsibility with regard to a thing of this kind, would you go all down the line and pick out the office boy for dismissal? Or would you go to the man who was primarily responsible? In this case that man is the secretary of the Commission. As I said before, do you expect the people of Canada to stand for this method of filling the Civil Service? If you do, I say with entire confidence, that you will find yourself mistaken. We want the

Civil Service reformed; but this is not reform, this is establishing a system under which the grossest corruption is practised to the detriment of fair-minded, honest young men and women who are desirous of serving the country in the Civil Service. We have heard the patronage system cursed up and down the country, and a good deal of opinion has been manufactured against it; but the patronage system at its worst was better than this. If you are going to continue this system, you are going to have not only an ineffective service but a service filled with people upon whom you cannot depend. For the man or woman who would take means such as these to secure an appointment is not fit for a place in the Civil Service.

I have just one suggestion to make in closing, and that is that the Civil Service Act should be amended at a vital point. I would have every position in the Outside Service filled upon the recommendation of the man who sits for the constituency in which the appointment is to be made. I do not want the annoyance of patronage, I would like to get rid of it all; but I would rather face my responsibility in this regard than see the present method continue to be employed in filling the Civil Service. There is no man so well qualified to speak as to the character and general attainments of one applying for a public place as the member for the constituency, who knows the applicant, knows his family and his antecedents. By consulting this representative you are on much safer and sounder ground than you are to-day. I have felt it my duty to bring these things to the attention of the House and of the Government. I have only touched the fringe of the subject. There is not a member of this House, I venture to say,—I should be surprised if there were one—who could not relate to you incidents of a similar character to those which I have related. I have one thing to say about the Commission, and that is they have shown remarkable impartiality. In Ontario they have appointed to Civil Service positions more men and women who supported the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the last election than those who supported the Union Government. Now that is a form of impartiality which I think is a little strained. I would give my hon. friends opposite the right to nominate in their several constituencies every man and woman appointed in the Outside Service; but I would give to the men on this side of the House the same privilege. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, that that is a fair system and that it will work out better than the present one,—that there will be less inefficiency in the Service, and more satisfaction in the country. I do not want any man or woman appointed to the Civil Service of Canada who is not needed. That is where I begin. I do not want any man or woman appointed who is not qualified. When a recommendation is made by the member of the constituency—perhaps two, or three or four names sent in—let the Commission test the efficiency of the candidate in any way they think necessary. But let the appointment rest on the responsibility of the man representing the constituency and you will have a much better result than you will ever have under the law as now operated.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD (Restigouche and Madawaska): My desire on this occasion, Mr. Speaker, is to make briefly a few observations on the important questions referred to in the Address. Before going into my subject let me refer to the death of my late honoured chief, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Sir Wilfrid Laurier during his long political career was animated by the one desire to promote the welfare of his country; and never was a great life more nobly spent in the accomplishment of such a great purpose. His career has been recognized as a most useful one, and the last tribute paid to his remains is but one mark of esteem and appreciation manifested by the whole Canadian people.

But, Sir, this country is mourning the loss abroad of other good citizens who have given up their lives within the last four years for the cause of liberty. Widows and orphans are turning their eyes every day towards Europe, towards the fields of Flanders and the soil of France. They have been left in this Dominion of ours with few resources, and without much assistance. At this time they look towards this capital of the Dominion where we are assembled as representatives of the people and they are asking us if what we have done thus far is all that we can do, and they pray that we should take a deep interest in their welfare. Our returned soldiers to-day are turning their eyes to the capital of Canada and they are asking us whether we have done our duty to them. We must put aside all personal interest and devote our energies to the task of doing justice to the men who have so distinguished themselves on the field of battle.

It is true that several of the different classes of people who compose the Dominion are able to take care of themselves. The capitalists met in Ottawa during the

war as well as since the war. The farmers met in Ottawa last year and we know what kind of a reception they had from this Government. They were told by the Prime Minister and his colleagues to go back home and work on their farms. They went back home with the remembrance of what they had heard and seen in Ottawa and with the determination that in the near future they will be heard by those who will take the places of the Government who refused to listen to them. They will not only be heard at home but they will be heard in this house. The labour men came to Ottawa and met the Ministers of the Crown. The returned soldiers came to Ottawa and submitted their grievances to the Government but very little has been done for them. Commissions were appointed during the war and many also since the signing of the armistice in order to make provision for the returned soldiers. Let me make a suggestion to the Acting Prime Minister. It is this that every commission appointed by this Government during the last four years should be required to make a report to this House. The Acting Prime Minister should inquire into the details of these reports and we, the representatives of the people, should have these reports before us so that we would be in a position to discover what is lacking in the provision made by the Government for our returned soldiers.

There has been a slowing up of business since the armistice was signed when we should have had an entirely different condition in a country such as this. This is one of the richest countries in the whole world. The enemy was kept away from our firesides and everybody in this country is ready to help to build up the country's best interests. One delegation came to Ottawa to present the claims of their respective industries but the Government did not welcome them too well. But, prompt and wise measures must be taken by the Government if we are to restore our industries to the position which they occupied before the war. We should invite the capitalists and the workmen to meet at Ottawa. We will never succeed in re-establishing our industries until we get the capitalists and workmen to understand one another. Let me read a paragraph showing what has taken place lately in England:

> Committee of 60 members to probe the labour conditions. British way is to have 30 Capitalists and 30 Laborites thresh matter out and report.
>
> London, Feb. 28th.—After an all day session devoted to airing the various phases of labour unrest, the industrial conference called by the Government and in which Government Ministers, labour leaders and representatives of the big employment interests participated, adopted a resolution presented by Arthur Henderson, Laborite, for the appointment of a joint temporary committee to be composed of 30 Laborites and 30 Capitalists to make a thorough investigation into the question of hours, wages, general conditions of work; unemployment and its prevention and the best means for promoting the relations between capital and labour and report back to the conference which will reassemble on April 5th.

It is not necessary for me, Mr. Speaker, to repeat that we must bring about a better understanding between capital and labour before we can re-establish pre-war industrial conditions.

Very little has been said in reference to the great and noble work that was done by the young girls and women of Canada during the war. We are perhaps not sufficiently appreciative of the magnificent example of devotion and patriotism set by our young girls and women both at home and across the ocean. They have splendidly seconded the efforts of our gallant soldiers.

The mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne were very wise in their statements. I followed their remarks very closely and I noted that they preached unity in this country. I understand what unity means. Brought up in an English-speaking province and being a French Acadian by descent, I have learned from my big neighbour the meaning of toleration and good-will. The sun shines upon the head of every Canadian. This country is big enough for every one of us whether we speak one language or the oher. We are all true Canadians and we would like to remain so.

My hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) stated in his address the other day that several millions of dollars will be spent on highways. The policy of building good roads in Canada has been well established and I believe that the money that will be spent on highways, as well as on railways, will contribute greatly to the development of the country.

In my own province within the last two years highways have been improved a great deal and there is no province in the whole Dominion where according to population so much money has been spent for this purpose. Our provincial Minister of Public Works and his colleagues have spent a great deal of money and I am glad to see that this Government has seen fit to trust the provincial government in each province with the money that will be devoted to the purpose of improving highways. I hope that this policy will produce the result that is expected of it.

We are asked to economize. We had to do so in order to meet our expenditures during the war. We are at the same time asked to build more railways in Canada. I do not agree with the policy of the Government. Let us stop for a while building railways in Canada. We have enough of them. Let us take care of the railways we have already on hand because we have more than we can afford to attend to. We have bought a number of branch lines and very few are left that are not controlled by the Government. I hope the Government will buy those that it has not already taken over, but, Sir, no more new lines of railway for the present.

On the question of the tariff, Mr. Speaker, let me say that this country will be unable to maintain the indispensable industry of farming if the tariff is not lowered in this country soon. Before long the farmers will have to sell their products at lower rates than they are selling them for now, and, though deriving a diminished revenue from their farms they will be called upon to pay high prices for their farm implements. They will be debarred, if the tariff is not modified, from selling their products in the highest markets, and compelled to pay the highest prices for their farming implements. Sir, this question will present itself again at a later date and therefore I shall not further discuss it at the present time.

Now let me deal with another point. During the last three or four years posters were conspicuously displayed—in public buildings, on the streets, and on the cars carrying our soldiers to the ports of embarkation for the front, not only the volunteers, but the conscripts, also—bearing this motto: "Your services are needed." Today the bodies of many of those soldiers are lying on the field of battle, but their widows and orphans in Canada need to be cared for. Let me express the hope that that care will be ungrudgingly bestowed, and in a manner worthy of those who gave up their lives for their country.

The restoration of our industries to the strong position they occupied two or three years ago is a task that must be undertaken. What are we going to do in that direction? I am not considering those industries which yielded immense fortunes to their owners out of the manufacture of war munitions and materials for war purposes. The gentlemen who accumulated millions of dollars in this country from these sources during the progress of the war, in my opinion, should be required to make a return to the Minister of Finance of the immense profits which they derived and contribute to the public chest some portion of those profits, whereby a long step might be made in the direction of re-establishing our national revenues. If we could receive only a percentage of the immense sums which have been earned during the war-time period, beyond all question we should be in a much better position to administer the affairs of Canada.

Mr. WALTER DAVY COWAN (Regina): Mr. Speaker, as an humble supporter of that party which the Canadian people by insistent demand brought into existence less than two years ago, permit me to express my extreme gratification not only at the many compliments which have been paid to the mover and seconder of the Address, but also the compliments paid by the leader of the Opposition and some of his supporters to the members of the Government and to other hon. gentlemen on this side of the House. The compliments paid to the mover and seconder of the Address were certainly deserved, and as a westerner I feel exceedingly pleased at the manner in which they presented their case. I have travelled a good many times east and west in this country in the years that are gone, and I have never yet discovered where the East stopped and the West began. I do not want ever to see that line marked out. At the same time we cannot help but feel that those who belong to Fort William and the West are realy westerners, and if the speeches delivered by the mover and seconder of the Address are to be taken as an example of what is to follow on the part of hon. gentlemen from the West, I think Eastern Canada will soon have to sit up and take notice. But apart altogether from such considerations, I was exceedingly pleased at the compliment paid by the leader of the Opposition to the members of the Government. The latch string that the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) spoke of is pretty well worn out, and it is rather dangerous perhaps for me to refer to the sentiment, but I am sufficiently old to recall the early days in this country when the latch string was very commonly in use. I can recall quite well the class of people that were invited to make use of that latch string, but I never saw a highway tramp or a person of disrepute in the neighbourhood invited to lift the latch string and enter the domicile; it was always genial souls whose friendship was desired; those who were considered worthy and well thought of. Those were the only people who were ever invited to lift the latch string and walk in. Therefore I can

quite understand the new leader of the Opposition, desirous as he is of building up a new political organization, entertaining the desire that hon. gentlemen from this side of the House should go over and help him. Indeed I fancy that when he looked around, with that instinct of Scotch canniness and prudence of which he is possessed, he surveyed the material on his own side, and he lost no time in issuing the invitation to this side, "Come over and come over quickly."

But, Sir, while gratified at the compliments bestowed by members of the Opposition on gentlemen on this side, I must confess to a feeling somewhat of resentment at the tone of the speech delivered by the member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy). That hon. gentleman rather attacked the Prime Minister of Canada—in fact, he tried to mix him up with Hottentots. I do not know just how the hon. gentleman did that but he told us that the Prime Minister had no business being where he was, and that he ought to return to Canada and attend to the business of the country. It was a matter of wonder to me how the hon. gentleman in question, standing as he did behind the seat of his former leader, could so soon forget the lessons taught by his old chieftain. Several years ago, probably ten or twelve, in a political campaign which we were fighting in Western Canada, when I was a bitter opponent of the Liberal party—for I have always been a very ardent Tory and I am not ashamed of the fact—I remember the assertion being made throughout the country that Sir Wilfrid Laurier had made Canada a nation, an assertion I found it exceedingly difficult to combat. A great many people believed the statement when it was made, and the great majority of them are still of that opinion. I quite agree with those who say that Sir Wilfrid Laurier did splendid work in assisting to make a nation of Canada, but, Sir, what was the good of the late lamented Liberal Chieftain helping to make a nation of this country if it is not to play its part as a nation? And, Sir, what is a nation's place? Is it to surround itself with a fence and have no truck, trade or treaty with the other nations of the world? Or are Canadians to take their place, as other peoples do, in discussing with the rest of the nations of the world great international problems, and assisting as far as they can in their solution? To me it seems that the proper place of the Prime Minister of Canada at the present time is where the other nations of the world are at work helping to solve the great problems that are pressing for settlement.

What have we in this country been doing for the last four years? We sent four hundred thousand troops to Europe to do their part in fighting for us and helping to settle international questions. That was assisting Canada to play its part as a nation, just as Sir Wilfrid Laurier wanted Canada to do, and be a nation in every sense of the word. After we have done this, after our troops have assisted in winning victory, are we to bring back our whole army from the front and leave the fruits of victory to be enjoyed by other nations? I have, of course, no right to speak for the Government because I do not know what it intends to do, but interpreting future action by past events, I should say the policy of the Government of this country should be, that wherever Canada has business to attend to, we are going to have men there to look after that business. Wherever the interests of Canada have to be watched, there we are going to have delegates or representatives, whatever you may choose to call them, to look after those interests. I say this to the Government: If they do not attend to business where it ought to be attended to, they need not expect any support from me. I want the business of the country to be done where it has to be done and when it has to be done, and I want it to be done promptly. If hon. gentlemen want these things done in some other way, they will have to get into power and do them. But of all the people on this earth to suggest that Sir Robert Borden should be called back to Canada, hon. gentlemen opposite are the very last. What has been their policy? As an old Tory I should not be at all afraid to leave the settlement of these questions in the hands of the Imperial authorities. But if we bring back our Prime Minister before his work over there is finished, where are we? What must happen? One of two things: Either our interests must be neglected, or we must look to the Imperial authorities to protect our interests. Hon. gentlemen opposite, particularly their late leader, have been very insistent in maintaining the principle of Canadian autonomy and the right of Canadians to look after their own affairs. That is exactly what we purpose doing—look after our own affairs just as soon as we can. We are quite capable of looking after the affairs of Canada, even though four or five members of our Cabinet are at present overseas attending to overseas affairs. For four long years

400,000 of our best men have been in Europe fighting our battles for us. Did we, while they were away, play the part of cowards, sit down and say: Well, Canada must drift, because our boys are away? Not at all. The very fact that Canada to-day is more prosperous than any other nation and that we have less industrial disturbance than is to be found anywhere else proves conclusively that the Canadians who were left behind knew their duty, were able to do their duty, and did it. While we should like to have these Cabinet ministers back —I for one would be pleased to know that their duty was done, and that they were back with us,—we must carry on the business of cur country while they are away—and I feel satisfied from past events that that will be properly done.

Why is it that Canada is to-day in such a prosperous condition? The speech of the member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy) contained a wealth of bitterness and was singularly free from anything in the shape of suggestion; it accomplished nothing. Bitterness is the last thing that we should have in Canada to-day. What has been the policy of the Government?

9 p.m.

Has it been one of bitterness? I fancy not. To me it seems that they have invited co-operation throughout the whole of the Dominion, and, what is better, they have succeeded in getting the co-operation which they desire. I remember quite well the time when it was considered to be a proper thing for the provincial governments to be at the throat of the Federal Government and to be causing as much political unrest as they possibly could. Is there any dispute to-day between the provincial governments and the Federal Government? I have not heard of any in the far East, and I know that the people in our part of the country are exceedingly gratified because of the splendid co-operation which has been brought into existence. I do not know who is wholly responsible for it, but I feel satisfied that one of my old political opponents, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder) is very largely responsible for the feeling of harmony and co-operation prevalent in Western Canada. He is an old Liberal, as he told you the other day, and I am an old Tory, as I tell you now; and we have fought many a battle in the past. It may have been necessary for him to tell you that he is a Liberal still; he does not have to tell me that, for I sadly know it by experience. But although he is a Liberal and I am a Tory, there is a common platform on which, on occasion—and the occasion exists to-day —we can unite, and that is, the common interests of our nation. As long as he and other members of this Government stand on that platform, I shall be glad to support them. We have, of course, in Western Canada a few—you could count them on the fingers of one hand—who are bitter and narrow partisans. Yet I speak for the great bulk of the people out there when I say that we desire harmony, co-operation and unity. I am satisfied that the policy of the Government is in that direction, and I am confident that they will continue it; at any rate, I urge them to continue the policy of co-operation which they have so well established.

To me it seems that four bodies ought to be invited to unite with us in this spirit of co-operation to decide what is best. First, the provincial governments, in highways, in housing problems or whatever problem it may be, and then, our Great War Veterans—their organization should be perfected and they should be asked to co-operate with us to the limit. When I say that their organization should be perfected, do not misunderstand me. This Government should not take any part in the organization of that body. Let the Veterans choose the organization they wish; let them create the machinery; let them elect their own officers; let them determine their own policy. But give them every encouragement and assistance in order that they may make it as perfect an organization as they can from the Atlantic to the Pacific. There are some, I know, who say that this is a dangerous organization and should not be encouraged. There is no question about the fact that if it is but half formed and if ill-managed it will be a menace to our country, but if it is—as it will be; we cannot stop it—perfectly organized from the Atlantic to the Pacific it can be of inestimable value to all the governments in the Dominion. I would urge the Government, therefore, to assist as much as they can in this respect in order that we may have the benefit of the advice and assistance of this organization at an early date.

I do not think that we should attempt to come to a final settlement of the problem of the returned soldier—if you call it a problem; some object to that term—until all the men shall have returned. I do not think it would be fair to those men who are yet overseas to make a settlement before they have had an opportunity of being consulted in regard to it. Let us continue to do the very best we can for the men who are here to-day, leaving the final set-

tlement until the time when all these men shall have returned, and then this entire body, its organization perfected, will be able to assist our Government, and a satisfactory settlement of matters affecting their interests will be assured.

Then, I think we ought to ask our press to co-operate with us a little more than they have done. I know that during the four years of war they were subjected to the censorship, and some of them smarted under it—perhaps justifiably so; but it had to be. Now that that ban has been lifted, we ought to ask them to give us every possible assistance; the Government should take them fully into their confidence so that they will know what policy should be pursued. One thing which is being done by one of the committees through the press and which, I think, is of inestimable value to Canada, is the publishing of advertisements by the Repatriation Committee. Those advertisements are enlightening our people and our returned soldiers as nothing else ever has enlightened them. They are clear, concise, definite; our people know exactly what that Repatriation Committee is doing. In that respect I think that the Repatriation Committee differs very much from the Food Board, whose publicity was the worst conducted thing I ever saw in my life. It caused confusion in the minds of the people, we knew not where we were at all. But this body is doing it splendidly. The member for St. Hyacinthe (Mr. Gauthier) the other day took up one of these advertisements and held the Government up to ridicule on account of them. He read a long list of gentlemen who had been appointed to certain positions, and he said: "Has patronage been abolished? Look at this: Tory, Tory, Tory, Unionist, Unionist, to whom patronage has been extended." But if that hon. gentleman had looked at this military or semi-military organization from the inside instead of through a long-distance telescope from the outside, he would have appreciated the position much better than he did.

What is patronage? To my mind it is something which contains a profit. Is there any profit to these medical men in the work which the hon. member told us about the other day? Why did the hon. member not tell us the amount that these men were getting? Instead of that, he simply held them up to ridicule. I know whereof I speak, because I belong to an allied profession and have been in a service where I could see what occurred. These medical men throughout the Dominion of Canada who have been and are to-day serving the Government are doing it for one-third the amount of money they could make if they devoted their time to civilian medical practice. As paymaster for the Army Dental Corps in my district, I have had exactly the same experience. I have issued cheques every two weeks to the men under my command; I had previously issued cheques every two weeks to the same men in my own office, and I know that both the medical and the dental profession in this Canada of ours have been and are to-day serving for one-third of what they could get in civilian practice anywhere in Canada. It is a common thing in western Canada, because of the dearth of medical assistance, for medical men to make from ten thousand to twenty thousand dollars a year, and I doubt if any one of them is making less than $5,000 now. Let the hon. gentleman procure a list of the salaries paid to these men and compare them with what they could obtain in civilian practice, and he will see that it is patriotism and not patronage that is moving them, and that he owes an apology to them.

I want to come now to one or two things of probably a more practical nature. The Government has submitted to us a housing scheme and asks us to accept it. The first question that comes to my mind is this—Is a housing scheme necessary? I say most unhesitatingly that something of that nature is necessary, because, go where we will, our people cannot find places in which to live. If that be the case now, what is going to happen in the future? I am told on fairly good authority—I do not know just whether it is right or not—that some fifty thousand of our men overseas have married while in Great Britain. That is a large number; it seems so large that it is almost incredible. If it be true there are so many, I must say that either the English girl is an exceedingly good-looking girl or there is a matrimonial agency of some kind in Great Britain. But be that as it may, a great many of these women are coming for the first time to Canada, strange people in a strange land. Most of them come from comfortable homes, and if they come to Canada and if the Canadian homes are not comfortable we are going to find a great deal of dissatisfaction in a very short time, because Canada is a cold country. There is no getting away from that. If our homes are comfortable there will be no trouble, and the question is to get good comfortable, modernized homes. Have we them? Unquestionably we have not, and we cannot

at present accommodate these people. What, then, is to be done? While I support this scheme I sincerely hope this Government can bring sufficient pressure to bear upon the municipalities to induce them to give the entire amount of money for the housing of our returned soldiers. I think none other should be allowed to share in the benefits of it. I would also like to make this suggestion to the Government: In our part of the world a new condition of affairs altogether has come into existence. In the province of Saskatchewan particularly for years and years our farmers have raised nothing but grain, and grain requires no stabling. In the last three or four years they have changed their methods and have now gone into stock raising to an enormous extent. The progress which has been made in that direction in the last three or four years is surprising. What does that mean? It means that thousands of our farmers to-day require more commodious stabling or entirely new stables. If they started to do the building that they should do and want to do and will do, if conditions are satisfactory, we shall not require anything at all in the way of a housing scheme to assist in furnishing employment. In addition to that, many of the farmers are now, I am pleased to say, in a sufficiently prosperous condition to be able to afford to have better homes. What is their complaint? Their complaint is that the cost of lumber is prohibitive; that if they go to work to-day and build a house or a stable —and the same thing is true in the cities—and if in a year or two the cost of lumber and other building material goes down, they will lose a substantial amount of money upon their investment. Therefore they hesitate, they say: It will probably be better for us to wait until the price of these commodities comes down. Building hardware has, I understand, already fallen considerably in price. But I would suggest to the Government to do would be this, although my suggestion may seem radical to some of my Tory friends:—in view of the tremendous amount of building that can and will be done in that section of the country if conditions are made satisfactory, the duty should, temporarily at least, be taken off lumber so that some reduction may be made in the price of it. It will not, I fancy, be a sufficient reduction. In addition to that, therefore, because a reduction in the tariff will not accomplish everything, I would suggest to the Government that for this year they try to make some arrangement with the railway companies so as to get a lower freight rate on lumber from British Columbia into the Prairie Provinces. In that way they will assist the lumber industry in British Columbia and they will also assist in reducing unemployment in the Prairie Provinces. If they will do that, then the problem, apart from that of the returned soldier, will solve itself, and if we can induce other people to do things for us, there is no sense in our doing them at all. My idea would be to hold out this inducement so as to get the farmers and others to engage in that work.

I am not going to hesitate to discuss the question of a reduction of the tariff. Probably some hon. members may, but being an old Tory and a believer in protection, as I have always been, I have no hesitation in discussing this question.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That's the stuff.

Mr. COWAN: But my hon. friend and I may fall out when I utter my next sentence. The other day the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), speaking about the removal of the duty on tractors last year, tried to ridicule the action taken by the Government, and he said: If they take the duty off the tractor, why is it not right to take it off the plough? That is logical; that is the proper way to state your case; but the attitude of the western farmer—and I suppose it is the same in Ontario—is that every Government, Liberal as well as Conservative, has been protectionist and the former Liberal Government was just as protectionist as any other government in Canada. I may tell my hon. friends that to-day there are more protectionist Liberals in Eastern Canada than there are protectionist Tories in Western Canada. The attitude taken by the former Liberal Government is this: They removed the duty from the minor article and leave it or increase it on the major article, the result being that they give you one dollar and take away ten dollars. This Government took an entirely different attitude. They said: We will remove the duty from the major article; we will give you ten dollars, and it will cost you only one dollar. The western farmer says: Keep on at that rate and we shall be entirely satisfied with you. I would suggest to the Government that they ought, at as early a date as they possibly can, make a substantial reduction in the duty on the major article, namely, on agricultural implements.

Just a word or two in regard to the statement made by the hon. member who preceded me (Mr. Michaud). He said he was

opposed to the Government's building any more railways in Canada at the present time. I do not know what part of the country he lives in, but I can assure him that there is more profit to the Government in building branch lines, or laterals, as we term them, in Western Canada today than any other enterprise they can embark upon, and I was pleased at the statement made, I think, by the Acting Prime Minister, that the work done in Western Canada this year would be chiefly in building branch lines.

Let me draw attention to the conditions which prevail out there. In the south and southeastern parts of Saskatchewan there is one block containing if I remember correctly 220 townships without a single foot of railway in any one of them. There is a settlement there of good substantial farmers who are raising lots of grain, and in many cases they are from twenty to thirty or forty miles from a railway. The consequence is that they have to team their grain that distance to market. Some people say the farmers are profiteering with wheat at $2.20 a bushel. I would ask those who say that to team grain for thirty or forty miles and see how much profit there is left with wheat at $2.20. These farmers cannot get to market with one load and back again in less than three days. There is really no profit in it at all. The section I am speaking of lies along the Montana boundary line. Thousands of these farmers, in fact the great bulk of them, are Americans who have been brought up where marketing conditions are splendid, and naturally they do not appreciate the conditions on this side of the line. As a result, with a railway on the American side of the line built much nearer for the farmers to use, they send their grain to the American market, because you cannot have enough police out there to stop it; and the farmers buy the goods they need on the other side of the line, so that Canada loses the trade both ways. Such a condition seems to me to be entirely improper, and I think it should be remedied as soon as possible. Northeast from that there is a block of 190 townships, in which there is not a foot of railway, and people have been in there from ten to fifteen years, twenty and thirty and forty miles from a railway. Women have been in there ten or twelve years and have not seen a railway during all that time because they cannot leave the children and the stock, and the husband is the man who must go to the nearest town to transact the business. In the place I speak of there are good stores, and the storekeepers are using continuously two, three, and four-horse teams hauling their merchandise from twenty to thirty miles. The result is that they add the cost of that teaming to the price of the goods they sell, and you can quite understand that the price the farmer has to pay makes him feel he has a grievance.

What are the conditions along the north bank of the South Saskatchewan river? There is a railway on the south side but none on the north, and this winter I am informed that there are hundreds of thousands of bushels of wheat still lying on the north side because the farmers cannot get it to market. There is a ferry there which runs in summer, but there was just enough ice there this winter to prevent it running, and not enough ice to allow farmers to haul across the river. Their grain is still lying on the north side as they are unable to market it. And then people wonder at the farmers being discontented and seeking a remedy at the hands of the Government.

I understand that this Government is going to build laterals to make connections with the main line, and I hope that when this is done they will see that the Canadian National railways get the biggest portion of the business because the Canadian Pacific has had forty years in which it could have entered that territory, and as it has not seen fit to do so, it should not receive very much consideration at our hands. Furthermore, in the building of these laterals, there should be no parallel roads within a few miles distance of each other. It should be compulsory for the roads to be built a certain distance apart, so that we shall not have a condition where a certain number of farmers will have two lines of railway two or three miles apart, and another lot of farmers will be condemned to live fifteen or thirty miles from a railway for some years to come.

I wish to compliment the Government upon the re-establishment of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. Some people might ask: Why do you require a large body of police in Western Canada? Are you going to use force and keep the people of Western Canada in subjugation? After forty or fifty years knowledge of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, it is my opinion that there is not a body of men on earth who can maintain peace with less exhibition of force than the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, they have a prestige which no other body of men on earth possesses. Let me illustrate. I was a defeated Tory candidate in a Re-

gina constituency in 1911 and I was given that cursed patronage for the district. Thank God that has been done away with; I do not want any more of it; I have had enough. A deputation came to me from the village of Ceylon which lies near the Montana boundary, and asked if I could have a detachment of the mounted police sent to their town. I asked what they wanted a detachment of police for, and they told me that there were a number of outlaws and roughnecks coming across the Montana boundary and getting drunk in the village, and things had got so bad that the women had made up their minds to leave. I called up Commissioner Perry on the telephone. I knew him sufficiently well to know that when I laid a case before him and he said he would attend to it, it would be attended to, and I need not bother any more about it. So I told him the facts, as given to me, and he said he would look into it. About a month afterwards the head of this delegation came to my office in Regina and said "I have just come up here to thank you for cleaning up our place and sending the police down there." I asked if Commissioner Perry had sent a detachment down there, and he replied "No, he only sent one man." I asked if that one man did what was needed, and he said that the outlaws and roughnecks vanished on the night this one policeman with his red coat appeared on the scene. The sight of his red coat was enough, and that is the case all over the West. The prestige of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police is such that at the sight of the red coat lawlessness immediately stops and force is not required, because everybody knows that if force is necessary force is going to come, and come effectively; there is no nonsense about the Mounted Police. For that reason, because of the confidence which our people have in the force, I am very glad indeed that the Government has decided to re-establish it. As soon as this became known the people out West on all sides expressed their satisfaction.

I hope the Government this session will continue to carry out their promise of last session. I have reason to believe they have already started to solve the problem of the coal supply in southern Saskatchewan. Last session $200,000 was voted for the purpose of conducting experiments, and experiments have been made in connection with briquetting lignite, of which we have fifty-nine billion tons in southern Saskatchewan. I hope there will be no departmental sloth in this matter and that the Government will expedite the completion of the briquetting plant because our people are anxiously awaiting it. The people in southern Saskatchewan and southeastern Manitoba feel that they are being bled unmercifully by the coal barons, who have no right to rob us as they are doing. We feel it is the biggest robbery in western Canada to-day and we think the problem can be solved, and solved easily, and in a way that will tend to develop our own resources and furnish employment to a great number of our workmen. The coal is there by the billion tons, and all that is required is to put it, as it can be put, into a marketable, commercial shape, and there will be a ready market. I urge the Government to expedite that matter so that we may as quickly as possible have the benefit of this great natural resource.

The Government, I understand, intend to bring down a Bill to establish a Health Department. That was opposed by one of the hon. gentlemen opposite. I thing it was the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) who said—but I may be mistaken in attributing the remark to him and I do not want to accuse him of that of which he is not guilty—that we did not want more duplication in our public service and that this would be a duplication. I cannot see duplication in it, but I can see direction, and much better direction than we have now, in matters vitally affecting the interests of the Canadian people. There are several defects in the British North America Act, defects which must be overcome by co-operative action on the part of the representatives of the people. There is a defect with regard to the medical profession, with regard to the dental profession, with regard to the veterinary profession. Under the British North America Act these are made provincial, with provincial bounds. As a professional man, if I go into Manitoba to practice my profession, I become a criminal. And so throughout the Dominion we have these limitations in the handling of a problem affecting the happiness and welfare of all the people. Does not my hon. friend know that the importance of public health has made tremendous advance in public estimation of late? Take the case of the Red Cross. That whole world-wide organization is shortly to meet, I understand, in Geneva. And for what purpose? To arrange that their body may engage as a world wide organization in peace work, in other words in the education of the public in regard to health and its preservation. And in Canada we find our Red Cross meeting no longer ago than last Saturday, determining to petition Par-

liament to allow them to engage in the same work throughout the Dominion. What are we, as a nation going to do? Are we going to see these great organizations undertake this work voluntarily and give them no national assistance? To my way of thinking provincial bodies cannot all properly undertake this work. In the great province of Ontario where they have unbounded wealth, or in Quebec where they have so much, they may be able to establish laboratories and provide for the research boards to gain the necessary information to establish the best practice in matters of public health. But can we expect the same of the little province of Prince Edward Island? I say we cannot. Yet, are we to regard the health of a Prince Edward Islander as of less importance than that of a citizen of Ontario or of Saskatchewan? I strongly believe, therefore, that it is necessary for the Government to take this problem in hand on national lines, and, by means of a research council and a system of publicity and advice, to enable the provinces to combat epidemics and everything that would menace the public health. I think that the address of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) was a most admirable one, and I would like to repeat every word he said on this subject.

I will not detain the House any longer. I feel that up to the present this Government, as was said in the admirable speeches of the mover and seconder of the Address, has done exceedingly well. If it continues to do as it has done in meeting the demands of the people in a sensible energetic way, and in giving to our returned soldiers that which is coming to them, I, for one, am prepared to continue my support. Their treatment of the soldiers in regard to the war service gratuity, I think, was exceedingly commendable. I regard that war service gratuity as compensation in part,—a recognition of the fact that we owe these men something. As to whether or not that compensation is sufficient, I am not going to say—except, that I do not think it is. I think we shall have to do a good deal more than that. We shall have to bring a portion of our men who served in England, but who nevertheless gave good service, within the operation of the war service gratuity. We receive a great many demands from the several units of the Great War Veterans' Association who are probably not so completely organized as to be controlled as they might be. Some of them are making elaborate demands. The other day the Great War Veteran meeting in Calgary requested that the men who served in Canada only should get $1,000, those who had served in England, $1,500, and every one who had served in France, $2,000. We owe it to them, there is no question about that, if we put it on a basis of the difference between what they earned as soldiers and what they could have earned in Canada. But we must face this thing in a sensible way. Is it possible for us to give them this amount of money in cash? The aggregate amount would be about $750,000,000. I wish I could think there was that much money in Canada. But it may be possible for us to capitalize the amount and pay them, after the expiration of the war service gratuities, for their service, and without regard to rank, extending over a period of time, and in that way really effect a final settlement. But what I do think is that we should as soon as possible take these men into our confidence and let them know where we stand. Immediateness is their pressing demand. Hon. gentlemen opposite have been complaining because some of our Cabinet ministers are overseas. I would like to see one more cabinet minister leave his post here and go off upon another mission, right here in Canada. If there is unrest to-day among the great war veterans, it is due to the fact that the Canadian people have not been sufficiently candid and frank with them, and they do not quite understand the situation. I think that the best thing we could do to allay that unrest would be for one of our ministers to jump his job here and spend three months in meeting the Great War Veterans in their own halls. I do not mean that this minister should go to Halifax or to Calgary and stay there in his private car or in his hotel room and ask two or three men to meet him to talk the situation over. Not at all, the minister should go plump into the Veterans' own rooms. He will find them a sensible body of men, ready to discuss things in a sensible way. I have been at their meetings, and I have never heard men discuss affairs more intelligently or with less tendency to be extreme. But what they do want is to meet somebody in authority with whom they can talk. They will not be bothered with understrappers—no use sending such people, for these men will not listen to them. But if any member of this Cabinet will go out and meet these men as I have suggested he will perform an excellent service. A great deal of this unrest arises out of merely minor things. These veterans see a piece of land held by a speculator and they think they would like to get it, and want it right away. Or they see two or three townships held for

quarantine purposes, and they do not see why they should not get that. If one of our ministers would go and discuss the matter with them as soon as possible, and would give them to understand that the people of Canada intend to do them absolute justice, we should find the unrest cease. I do not know that the suggestions I have made are of value to this House, but at least I have had the satisfaction of mentioning some of the things that I think ought to be dealt with.

Mr. C. A. FOURNIER (Bellechasse): Mr. Speaker, hon. members have listened with admiration to the many eloquent addresses that have been delivered thus far. I am sorry to be the first to break the line. As you know, I have not the distinction of being a man of letters; neither have I the privilege of being a lawyer. I am a farmer and the humblest of all the hon. members here. If I cannot favour the House with an academic dissertation, I can assure hon. members that they will not be compelled to listen to any lengthy remarks.

As I look to the vacant chair, may I be permitted, in my own name, and in the name of the people of Bellechasse, whom I have the honour to represent, to express our sentiment of the deepest sorrow that the greatest of statesmen is no more. We loved the great Canadian because he believed in Canada and the Canadian people, because he had an abiding faith in the future destiny of Canada, because he had a high conception of what this great, new country should be and because he followed out that ideal with loyalty and truth. He spent his long life in teaching unity, the most powerful lever by which the rights of all classes are to be respected. He was the soul of personal honour and integrity. He wore manhood's great and noble crown. We trusted him because we were safe with him. We well nigh worshipped this great Canadian living, and true to him to the last, we will continue to honour and reverence him with an unchanging fidelity in death.

I desire to offer to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) my best wishes and I must say to him that I will be a Highlander in my loyalty to him and to Liberalism. I desire to join with the hon. members who have previously spoken in tendering my most cordial congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address. While I am on this side of the House and while I may differ from them, I may say that the lofty views to which they have given expression and the manner in which they have presented them, assure them of the brightest parliamentary careers.

This Government has taught me, as it did the rest of the farmers, to be a little suspicious of what it does and says. I do not suppose it expects that I shall say that it has done exceedingly well. I shall not dwell upon the effort that Canada has made during this war. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) in a public meeting, made the statement that Canada was the only allied country that had maintained its divisions at the front to their full quota. Therefore, as far as men are concerned, Canada has done her duty. As far as money is concerned, our debt furnishes the answer.

I desire to say a word with regard to the failure of the Government to make adequate preparation for meeting after-the-war problems. The Government knew well that the war would end some day. The Government refused, practically speaking to confer with the representatives of the people to assemble Parliament. They preferred to deal with Orders in Council—all of them autocratic and arbitrary—and one of the greatest of them was, if I remember well, "work or fight." The fight is finished, Mr. Speaker, but the work is left. Orders in Council will not produce work where the positions do not exist. Therefore, we have unrest in this country due to the failure of the Government to prepare for the after-the-war problems. Far from the seat of hostilities the war has created problems and these problems must be solved.

It was the fashion at the outbreak of war to prophesy smooth things of these post bellum conditions. They, we are assured, differ materially from those before the war. I confess I am not convinced. In a war which, if prolonged, can end only in the ruin of the vanquished and the exhaustion of the victors, I find it difficult to believe that the havoc and destruction wrought in human life and property can be repaired except by much travail and privation. I find it hard to believe that the industry of this country can be lightly turned from the arts of war to the arts of peace, from forging swords to beating ploughshares, or its foreign trade restored to its former volume and channels without long and painful effort.

Nor am I comforted by those who assume that by the simple expedient of increasing the national debt we can transfer the burden from our own shoulders to those of posterity. I believe that to be a delusion.

It is present capital that is being destroyed, and it is the present generation that must repair the loss or go without the capital. A national debt, in so far as it is raised within the country, is a device for transferring money from private purses to the coffers of the state. The state becomes a competitor in the market for capital, and every increase in the rate of interest which it is obliged to offer tends to withdraw capital from more and more productive enterprises. It is inevitable that capital should become scarcer and dearer, and the surplus available diminished. The material welfare of Canada in the last four years has been maintained by the war. The same influence that has depopulated the country has also, by reason of higher prices for all kinds of agricultural produce, and by reason of the industry arising out of the manufacturing of war materials, supplied the means of financing the nation's affairs at home and abroad. But the real testing time for Canada is after the war, when the present abnormal conditions affecting values have passed away, and we are brought into full competition again with all nations in the markets of the world. Canada has not yet been wholly and severely tried economically. We were prosperous during a period of ten or twelve years before the war because of the commercial activity created by borrowed capital. Money has always been coming into Canada for purposes of development. These sources will not be open now, and we must rely on ourselves. This will be the testing time.

I come to the burning after-the-war problems of demobilization, reinstatement of our valiant sons into civil life, and reconstruction. The Acting Prime Minister said that demobilization was progressing rapidly. I think it is a little slow yet, and I see the statement in the press that the big ships that used to take our soldiers to England were withdrawn because the port at Halifax was not equipped to receive big ships.

Now, Sir, it seems to me that the same vessels which conveyed our soldiers overseas could very well convey them back to Halifax, or some other Canadian port. The circulation of any contrary statement without challenge in the press must be a great injury to this country, and most certainly to the port of Halifax.

Now as to the reinstatement of our soldiers into civil life I have a very warm spot in my heart for these brave men. Much has been said of their patriotism and their sacrifices. Nothing can be too good for them, and if it rests upon my vote, Mr. Speaker, they can have all they want. But I must say this it has come to a time where soldiers cannot live on compliments. You cannot stuff them any longer with compliments; it is a diet, Mr. Speaker, that neither you nor I would exist very long upon. The soldier needs something substantial to subsist on, and we are told that he is to be settled on a farm. Nobody quarrels with land settlement. In America it always was the basic scheme for absorbing soldiers in civil life; how good the scheme may be it depends how it is worked out. It is not my desire to make premature criticism but in my opinion, this plan, as far as outlined by the Government, bristles with potential troubles and dangers for the man who has no practical land experience, and especially who has been dazzled by promises that he would be lent money and established on a ranch, or its eastern equivalent, a farm. I see great dangers ahead, in connection with the scheme, and great care should be exercised to prevent individuals disaster and to the country as well. I say, Mr. Speaker, that the first thing to do is to get behind a returned man's mind and find out what, under his own power he elects to do, and not to tow him into anything that will mean a failure. Failures we must prevent, and we must assure the returned men success. There are just as many discontented men on farms to-day as in any other business, and the farmer is the poorest remunerated lot, and since the armistice, the farmers were the first to suffer losses. I am of the opinion that the enthusiasm displayed at the Hun line, will not be of the same nature in pulling out stumps. It is well advisable that the returned soldier, before he is allowed to drift to civil life and to root for himself, should be dealt with with the greatest care in order to assure his success. So much for the man. Now let me consider the land. As far as I am informed speculatively held land is to be bought by the provinces with money lent by the Dominion, the buying to be done by the province—in plain words the provincial government is to handle the provincial speculator. He is the bone of contention. I submit, Sir, that great care should be exercised in connection with this scheme. Speculators and land sharks have been praying the Lord for such an opportunity to be rid of their holdings. It is not my desire to say that the land the speculators own is all bad, but in our simple trust and innocence let us not go and pay for orchard land the price of mixed farming lands, otherwise the soldier settler and the country will get

stung. I do not impute impropriety to any government or its member, but speculator's influence is strong, and they know it. In my humble estimation the Government has no right to delegate the buying of lands for returned soldiers to anybody; in so doing it is taking a chance which it has no business to take involving expenditure of Canada's money and the future of Canada's fighting men. Canada at this juncture has no money to fritter away on half-baked schemes, and it is well to look sharply to a possible land speculator's long deferred clean up. Let the Government examine into this just as quickly as the Minister of the Interior would make a Franchise Act.

This brings me to that subject which is contained in the Address. The War-time Elections Act was an Act born of desperation and it served the most reprehensible purposes. It disfranchised all those citizens who had been teased, coaxed and towed into this country under the solemn guarantees of rights and liberty. It has been a base deception and despicable persecution of foreign settlers, and a direct violation of the State's promise, and it should be wiped off the statute-book, for it is a shame that it should remain one minute longer. The new proposed franchise mentions the admission of women as members of Parliament. My views on the matter are well known and are recorded in last session's Hansard. I may say that I am not a "rapid change artist," and I see no reason to change my mind and principles. Nevertheless I say this, if the proposed new Franchise Act is to create another hand-picked electorate to rob another election, that, Sir, will demonstrate beyond controversy to my mind, one thing, and that is if the word "hypocrite" should be lost to the English tongue, the word "Unionist" would stand in its place.

Remember, Mr. Speaker, that we shall be judged not by the prowess of our fighting men, but by the sacredness of our pledged words.

Now, as to reconstruction. My utterances on this subject, Mr. Speaker, may be a shock to my hon. friends the high priests of protection. Tariff reform is a part of reconstruction. The member for East Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) who spoke this afternoon, said that when you speak of tariffs you are walking on sacred ground.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Holy ground.

Mr. FOURNIER: I may be a little bold, Mr. Speaker, but I am going to walk into the sanctuary of protection, and without putting on a pair of gloves I am going to deposit on the altar of protection something which represents this principle: I am an advocate of free farming implements. Farming is fundamentally the industry of Canada. The farmer must rely on machine power if he is to increase his production and to decrease the cost of living. The removal of the duty on farm implements must no longer be kept in abeyance. Shall we be able to reconstruct if we do not meet the requirements of the people? Shall we be able to reconstruct if we decrease the value of farm and other landed property? Shall we be able to reconstruct if we oppress the masses for the enrichment of a few?

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder) in his remarks the other day told us that many people had left their moorings during the war. That is true, but the farmers and the labourers have not quite left their moorings. A few Liberals have left their political moorings, and, though still claiming to be Liberals, are to be found on the Treasury benches. They have ceased to defend the masses, and now they prefer to listen to the endearing tones of the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) and hear it stated that their former Liberal doctrines were unsound. They prefer to listen to him now and to accompany him in the excursions which he has been in the habit of conducting personally at every session, unfolding to hon. members the delightful panorama of flaming furnaces, belching smokestacks and the hum and whir of busy machinery, singing the sweet song of the millionaires and Tory prosperity. The member for Brantford has told the House that the newly-united separated brethren had been provided with a home. I think his words were these: "We have given them a home, and they are taking full advantage of it." I have no objection to that; I am glad that they are happy and contented. But I say this to them: Tariff reform shall not be kept in abeyance very much longer. The member for Brantford said that the separated brethren were united on tariff reform; that tariff reform would be carried out by a cheap compromise—a compromise, at any rate, and I know that it will be cheap. The separated brethren with their new friends may stand united, but the farmers are telling them this: "Hang together or hang separate, we do not care; but if you do not separate pretty quick you will all hang together."

It is not my purpose to champion the theories of any set of doctrinaires. A lot of theories are apt to become lost in the

shuffle of argument. Will any one in this House deny that Canada is best suited to the production of foodstuffs? 10 p.m. Our vast areas of arable lands furnish the answer. Will any hon. gentleman deny that Canada under peace conditions failed to hold her own in manufacturing, save in a few special lines, with the rest of the world? The paucity of factory made goods exported before the war furnishes the answer. I am willing to pause for a crushing rejoinder from some hon. gentleman to this effect: What are we going to do with the factories which have represented the wealth of this country? We must protect our factories during the period of their infancy. In reply I ask this question: Some one has to pay the bill for protected industrialism; can that some one keep on paying the bill and at the same time pay the foreign obligations of the country? Tariff reform is a burning question, but it must be faced; and, in the words of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, when you have anything to do, do it. We want cheaper farming implements, and if the Government forgets the farmers, the farmers will not forget the Government.

It is argued by hon. gentlemen opposite —if you can call it an argument; it always comes from a Tory—that in this respect the Liberals, when they were in power, did not do anything. While it is always a pleasure to listen to a Tory, it is quite unusual to get an explanation from him in which he has not recourse to recrimination. My friends the Tories are admirable gentlemen, but I do not know what to admire most in them, their wealth of imagination or their shortness of memory. My friends the Tories seem to forget that their leader while in Opposition bitterly denounced the policy of handing over to the Prairie Provinces the control of their natural resources. But although their leader has been Prime Minister for over seven years, Manitoba, Alberta and Saskatchewan still remain the wards of the Dominion, not yet to be trusted with the management of their own property. Oh, the Tories—their memory is so short.

Again, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to be cruel, but my friends the Tories seem to forget that their leader in 1911, in Opposition, bitterly denounced the Laurier naval policy, called it disloyal, made references to the tin-pot navy, and all sorts of things. Yet we are told that Sir Robert Borden in his many pilgrimages to the Imperial fount has committed the Canadian Government to a naval policy.

Again, my friends the Tories seem to forget that their leader when in Opposition bitterly denounced the trading and trucking with the Yankees. It was disloyal; we on this side of the House were branded as traitors. But now we find ourselves doing more trading and trucking with the Yankees, and we are doing it by Order in Council. Free wheat, that was an abomination formerly, is all right to-day.

Another argument, if you can call it an argument, put forward is that when the Liberals were in power, no sensible tariff reform ever took place. Recrimination is no argument.

I come now to another problem, namely, that of the high cost of living. Last session we listened to a report from Commissioner O'Connor on the cost of living. He denounced the speculator and the profiteer. I was surprised, a few weeks after I reached home, to find that another report on the cost of living had been sent to the Minister of Labour. I was amused. If that report is in any sense to be relied upon, the remarkable metamorphosis which has occurred in the cold storage business in Canada is an example of a regeneration unsurpassed by any convert even of the wonder working Billy Sunday. The cold storage plants which, not so many months ago, were disclosed by Commissioner O'Connor to be centres of profiteering and speculationn are now painted to a bewildered public as an angelic aggregation comparable only to the beauty of a social service organization for purely altruistic purposes.

It is a little strange that after the man who disclosed the abuses existent among our great food profiteers should have been dismissed, a report should be presented by his successors wholly at variance with his findings and giving something closely resembling a whitewash to the cold storage kings. Is it possible that since the sleuth O'Connor was pushed out of his sentry box, the cold storage operators all vowed to lead a new life and depart from the ways of evil? Or is it more possible that with the sleuth O'Connor gone, the profiteers have been able to present a plausible statement to a friendly and none too inquisitive successor who has been more anxious to hold his position than to ferret out truths unpalatable to those in high places? Which is the more probable? The absolutely altered tone of the report on the cost of living, the old devices of blaming all the high prices on the war, the deprecation of any suspicion of profiteering, all this marks such a radical departure from the reports of Commissioner O'Connor, dismissed for his zealous service,

that one is inclined to wonder if the millenium has arrived over night, or whether Sir Joseph Flavelle is still the cock of the walk, and with him we could all sing the following song:

Is there a profiteer so dead
Who never to himself hath said;
"This is my own, my native land."
I've got this country by the hair
In what they eat and what they wear,
I'm glad the boys are over there
Upon a foreign strand;
And so I'll bleed this country white,
They're suckers all, and they will bite,
I'll help myself while others fight;
I'll own my native land.
The price of living so complex
It even master minds doth vex,
So soak the plebians in the nex
Before they understand.
And then when home the boys are come
I'll wave the flag and beat the drum,
And if they're good I'll give them some
Of this dear fertile land.

I do not care a rusty pin,
So long as I can save my skin,
Preserve my well-clad self.
Why should I care, alas, alack,
While shysters shyst and slackers slack,
If I can make more pelf?

Why should I care who pays the price
And gets their heads packed up in ice,
As long as I can smile?
I hardly care who wins the war,
As long as I can make some more
Additions to my pile.

I do not care a tinker's cuss
Who goes and cleanses up the muss,
And loses all most dear.
I shall be, if I riches get,
A knight, or p'r'aps a baronet,
Cos' I'm a profiteer.

And then when I am gone and dead,
Upon my tombstone shall be said:
"He helped himself while others bled,
For this his native land."

I would like to refer briefly to these wholesale visits of our Cabinet ministers overseas. There are two aspects from which these visits of Dominion politicians and ministers of the Crown to London may be viewed. The first is that they go to give advice on Imperial matters. This is the usual interpretation of Imperial Conferences, and in so far as this is their function they form a fitting superstructure to the organization of our splendid Empire. Well and good. I do not want to reproach Sir Robert Borden for being overseas at the present moment, but I do object to so many ministers going across when there was no need for it. But there is the second aspect. Our Dominion politicians may go to London for the purpose of giving advice and conclude simply by receiving it. Instead of exerting the influence of the Dominion upon Imperial matters, the influence of Downing street may be exerted upon the affairs of the Dominion. Unless our Canadian politicians are possessed of a hardy, indigenous national culture, those perennial peregrinations to the Imperial fount are likely to exert a centralizing effect upon their policies not entirely in keeping with the feelings of the people generally, who have not the advantage of yearly pilgrimages to the shrine at Westminster. A more steady policy can be developed only on Canadian soil.

My hon. friend, the Acting Prime Minister, has said that an indictment before an impartial tribunal of the guilty, the wholesale murderer in this war, would be a good lesson to prevent a future recurrence of war. I fully concur in that, and I hope that the breeze will carry the utterance of the Acting Prime Minister to the ear of Sir Robert Borden. If the Kaiser, the guilty, the wholesale murderer, cannot be punished, or if they do not punish him over there while the conference is going on or after it has concluded its labours, I would like to suggest that Sir Robert Borden and his honourable colleagues should get the Kaiser away from the castle in which he lives in such splendour, bring him to Canada and compel him to live on an average Canadian pension.

I know that the problems that confront us are very serious, but I do not like to hear the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) say that mistakes have been made and that more will be made. That reminds me of a story. In the antebellum days a well-known family physician in a southern city had for a coachman an old darkey who by reason of his long service with the doctor was considered by the community as an authority on matters pertaining to health. One day this darkey was accosted by a passer-by, who asked him "who has died in the next block?" The old darkey straightened up, gazed intently in the direction indicated and breaking into a broad smile replied "I do not know, sir, he is none of our killing." I understand, of course, that mistakes will occur, but we should try to avoid mistakes.

I cannot resume my seat without making an appeal to the Press of this country. As an aid to civilization and human fraternity, there is no greater force existing in the world than the Press, if its best powers are employed for the noblest purposes. The Press ought to resemble a mighty ship which with brave, true men at the helm moves over a straight course, clearing the waters of darkness and error and making direct for the highest shores of peace and

promise. But it must be a ship indeed, grandly built, nobly manned, and steadily steered; not a crazy, water-logged vessel, creaking with the thud of every wave, or bobbing backwards and forwards uncertainly in a gale. The Press is a great educational force. In its hands is the social moulding of a people and the dignity of a nation as represented before other nations. There could hardly be a nobler work; there can never be a higher responsibility.

My hon. friend who seconded he Address said that an antagonism existed between the two great races in this country. For my part, I should like to see all antagonisms submerged. Providence has put us here side by side, and in that relation we must live whether we like it or not. We all have faults, but let us be men and say "The faults of our brothers we will write on the sand, and their virtues on the tablets of love and memory."

Mr. PETER McGIBBON (Muskoka): Mr. Speaker, rising for the first time seriously to address this House, I ask the kind consideration which any man placed in this embarrassing position needs, and which I feel will be gladly accorded by every hon. member. I wish first of all to pay my humble respects to the late leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). Though differing with him on many matters of principle, as most of us did on this side of the House, we recognized in him a great Canadian, and a great man. He had passed some forty or fifty years on the political stage of Canada, sometimes tasting the sweets of office and at other times the bitterness of defeat, but on every occasion he played the part of a great Canadian. We were proud of the way he represented us on the occasion of the Diamond Jubilee of Queen Victoria, and at the coronation of King Edward VII. Now, in the fulness of time, he has passed to the peaceful bosom of eternity, honoured by peasant and king, and we mourn his loss. He was unique in the sense that he belonged to a departed school of statesmen. He was a scholar, gentleman, and statesman, and as the poet says, lived—

> . . . . to clutch the golden keys,
> To mould a mighty state's decrees,
> And shape the whisper of the throne.

I wish also to congratulate the hon. member who is at present leading the Opposition (Mr. D. D. McKenzie). Whether he occupies that position for a long or a short time, on him has been conferred a great honour, and I can only hope that so long as he leads his party in this House he will be worthy of the great leaders of the past and build for himself a monument worthy of the honour which has been conferred upon him.

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, we must all be impressed with the changed conditions under which we meet this year. A year ago our great Russian ally had ceased to be a factor in the war. Rumania had been forced to make peace, and the Germans reinforced by two million men on the western front had broken our lines and were fast marching to the channel ports and the strategic positions commanding Paris. Those were indeed dark days for us, and we remember only too well the sadness with which we used to scan the bulletins and read that fateful message of Haig's to his men to stand and die facing the foe. Then, as if by Providence, in the early days of July things began to brighten. Peace loomed up on the horizon, and by November 11th had wrapped the whole world in his glory. To-day there are sitting in the beautiful palace of Versailles representatives of all the great nations of the world, in an endeavour to establish a tribunal which will forever do away with war.

I have also been impressed with the change in the attitude of hon. members of this House from a year ago. Then the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) rose from his seat and with all the eloquence which he possesses said to certain members on this side of the House, if not in so many words, at least in effect, "Depart from us ye workers of iniquity. We need you not." I leave it to the House if I am not right when I say that on that particular occasion it was the ambition of the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) to bury Caesar, not to praise him.

Then, this session, we have had the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), arising in his place, and with all the prestige of his position, telling them that the banquet is prepared, that the light is in the window leading them to the fireside where they can all sing, "Home Sweet Home." Truly, that is a marvelous picture. I know not whether it was the intention of hon. members on that side of the House to seek some political leader to lead them out of the political wilderness, or whether the hon. member for Russell wished to exercise his ability in playing the part of Mark Antony and to make a funeral ovation over the hon. member for Durham. But I believe it will all be in vain. I believe the hon. members who heeded the Scriptural injunction, "Come

ye out from among them," feel that their duty to their country is not yet performed and will not cease until that task is completed.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say something in reference to a statement by the last speaker (Mr. Fournier), a statement which was made also by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy), and that is that the Premier of this country has no right to be sitting at the Peace Conference at Versailles. I want to say, Sir, as one who got pretty close to the Huns on several occasions on the battlefield, that I think I can speak for others when I say that we consider the place of the Prime Minister of this country to-day is in helping to settle the great questions in Europe, and we think he should stay there and attend to that duty until it is accomplished. I can readily understand that the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), who carries the terrible burden of the country's finance on his shoulders, may well wish to have the Premier back; but I think the affairs of this country can be carried on successfully during the Premier's absence. In this connection I must make a passing reference to the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). He told us with great emphasis, that the War-time Elections Act was a blot upon the fair name of Canada. Well, I hope to have the privilege, before this session closes, of voting to keep the German and the Austrian from ever again having a voice in the selection of members of this Parliament. We did not go and fight them on the battlefield—60,000 boys of Canada did not lay down their lives on the sunny fields of France—that there might be handed back to the Austrians and Germans power to control the affairs of this country and I cannot see why in the name of reason there is anything unfair in depriving our alien enemies of any such power. I couple with this the hope that I may have the privilege of voting for the disfranchisement forever of all the slackers and deserters in this country. I believe that a man who refuses to fight for his country should have no part in the direction of its public affairs. I hope the Government will have the courage to bring in a Bill to disfranchise such people for the rest of their lives.

Now, I desire to refer for a moment or two to a few things spoken of by the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell). I quite agree with him that this country is heavily in debt. Two billions is truly a colossal debt for a population of eight millions of people. I also agree with the statement made in this House that when a nation, as when an individual, is in debt, there are just two things to be done—produce more and save more. But I would like to draw attention to something which previous speakers seem to have passed by, and that is that we are in an entirely different position from any of the European countries. Take France, for example, every inch of her land is under cultivation, and her population overflows. The same is true of Great Britain, of Belgium and of other countries of Europe. But in Canada we have a country capable of supporting hundreds of millions, and up to the present time we have a population of only eight millions. But those eight millions of people last year had on deposit in the chartered banks and savings banks something like two billions of dollars, a sum about equal to our national debt. Last year we had field crops worth $1,367,000,000; live stock worth $2,000,000,000; fisheries, $52,000,000; dairy products, $93,000,000; minerals, $189,000,000. Yet our natural resources are almost untouched. We have roughly speaking one thousand four hundred million acres of land, of which practically one-third can be cultivated. But of this cultivable land less than twelve per cent is under cultivation at the present time. If twelve per cent of our arable land can produce wealth in the quantities I have just indicated, what may we not hope for the future, especially—and this is a very important part of it—when, as I strongly believe, we are to have population coming into this country by the million? The advertising that Canada has got in this war through the work of our army, and what the people over there think the extravagant way we paid them, is going to attract to our shores untold millions of people. I do not believe I am wrong in saying that within the next fifteen years the population of Canada will double. If that population is wisely directed towards the development of our natural resources, I think that Canada can get through this war and the liability connected with it better than any other nation on earth, and I believe we shall. What we must do is to produce more, not only from our soil, but in our factories, and in every industry of the country. We must find some place, if possible, to market our products. In this connection I think we should congratulate the Government on the step they have taken in giving to the countries of Europe a line of credit. I wish they could double or treble it, and thus bring to this country orders to keep every factory

and machine shop going, and thus solve the labour problem to a very great extent.

Along with this we have—and it is a very big problem—the repatriation of the soldiers. Some people object to it being called a problem. I think it is one of the greatest problems we have. I would like to call the attention of the authorities to the fact that the problem is partly, and mainly, psychological. That remark is not original with me. It has been made by many, particularly by Col. Molloy whose reasoning is absolutely good and sound and who points out that until this country gets into the way of considering the problem in that light and of replacing what it has taken out of a man it cannot expect him to start off from where he was before. For three or four years we have trained a man for one thing and that was to destroy the enemy. We have never allowed him to think for himself. We told him when he should rise, when he should go to bed, how he should dress, what he should eat, and so on and for four years we have treated him in such a way as to have driven out of him practically every ounce of originality. Then he comes back and we immediately expect him to start off from where he was when we took him four years ago. To my mind, Sir, that is, in many cases, impossible. We have to restore the initiative in that boy, the desire for self-preservation, for creating a home, for creating an estate of his own and along that line I think there should be some serious thinking done.

I want to say a few words with regard to the treatment of the returned soldier. The first thing that I want to touch on is the question of pensions. We have a scale of pensions which, I was going to say, is disgraceful. Probably that is not too strong a word. You draft a boy into the army, or he volunteers for active service, he goes over to France, he comes back with both of his eyes blown out, or he has lost both limbs or perhaps both arms and legs and we have fifty or sixty of those cases in Canada. Is it creditable to the country that we give him $600 a year? That is not the price of one meal per day in a first class hotel in Canada. Canada cannot afford to treat her soldiers in that way. They have earned better, they should get better and I believe the people of Canada want them to get better. Then, too, there are many things connected with them that are not right. Canada has taken the stand that she will not stand by the examination of her own medical officers when soldiers enlisted. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that is grossly unfair and there are those to-day who have volunteered and given their services for Canada who are going around begging for a living. I have taken cases along that line before the Pension Board and they say that they can do nothing under the regulations. I only mention these things to bring them to the attention of the House, feeling that this is all that is required to have them remedied, but, I think they should be remedied.

Then, I must touch upon the matter of promotion and of appointment for returned soldiers. I agree with the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) that they deserve a little better than the average person. Are they getting it? I do not think they are. I have not been able yet to get the figures from the Civil Service Commission, but if what I have heard is true the soldier is not getting very much sympathy there. I would like to say too, Mr. Speaker, that as far as the Militia Department is concerned, I do not think the returned men are getting what they ought to get. I would like to see the different positions in the military centres of this country filled by returned men instead of those men who have never been out of Canada. I do not believe, excepting a few men who have special knowledge and fitness, that the men who have been performing these duties are as good or as capable as the men who could be got from amongst those who served in France. As far as the medical fraternity are concerned, it does appear to me that those who got nearest the Hun in France are kept farthest from places of emolument when they return to Canada. It would appear almost as though their service was like the blood on the lintel and door posts of the Israelites: a sign by which they were to be passed over.

I would like to draw the attention of my hon. friend to the condition of the tubercular patients who have returned to this country. I think it is a great mistake to put these patients in civilian institutions. These institutions have been overcrowded for years. We medical men could not get room for our own patients. Now, the military authorities come along, and, instead of looking after the military patients, as it is their duty to do, and as I believe they will have to do, they simply pass them on to the provincial authorities, pay them a certain price and ask them to look after them. I have visited many of these institutions from the Atlantic to the Pacific and I have not yet seen one of them where I considered these men were under the very best, or even fairly good, conditions. I think it is

the duty absolutely of the Dominion Government to shoulder the responsibility of organizing proper institutions for taking care of those patients.

I would like to mention one or two things in the speech from the Throne that met with my very hearty approval. One is the announcement of the Government's policy with regard to public roads. I do not know of anything that will so add to the comfort and convenience of the people in the north country especially as the building of real good roads. It is hard to realize what life means to some of these men. They, are away in the back woods, they get a mail once a week, they have no neighbours, they are there week in and week out trying to hew homes out of the backwoods, and if we wish them to stay there and to build up this country we must make things pleasant and convenient for them. I do not know of anything that will do more in that direction than the building of good roads, giving them a good mail service and possibly a rural telephone. I wish that the Government could see its way clear to give twice the amount of money to the different provinces in order that these ends might be accomplished.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there is legislation promised to create a Department of Public Health. I do not think the Government, late as it is, could have found a more appropriate time than the present in which to introduce that Bill. As I have already stated, I believe you are going to have mlilions of people coming to this country before long, and they will bring with them many of the diseases of Europe. Those people will have to be very carefully scrutinized and examined, and therein lies great work for the new Department of Public Health. Then there is our infant mortality to be considered. More children have died from preventable causes during the last four years than there were casualties resulting from the war. Again there is the great tubercular problem, the great white plague, that scourge that is passing through this country claiming its victims by the thousands and tens of thousands. These are problems worthy of the consideration of the best minds and the best men that can be got for that position. I agree with the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) that in order to get the best results, the best medical minds that can be got in Canada must be placed in charge. I hope the Government will do that; it is not a department that can be run by laymen and run successfully. Furthermore, we have our great international waterways. We know how they are contaminated from time to time, and the plagues of typhoid and other diseases that spring from polluted sources of water supply. These are problems, affecting the health of the citizens of Canada, which the Department of Public Health, administered by the very best minds available, must deal with.

With respect to the admission of women to this House, it does seem to me that if the enormous amount of labour and suffering our women have gone through during the last four years, has fitted them for anything, it has certainly fitted them for admission to the legislative halls of the country.

In conclusion, I cordially agree with what my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) has said with respect to the real heroes of the great war and I hope that the people of this country will ever keep those heroes in mind, because forgetfulness is so easy once a service has been rendered.

The man who has lived for three or four years in the trenches in France and Flanders is entitled to our best consideration. He has gone over the top time after time into the very mouth of hell, and sixty thousand of them have laid down their lives on those blood-soaked fields. This country should remember with all reverence those gallant boys who saved the honour of this country, and who helped to maintain intact the integrity of the British Empire, and the civilization of the world.

On motion of Mr. Pedlow the Debate was adjourned.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Hon. Martin Burrell, the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m.

Tuesday, March 4, 1919.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Department of the Interior for the year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

First Annual Report of the Historical Documents Publication Board.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Final Report of the International Joint Commission on the delimitation of boundary waters.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Report of the Royal Commission appointed to inquire into and report upon

the conditions in the pilotage districts of Miramichi, Sydney, Louisburg, St. John, Halifax, Montreal, Quebec, Vancouver, Victoria, Nanaimo and New Westminster.—Mr. Rowell.

Return showing reduction in price and remission of interest under section 88 of the Indian Act, Chap. 81, R.S.C., 1906.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette, between 16th March, 1918, and the 20th January, 1919, in accordance with the provisions of Section 77, Chapter 20, 7-8 Edward VII, "The Dominion Lands Act."—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette between the 16th March, 1918 and the 20th January, 1919, in accordance with the provisions of Chapter 47, 2 George V, entitled "The Railway Belt Water Act."—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette and in the British Columbia Gazette, between 16th March, 1918, and the 20th January, 1919, in accordance with provisions of subsection (d) of Section 38 of the Regulations for the survey, administration, disposal and management of Dominion Lands within the 40-Mile Railway Belt in the province of British Columbia.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

All Orders in Council passed under the provisions of Chapter 18, 7-8 George V. An Act respecting a certain convention, &c. known as "The Migratory Birds Convention Act."—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette between the 16th March, 1918, and the 20th January, 1919, in accordance with the provisions of Section 19 of Chapter 10, 1-2 George V, "The Forest Reserves and Parks Act."—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Orders in Council which have been published in the Canada Gazette between the 5th April, 1918, and the 20th February, 1919, in accordance with the provisions of Section 8, subsection 2 of Chapter 21, 7-8 George V, "The Soldiers' Settlement Act."—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Annual Report of the Department of the Interior for year ended 30th March, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

RESIGNATION OF PARLIAMENTARY SECRETARY SOLDIERS' CIVIL RE-ESTABLISHMENT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I beg to lay on the table of the House copies of the correspondence relating to the resignation from office of the Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment asked for by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) yesterday.

ADJOURNMENT OVER ASH WEDNESDAY.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That when this House adjourns on Tuesday the 4th day of March instant, it do stand adjourned until Thursday the 6th day of March instant, at Three o'clock p.m.

He said: The occasion for this motion is the fact that to-morrow will be Ash Wednesday.

Mr. SPEAKER: This motion can only be passed by unanimous consent.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH. ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East), for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session resumed from Monday, March 3rd.

Mr. ISAAC PEDLOW (South Renfrew): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the discussion that is now before the House I might be permitted to pause for an instant to place on Hansard a verbal wreath from the electoral district of South Renfrew to the memory of our distinguished leader, the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whose empty chair is a daily reminder to the members of the House that this great, this grand old veteran statesman, is with us no more. His Canadianism was in a class altogether by itself. It was of the purest type, moulded on the world's best standards of patriotism. He ranked while living with the world's greatest statesmen and now that he is no longer with us in the flesh we unconsciously associate his name with those most prominent in world history—with Macdonald in our own land, with Gladstone and Disraeli, as well as with a host of other great and shining lights who have graced——

Mr. Pedlow's speech was interrupted by the entry to the Chamber of Col. C. W. Peck, V.C., D.S.O., member for Skeena, B.C., who had just returned from active service. The House paid a tribute to Col. Peck's distinguished war record by hon. members rising in their places and cheering as he took his seat.

Mr. PEDLOW (resuming): As a parenthesis in the remarks that I was proceeding to make when the distinguished officer,

the hon. member for Skeena, B.C., entered the Chamber, I pause to express our sense of the great honour that he has conferred not only on Canada but also on this House. He has, like many another soldier:

"Trod deadly road to deadly toil
Thickly strewn with dead,
Where noon-day sun and midnight oil
Light the soldiers' tread.

I am delighted to have the privilege of welcoming him to this House to-day, and I trust that his distinguished career will be continued, to the benefit of this country, for many years to come.

When the distinguished hon. member (Mr. Peck) entered the House, I was about to call attention to some of the qualities of our late lamented leader who has passed beyond that bourne from which no traveller returns, and I was associating his name with those of some of the men most prominent in the world's history—with Macdonald in our own land, with Gladstone, and Disraeli, as well as a host of other great and shining lights who have graced the brightest pages of history, in Great Britain and on the continent of Europe, as well as of Lincoln and others in the great nation to the south of us, all stars of the first magnitude, as Laurier undoubtedly was. The late Sir Wilfrid Laurier's wonderful and many outstanding graces endeared him to all who had the pleasure of coming into his presence. To know him intimately was to love and admire our old chief beyond my power to express in words. Alas! this striking, unique personality will grace these halls no more in the flesh, that great masterly intellect is stilled for all time to come, but the work he was permitted, during his fifty odd years of political activities to do for his own beloved country will live forever more as an everlasting monument to his life and memory:

Short days ago
He lived, felt dawn, saw sunsets glow,
Loved and was loved, but now he lies
In yonder fields.
To you from falling hands he threw
The Torch—be yours to hold it high.
If you break faith with him who died
He shall not sleep though roses grow
In yonder fields.

My next duty, Mr. Speaker, is to refer to the leader of our party who has been selected to occupy the place of our late lamented chief. While performing our duty to the memory of our late chief, we, on this side of the House at least, are not forgetful of our duty to his successor, and the loyalty we owe to him. It is with the very greatest of pleasure I assure him to-day publicly, as I have already assured him privately, of my loyalty in the very important position, both in the party and in the country, to which he has been elected, with so much unanimity by his fellow members in the House. His Majesty's loyal Opposition has at all times a very important part to play in the affairs of our nation—never greater than at the present moment, and the person filling the trying position of leader of the Opposition deserves, and will have, in order to induce good government, the united, wholehearted assistance of every one of his followers in this Parliament.

The entrance a moment ago to this deliberative assembly of the distinguished officer (Mr. Peck), to whom I made reference, reminds one forcibly of the fact that the war is over, and we thank God for it. After four long weary years of incessant appeal to the god of battles he has heard and answered our cry, and the prayer for peace is no longer heard in the land. In its place we have songs of praise out of grateful hearts, instead of the spirit of heaviness, for national salvation, and the greatest victory in freedom's cause ever fought and won, bringing in its train the dawn of a new era with such startling suddenness that we hardly knew how to give the thanks that we actually felt the occasion demanded of us. It is not with the slightest desire to dim the sword of Foch and his gallant fighting men, or to take from it the slightest touch of its power and glory, but I would say with him, and all the great commanders associated with him on both sea and land, in the words of Richelieu:

Let us own it; There is "one" above
Sways the harmonious mystery of the world
Even better than prime ministers.

Napoleon once claimed that the Lord was on the side of the cause with the greatest number of battalions, yet he, too, although almost a world conqueror, met his Waterloo. But with us the eternal question today is, how was the invader of Belgium held in check at Liège and in Northern France at Mons, and from Mons to the Marne, until the cause of right was able to secure the greater weight of arms and men? Was the ability to struggle on against tremendously overwhelming odds simply and solely based on the dogged human pluck of men, or was it not that there was something greater than mere material will power, something inspired? Was there not that something behind the arm speaking through the souls to the minds and muscles of the men? Kitchener's little army of

contemptibles, in order to stem the tide and onrush of the German hordes, fought every inch of the way from Mons to the Marne and buried themselves in everlasting glory by the thousand in France and Flanders' fields. And so, Mr. Speaker, let us to-day with a new vision repeat once more, and with an added meaning, the prayer of Kipling's Recessional:

Lord God of Hosts be with us yet,
Lest we forget, lest we forget.

Now, Mr. Speaker, turning more particularly to the matter that is immediately before us on this occasion, the speech from the Throne, I have much pleasure, in common with all who have preceded me on both sides of the House, in tendering my hearty congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address. The hon. member from Calgary East (Mr. Redman) certainly acquitted himself most excellently in the effort that he put forth on the occasion of his address, and as to the effort of the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion), nothing else was to be expected than the able and eloquent speech which we had the pleasure of listening to from him. I was rather interested though in some of the remarks of these hon. gentlemen, and I feel satisfied, notwithstanding the fact that they acquitted themselves well, that there was something held back, something that they did not care to lay before the House as coming from them, notwithstanding the fact that they claim to be the representatives of the returning men, and all honour to them because they themselves are returned men, but a fellow-feeling should make them wondrous kind. And for some unknown reason these hon. gentlemen seemed to hold back the information that they possessed, and failed to name the conditions that they wished to present to the House. For instance, the hon. member for Calgary East stated that the returned soldiers should not be hampered and irritated by red tape and unnecessary rules. That, Sir, indicated to my mind that the hon. gentleman from Calgary East knew more than he cared to put on the pages of Hansard. I have evidence here to prove that there is considerable red tape in connection with the return of our soldiers from overseas. There is much uneasiness in the minds of returned soldiers; they are not at all satisfied with their treatment on coming back to Canada, having in view the fact that before they left Canada for the front they were assured that nothing would be too good for them when they came back. We find that the conditions on some of the transports which brought soldiers home were not any too good. We find also that when the men return here they do not receive at the hands of the Government the consideration that they deserve. I have in mind one case of a young man who at the age of sixteen volunteered as of an older age to serve the British Empire in the South African war. Immediately on the outbreak of the war on August 4, 1914, that same boy, who was then an employee of the Government in Ottawa, volunteered for service overseas and spent three years of his life in the fighting line in France and Flanders. He returned to Canada and again took up a position in the department from which he had retired to go overseas. I would expect the member for Calgary East (Mr. Redman) and the member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) to champion the cause of such men, but they did not rise to the occasion, although I feel sure that they had the evidence at hand. After spending three years overseas on military service, this young man finds himself out-distanced and outclassed by men who failed to volunteer for service and who have been holding down positions in the Civil Service of Canada during the war. This returned soldier is in receipt of a salary of $1,500, while those who were his juniors when he left for overseas are receiving $1,900 and $2,000 for similar services. From the evidence which is placed in my hands from day to day, it seems to me that the returned soldier and the returning soldiers are not receiving at the hands of this Government the treatment that they were assured they would receive, not even the treatment that they deserve.

I have here a letter of another character. Two boys of the same family volunteered for military service immediately on the outbreak of war in 1914, and both are still overseas. In the early months of the fighting one of them was taken prisoner and was in captivity in Germany for over three years. When the armistice was signed he was a prisoner in Holland. On November 22 he was returned to England, and since that date he has been so moved about from pillar to post that he has become lost in the "machine" over there and we cannot find any trace of him. I will read a letter which he wrote to his mother, dated at London, February 3, in which he states:

I am back in London; it is not that I want to be here, but that I got frozen out of the camps. I have been down at Witley since December 5th, trying to get sent home, without any success. They sent us from Witley to Sea-

ford last week, and then sent us out on pass again. I was never so fed up in my life. We were sleeping on the floor, with only our blankets, and only enough coal to last for about two hours and the wind whistled through the cracks in the floor, and we got up in the morning as stiff as old men. Besides this, they took my pay book two months ago on December 5th and I had not the price to buy a cigarette or a piece of soap.

On that date this young man was promised that he would be returned to Canada by Christmas, and they took his pay book from him. Here is one of the men who volunteered early in the fighting and for whom we said that nothing was too good, with not a cent of money in his pocket during a period of two months. The letter goes on:

But I managed to get $5 when I came up here, and it took me two days hanging around the pay office to do that. I was more miserable for those three weeks than I ever was in Germany, as we expected that kind of treatment over there but thought we were coming to something better. But it is army system over again.

I direct the attention of the House to the position that this young man finds himself in. After he had succeeded in prying loose this five dollar bill from the Pay Office in London, he spent most of it in cabling his mother to send him fifty dollars to keep him going until the Pay Office or the machine in which he seemed to have got lost would get unscrambled again.

I have another letter which I am induced to read by reason of some of the remarks made by the member for Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon) last night. That hon. gentleman said that originality had gone from the soldiers. The following letter, which covers that point completely and proves conclusively that the very reverse is the case, is from a young man who has been in France for two years, and it is addressed to his mother. It reads, in part, as follows:

You will doubtless be wondering what I am thinking of doing on my return. It has given me a lot of thought, as it has all of us out here. This game has changed us—swung many of us so far out of the old channels that it will be impossible for many to return to former pursuits. By the time we return, most, if not all of the vacant places will be filled either by surplus men created by the closing of munitions factories, or by the latest crop of university and collegiate graduates, or by the returning conscripts. The employers of labour are essentially practical, and the resumption of normal business conditions cannot long hold vacancies in the name of patriotism. The war and the shouting is all over now, and so human nature turns to the urge of the dollar and the daily bread. It is well to recognize this fact. We, out here, are under no illusions about it and what it means to us. And it means this:

[Mr. Pedlow.]

The average employer (I say the average employer—there are worthy exceptions), does not fancy the returned man in his business. He may not admit it openly, he will be profuse in his plaudits of our war achievements, but he is human and demands instant efficiency or his business suffers in this competitive age, and the fighting returned man is going to have a hard struggle adapting himself. We out here recognize all this and make allowance for it in all our calculations. In short, we realize that the big employers, in any line, do not want men who have been spoiled by the war.

All any of us want is an opportunity, nothing more. We are not looking for anything soft or easy, but we do demand an opportunity, with as few handicaps as possible. It makes us smile sort of wearily to see the erroneous impressions formed in certain quarters, officially and otherwise of the returned man. We read long articles of what is being done for us in the way of receptions and training for civil life. You would think that we were either shell-shocked imbeciles or wild children who must be petted, amused, and sort of tolerated for a while—and then put to light work in a kind of kindergarten. Instead, we are alert, keen-minded human beings, somewhat battered and tired, but who are all set to "pitch in" and carry on where we left off.

This is a sentiment which, he assures me, prevails not only with this individual, but with all his associates.

When we heard the news that we might have to stay here for nearly another three months, everybody was in an ugly mood.

Another bit of complaint we have against the Canadian Government is the fact that throughout the war, either consciously or unconsciously, they have attempted or permitted to have Canada's fighting manhood dyed in Imperial tints, and our colour will not blend. We are proud of our distinctive Canadianism, of our acknowledged fighting record, of our independent action; and we will not be robbed of this —our birthright. We belong to the British Empire, but we are Canadians, free and independent, and we never did relish close contact with an out-of-date English Imperialism, convention and old army discipline. We realized the necessity for united effort and discipline in the operations of the war, and so submitted to it voluntarily, but there was no military necessity for such petty orders as trying to make us in the artillery take down our maple leaf collar badges and substitute grenades of Imperial design. It was such small things as this, too numerous to enumerate, that riled us. We even had difficulty in getting Canadian buttons for our tunics and had to wear the ugly Imperial design. You can see how passionately Canadian we were. The Australians and New Zealanders had distinctive uniforms; the Canadians had not. All through the war our wounded and sick rarely reached Canadian hospitals where they could hear the sweet sound of real Canada—a sure tonic for homesickness. No, it was to English hospitals that we were usually sent.

Premier Hughes spoke out in meeting several times for Australia when he thought the Imperial authorities were mishandling Australian affairs or interfering too much and General Smuts equally championed South Africa; and the reason, we all think, for Sir Robert Borden's advertised popularity in England is that he appeared to be more English than Can-

adian. He never protested; tamely took all that was handed out, and was a good little boy. The same with Perley, who made a fine pink-tea artist in the Empire's drawing room. Meanwhile the Canadian Corps gave to Canada first place in action.

And so on. I shall not read to the House any further extracts from this most excellent letter, but I read these to show that it is absolutely necessary that the special representatives of the War Veterans' Association should get busy on the job and try to induce those who are responsible for this condition of affairs to improve their methods. Is it any wonder, as admitted by the hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) the other evening, that there is a great deal of unrest amongst the soldiers in the West and elsewhere. The Government was supposed to have land and everything else ready for them on their return, but we find, from the reports that are handed out to us from day to day, that these soldiers are still waiting for the land that has yet to be procured for them.

I come now to another important subject, one that has received a great deal of attention at the hands of speakers on both sides of this House. I refer to the matter of "the latch string," which has been referred to by almost every speaker so far, and the setting surrounding it and the invitation extended by our esteemed leader on this side of the House. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) objected to the invitation being offered and to the setting surrounding that invitation. The light was, in his estimation, not strong enough, but he lost sight of the fact that we on this side of the House are modest people, and the setting was quite proper for the occasion. No doubt the leader of the Opposition staged the setting to suit the tune and the song:

> In the gloaming, oh, my darling,
> When the lights are dim and low,
> Will you think of me and love me,
> As you did once long ago?

The tune has apparently not appealed so far to members opposite. Possibly it was the scale of music to which it was set that failed to please, but I am assured that on another occasion, when our leader produces the same song, he will bring the bagpipes along, and then the music will have a sweeter, more appealing sound, because, you know, the music even of bagpipes has "charms to soothe the savage breast."

In this chamber, the other evening, the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) made a manly defence of his position, and I am still wondering how he can reconcile his position in this House with the position taken by him on that occasion. He claims that he is still a Liberal and he will not be driven out of the ranks of Liberalism. I do not know that any one on this side of the House has any desire to drive him out of the ranks of Liberalism. And how could we? He is not at the present time in the ranks of Liberalism. But, Sir,

> Maidens like moths are ever caught by glare,
> And Mammon wins its way where Seraphs might despair.

It is quite evident that there is, on the other side, something special to attract hon. members and to hold them there, notwithstanding their loud professions regarding Liberalism and Liberal principles. However,

> While the light hangs out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return.

There is in this House a former member of the Liberal party to whom a good deal of attention has been given during the debate. I refer to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). In a letter issued by him on October 18 last, and published in one of the newspapers in Halifax, on November 7 last, we find the hon. member making this statement, and with your permission, Sir, I will place this before the House also:—

> When the war and its immediate business are over, a new situation will arise. Then, I think, the Liberals may reasonably ask for a new deal, in which, in all probability a united party would place a Liberal Government in power at Ottawa.
>
> The record of the Conservative Party under the leadership of Sir Robert Borden remains, and a time will come when it can again be discussed with propriety. Some features of it have been too deeply impressed in the Liberal mind to be easily obliterated. The alliance with the Quebec Nationalists in 1910 and 1911, which was largely the foundation of the trouble that arose in that Province; the abandonment of the Laurier naval policy, which, if adhered to, would have given Canada war vessels to protect our ships and seamen from the depredations of German submarines; the election campaign of 1911; the fomenting of hostility to our neighbours, the people of the Great American Republic; the cry of "No truck or trade with the Yankees;" the misrepresentation and defeat of a fair Reciprocity agreement, a measure which was a realization of the desire of every Canadian Government, Liberal or Conservative, for more than half a century; the partisanship of the Conservative Government for three years of the war, culminating in the passing of the War-Times Election Act; these are things not likely to be forgotten—things which must yet be discussed before the bar of intelligent Canadian opinion, in the light of the abundant vindication of Liberal policy which time has brought.

Considering these views held by one of the leading statesmen in this House to-day, Hon. Mr. Fielding—I do not see how either he or other hon. members who left the Liberal party in the fall of 1917 can remain where they are any longer. While we are willing to concede the ability of these men to help the Union Government to carry on, we do not see any reason for their remaining where they are now when they can perform just as effective service with the assistance of their associates on this side of the House. We are working to-day under a new leader, and I should like just here to repeat that splendid congratulatory message telegraphed to him the other day:

> How sweet the name McKenzie sounds
> On every Liberal's ears.
> It soothes our sorrows, heals our wounds,
> And drives away our fears.

This Union Government is said to have been born in sin and shapen in iniquity, but my opinion is that it was born in a servile press propaganda and shapen in the city of Toronto for the express purpose of winning an election. As soon as it had succeeded in winning the election it proceeded to act as if it owned the country. It is now governing by Order in Council, and making partisan appointments, which latter were referred to at great length last night by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). The Government is guilty of extravagance without limit and there is chaos in every department of the service. Of this state of affairs the hon member for West Toronto is well aware. The Unionist party in my judgment is nothing more than "a thing of shreds and patches." We have the real Tories, we have Liberal-Conservatives, we have Unionist-Conservatives, and Unionist-Liberals; we have the Ginger Group, the Rogerites, the Rowellites, the Hughesites, and the followers of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark). But on this side of the House there is an absolutely united party. True, the membership is not so large as that of the party on the other side of the House, but good things are sometimes wrapped up in small parcels. We are here at all events, for better or worse, and there is a great work ahead to be done, and all too few men to do it. No time should be lost in "haggling" over trifles; there is no question of surrendering rights at all; it is simply a case of recognizing the task ahead and doing it with a will.

Let us try and eliminate the bitterness of party strife in this country. I think now is the time to bury the hatchet on many things that have torn the various sections of this country asunder in days gone by, and for that reason I notice with regret a resolution on the Order Paper by the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) which I am afraid will not have a tendency towards creating peace and harmony in this country. Confederation was only made possible in Canada by a give-and-take policy, but the resolution to which I have alluded contains a proposition that is bound to keep up the old race and creed trouble in this country throughout the years to come. I think it is time for us to bury the hatchet on matters of this kind. We are labouring for to-day, not for yesterday, and we are labouring for to-day so that to-morrow will be a better day. The resolution of the hon. member for Frontenac—

Mr. A. L. DAVIDSON: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a point of order. The hon. gentleman is, I submit, not in order in discussing the subject matter of a motion which is on the Order Paper, and which will be discussed at a later stage of the session.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I think my hon. friend has finished discussing that matter.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The point of order is well taken. The hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) is certainly anticipating the discussion of a motion which is on the Order Paper. A passing reference might be allowed, but I trust he will refrain from discussing this matter further.

Mr. PEDLOW: I bow to your ruling, Sir, but at some later date I shall certainly discuss this matter.

I should now like to place before the House the Liberal platform as enunciated at the Liberal convention held in the city of Ottawa on January 14th last. It includes: Fair treatment for returned soldiers; generous care of the dependents of the fallen; restoration of the British preference to its pre-war status; reciprocity in food stuffs; gradual progress towards freer trade; the democratization of labour; the abolition of government by Order in Council; the repeal of the War-time Elections Act and support for a league of nations.

The achievements of the Liberal party when in power from 1896 to 1911 will be within the memory of some of the members of this House. They were briefly as follows:

> In 1897 there were 48 articles added to the free list and duties were reduced on 147—including farm implements.

In 1904 there were 14 more articles added to the free list and duties were reduced on 14 others.

In 1907 the duty on harvesters, mowers, reapers, and self-binders and binding attachments were reduced from 20 per cent to 17½ per cent.

To Great Britain there was given a preference by way of deduction from the general tariff amounting to 33⅓ per cent.

With the United States an agreement was effected in 1910 whereby the minimum tariff under the Payne-Aldrich Bill was applied to Canada while the maximum tariff under the same Bill was applied to other countries by the United States.

In 1911 the Liberal Government of the day negotiated a Reciprocal Tariff Agreement with the Government of the United States, under which when effective certain natural products were to be admitted free into both countries, and the duties on a limited number of other articles were to be reduced.

On submitting its policy to the people, the Liberal Government was defeated and was replaced by a Conservative-Nationalist Administration under Sir Robert Borden.

After the Borden Administration attained office, the duties were increased on certain specified articles, and a further general increase of 7½ per cent was placed in the Tariff on all commodities coming into Canada from outside Great Britain, and an increase of 5 per cent was placed on the goods coming in from Great Britain.

Besides opposing the said Tariff increases of 7½ per cent and 5 per cent respectively, the Liberal Opposition on different occasions since 1911, and more particularly on January 28th, 1914; on February 10th, 1914; on March 11th, 1914; on April 23rd, 1914; on April 28th, 1914; on March 16th, 1915, and on February 23rd, 1916, moved in the House of Commons for reductions in the tariff on specified articles, and on each of the occasions mentioned their motions were defeated by the majority supporting Sir Robert Borden.

On May 23rd, 1917, the Liberal Opposition in the House of Commons moved an omnibus resolution embodying practically all the proposals for tariff reduction previously made by them in Parliament and defeated as in the next preceding paragraph mentioned.

The said omnibus resolution of May 23rd, 1917, was also opposed and defeated by the Borden Administration.

The election manifesto issued in November, 1917 by Sir Wilfrid Laurier as the Leader of the Liberal Party, contained a declaration as Tariff Reform in these words:—

"In further mitigation of disadvantages to Agricultural production, I would immediately remove the duties on Agricultural Implements and other essentials, as demanded by the western farmers. A general well-considered reform of the Tariff for the purpose of helping Canadian production and relieving the Canadian consumer would also be an object of my administration."

Therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this Association, not only should the said Tariff increases of 7 1-2 p.c. and 5 p.c. be immediately repealed, but that there should also be an immediate downward revision of the Tariff in accordance with the above mentioned omnibus resolution moved by the Liberal Opposition in the House of Commons on May 23rd, 1917, in these terms:—

"1. That wheat, wheat flour, and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list.

"2. That farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repairs for same, rough and partly dressed lumber, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers be added to the free list.

"3. That staple foods and food products (other than wheat flour), domestic animals and foods therefor be admitted into Canada free of duty when coming from and being the product of any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty.

"4. That substantial reductions be made in the general Tariff on all articles imported into Canada, excepting luxuries.

"5. That the British Preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff."

That is the platform on which the Liberal party stands four square at the present time. I make mention of it in order to show that it is in line with the demand of the community in general and especially of that portion of the community but feebly represented in this House at the present time—I refer to the united farmers of this country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, having dealt at so great length with many questions, let me deal as briefly as possible with another matter, one with which I am more familiar, perhaps, than with any other subject in the list; I refer to the matter of finance. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), on Wednesday evening last, sang a most doleful dirge over our federal finances, or at least his words certainly were not such as to make one very enthusiastic over the situation. He led us through an intricate maze of figures on into the slough of despond and left us there, without indicating how we were to make our way out—he left us to work out our own salvation in fear and trembling. His main query on the subject of Dominion finance was not exactly that made famous at one time in Ontario provincial politics, "Where "did" the money come from?"—but his query was: "Where "will" the money come from?" The position in which he landed this House on this question was enough to make pessimists of us all. To use an illustration that has been made famous, the hon. gentleman considered the doughnut and saw nothing but the hole—not a glimpse did he catch of the ring around the hole. He told us, among other things, that the public debt of this country in 1914 was $336,000,000, whereas it is now about $2,000,000,000. Five years ago our interest charge on public debt was about $10,000,000 or $12,000,000, but now that charge has increased to the enormous sum of $110,000,000. This charge upon our resources, he tells us, will remain, if not forever, at least during our lifetime. Turning to the other side of the ledger he pointed out that our customs receipts would amount to $140,000,000; ex-

cise $25,000,000; income and business profits tax $30,000,000, a total of $195,000,000. I have already said that he estimated our interest charge at $110,000,000 then there would be pensions, which we must go on paying for the next fifty years, amounting to about $50,000,000 a year, besides which there will be large expenditures in connection with Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment. In all, the uncontrollable expenditure he estimates at $185,000,000. This leaves a balance of only $10,000,000 to provide for all the other expenses in connection with the public service, the maintenance of the civil departments, the administration of railways, militia, navy and public works. These will entail an expenditure of $125,000,000. That is to say our annual expenditure will amount to $310,000,000 with a revenue of only $195,000,000 to place against it. In the Toronto Globe of

4 p.m. September 10, last, I find a statement, said to be given with the authority of the Minister of Finance. It showed that additional military expenditure would be required, as follows:

November 30, 1918, to March 31, 1919	$222,000,000
War outlay after March 31, 1919	300,000,000
Total	$522,000,000

This is in addition to the sums that are mentioned by the Minister of Public Works, and obviously will have to be met with borrowed money. A friend beside me suggests that this is an expenditure on public works. I take it to be for the return of soldiers from overseas and their maintenance in the meantime.

We still have to face the question of where the $125,000,000 a year is to come from to carry on the Government and maintain the public service. My answer is: from direct taxation. Professor O. D. Skelton of Queen's University has issued a bulletin on the subject of Canadian Federal Finance which gives some illuminating figures on the incidence of taxation in Canada, Great Britain, and the United States: In Canada, in the five-year period 1913-18, of a total revenue of $721,300,000, the amount collected through the income tax was only $37,000,000, leaving $684,300,000 to be paid by the consumer. That is to say the consumer paid 96 per cent of the revenue collected in this country, while only 4 per cent was collected from the income tax and property owners. In Great Britain during the same period, the total collections amounted to $1,771,000,000, of which $1,216,000,000 was collected from the income tax and property owners, while only $555,000,000 was collected from consumers—37·6 per cent from the consumers and 62·4 per cent from the income taxes and property owners. In the United States for the three years 1916-19, the total sum collected was $13,199,000,000, of which 44·8 per cent was collected from consumers and 55·2 per cent from income tax and property owners. Contrast the 4 per cent collected from income tax in Canada with the 62·4 per cent in Great Britain and 55·2 per cent in the United States. Actually less was collected from 45,000,000 people in England than was collected through the customs from 8,000,000 in Canada.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I would like to call attention to the fact that in Canada during 1916-17 there was practically nothing collected from income taxation, whereas in 1917-18, the last current year of which we have a record, eleven per cent only of the revenue was derived from income tax. In Great Britain we find a different story. In 1914-15 they collected 48 per cent of the entire revenue from the income tax, whereas during the last year 81 per cent was collected from the income tax. They collected all but 19 per cent of the expenditure of the Government from the income tax. In Canada the Government has considered it advisable to put the major portion of the burden on the consumer, while the capitalist, the wealthy man and the manufacturer goes practically scot-free. The hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) on Wednesday evening last informed us—and no doubt he knew whereof he spoke—that hundreds of firms had grown rich in Canada carrying on war business. My conclusion from that, and in view of the statistics to which I have called your attention, is that the Government has not been collecting the proportion of the revenue it should have collected from these industries and the capitalists. They have gone scot-free, while the poor labourer and the artisan have been paying the heavy end of the shot all the time.

True, Canada is not bankrupt, but if we continue spending at the rate of $125,000,000 a year more than our revenue, or, as stated, if we continue from year to year spending borrowed money that must be paid, principal and interest, some time, where is the money to come from? We have been told that the Government can reach a satisfactory conclusion on this question. Mr. Speaker, I am reminded forcibly in this connection of Wilkins Macawber's phil-

osophy of economics, and in order that the House may appreciate its exact significance on this occasion I would ask to be permitted to read this extract from David Copperfield:

"My other piece of advice, Copperfield," said Macawber, "you know—Annual income, £20; annual expenditure, £19.0.6d.—result happiness; annual income, £20; annual expenditure, £20.0.6d; result misery. The blossom is blighted, the leaf is withered, the god of day goes down upon the dreary scene; in short, you are floored forever."

I would like to call the attention of the House to another feature of this subject and the methods that have obtained so far in connection with the revenue. In the past three years the surtax has taken $110,000,000 out of the pockets of the Canadian consumers. Yes, more, because the consumer has to pay ordinary profit on this part of the original cost of the merchandise, which would mean an additional 25 or 30 per cent, and which, added to the above, would amount to a total of about $137,500,000, equal to $17.20 per capita of the population of Canada. The surtax, I understand, is not wanted by the manufacturers because it increases the cost of their raw material. I read recently a statement by a manufacturer in which he said that the surtax was put on not because it was wanted by the manufacturers but in spite of them. If that is the case, I am at a loss to understand their position in regard to it at the present time. They are up in arms against any suggestion made either by the Government, or by the members on this side of the House, regarding any interference with that tax. If you will read the resolution passed by the Liberal Association on January 14 last you will see that it is the policy of the Liberal party to demand the immediate withdrawal of the surtax. We would also go further and reinstate the preferential clause as relating to imports from Great Britain. We would also favour a general revision of the tariff on many of the articles that are imported. For instance, my contention is that the tariff as it at present stands bears more heavily on the workmen and the consumer than it does on the wealthy people. Take the question of diamonds. They are imported free into this country. The only duty that has to be paid on them is the five per cent war tax. It is undoubtedly the privilege of wealthy people to wear silk. Silks are admitted into this country at a duty of 20 per cent, under the special French treaty tariff, whereas woollen goods coming from Great Britain pay a duty of 42½ per cent. There again we have a tax in favour of the wealthy as against the poorer people who have to buy the less expensive materials. The same criticism applies to furs and other articles of luxury.

I understand that the Grain Growers' Association are up in arms against the tariff situation and the manner in which tariffs are made in this country. Here is an article from the Grain Growers' Guide of February 19th, 1919. I received this extract only this morning from a friend in one of the western provinces, and it reads:

Inside Information.

Tariff-making at Ottawa, in the past, has been a secret proceeding. The manufacturers have consulted with the Government in advance and have arranged what the tariff will be, and the public has known nothing about it until the finance minister makes his budget speech. Apparently, the same process is being continued. In the Montreal Gazette, of January 30th, appears the announcement: "There will be no general revision of the Tariff at the next Session of Parliament, for the sufficient reason that time does not permit." In the Financial Post, of Toronto, January 18th, appears the following: "The Government is disposed to let the Tariff alone during the coming session. This is the advice of the Financial Post's, Ottawa representative, upon a matter which is to-day very important in the commercial and industrial situation." These announcements by two of the journalistic apostles of high protection are significant. They indicate that the protected manufacturers are on the job and are getting the Government properly licked into shape to do their bidding. However, both these journals admit that the war tax of seven-and-a-half per cent and five per cent may be withdrawn if, as the Post says "The low Tariff element which is dominated by Western Canada sentiment can make a strong enough case." This is the crux of the whole situation. The Tariff will come down only when the people in sufficient numbers rise up and demand it.

I fancy we will see another procession to the city of Ottawa like the one last spring when the farmers of Canada invaded the city as well as the precincts of this House. They demanded admission here but were refused.

One would think from the attention paid to the subject that the manufacturers were the only class in this country entitled to special consideration—the privileged class, if you please. But I would like to call your attention to another class hammering at the doors of this House, and, according to the facts I am about to quote, are fully justified in demanding to be heard, and heard right away—I refer to those engaged in agriculture. Taking up Sessional Paper No. 10, page 16, 1918, I find that exports of agricultural products of this country, consisting of grain, cereals, animals and their products, in the five-year period 1914-

18, amounted to $2,054,915,245, and that manufacturers' exports, which included war material, during the same five-year period, amounted to only $1,499,020,143, showing a difference in favour of agriculture of $555,-895,102, and proves conclusively that the agricultural community is the bone and sinew of this country, the foundation stone on which this country must build its future.

I find, also, from the Official Record—and, by the way, this is a paper that was established by Order in Council during the past year, I do not know for what purpose, the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and myself hunted the library and reading room of this building a few days ago without succeeding in finding a copy of that publication; it was supposed to be established for the purpose of informing the public generally, but there was not a copy of it in either place mentioned, at least not then. However, I succeeded in obtaining a copy eventually, and from that publication I have taken these figures: Table I, National Wealth of Canada, $19,002,788,125. Of this total $5,216,117,000 is derived from agriculture, or over twenty-five per cent. I commend this fact to the notice of the House to establish further my contention that the agricultural section of our community is the foundation rock on which we must build the future progress of this country. We cannot, we must not, depend entirely on manufacturing concerns for our progress in the days to come, because these industries do not produce quite fifty per cent of as much of the wealth of the country as does the agricultural class. Now, the manufacturers claim that it is impossible to continue in business in this country and succeed, unless they are doing business behind the high tariff wall. If you continue building up this tariff wall you certainly will protect the manufacturers, but at the same time you shut off the Customs revenue of the country. But let me give a case in point to explain my contention that it is not absolutely necessary that the manufacturers should receive the attention and consideration they demand. I have in mind an institution organized in the town of Renfrew for the manufacture of cream separators in the year 1910. I might just state that cream separators were placed on the free list in 1897. There were none made in Canada prior to 1897. A few only were assembled prior to that year, but not made in this country. The concern I refer to was established in 1900, that is the Renfrew Machinery Company. It has gone on successfully doing business in this country until its output covered the market from end to end of this Dominion. Not only that, Sir, but it has entered the United States, and is competing successfully for business with the best producers of cream separators in the United States and in the markets of the world.

There is another matter I would like to call attention to while I am on this subject, and that is the duty levied on motor cars. A car costing $500 in the United States, costs, laid down here $712.50. A car costing $1,000 in the United States, costs laid down here $1,421. A car costing $1,500 in the United States, costs laid down here $2,137.50. To the Canadian price must be added a duty of thirty-five per cent, plus seven and a half per cent, or forty-two and a half per cent in all.

Now, Sir, if you want to make the farmers satisfied with their lot in life, if you want to improve their surroundings, one of the best methods would be to supply them with motor cars at the lowest possible price. If you continue to collect the revenue that I have referred to on these necessary items for their service and use then, Sir, you will delay and retard the farmers in their operations and make them dissatisfied with their surroundings and life. Now what are we to have in Canada? Are we to have stable industries based on sound business principles, or are we to continue the maintenance of industries that require twenty-five, thirty-five or forty-two and a half per cent protection for ever more? I claim, Sir, that the time has arrived—nay, it is past due—for a revision of the tariff, and that it is not in the best interest of Canada that this House should pass over that important subject to a more convenient season. The country is up in arms against delay in the matter.

The Minister of Immigration the other night seemed to think that there was no need for alarm, but he certainly has not been studying the press of the country, especially the western press, or he would have a different opinion. I have heard of alarming conditions obtaining in the Western Provinces, on this subject—tariff reform—and I have read of extensive demands being made on representatives from western constituencies who are members of the Union Government. Such being the case I think the Government should address itself to the subject of tariff revision at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. Speaker I have transgressed at great length upon your patience, and the patience of the House, and I now beg to thank you for your kindness and your attention.

Lieut.-General Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I desire to congratulate the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) on succeeding to the seat so ably and so long occupied by the distinguished and worthy statesman who has recently departed this life. I think possibly the leader of the Opposition will be frank to admit that in years gone by your humble servant contributed a good deal towards placing him in the position he now occupies. We used to have great delight in the olden days in annoying the hon. member, getting him to display his talents and his ability, and in that way he became skilled and polished and has risen to the high position which he now holds. May we promise him that we will endeavour to test his temper occasionally again? I am sure that discharging the high and distinguished duties which he is now called upon to discharge, he will not hesitate to respond as he used to in the olden days.

The mover and seconder of the Address have distinguished themselves, not only on the floor of the House but elsewhere. The mover of the Address (Mr. Redman) in his dogged, determined, fearless manner, gives the key to why the Canadian position stood at St. Julien, and held back twenty times their number of the enemy. He was one of the lads who won distinction there. He got knocked to pieces a bit, but he is still able to hold his seat in Parliament and to do nearly as well as those of the community who did not go to the front. As for the eloquent seconder of the Address, (Mr. Manion) I was thinking while he was speaking, Sir, that if he had not kissed the blarney stone himself, he had either followed in the footsteps of some person who had, or had been conveniently near to some pretty girl who had performed this picturesque feat.

His address was a model in many ways. But, Sir, lest the public should think that these are the only two members of the House who have been to the front, permit me to draw your attention to the fact that a distinguished soldier has taken his seat in the House to-day. I refer to Colonel Cyrus W. Peck, the member for Skeena, who has won the Distinguished Service Order, with a bar, and also the Victoria Cross, the coveted highest honour of the Empire.

I wish to take the liberty of giving the names of other distinguished soldiers who occupy seats in this House, as well as of members of the House who are the fathers of distinguished soldiers. The list which I am about to furnish may not be complete, and I shall be very glad to receive any additions that may be offered. I trust that there will be no opposition to adding to the Hansard record any odd name that may be left out, because I think it is important that the complete list should go down on the record.

First, I find the name of a gallant lad who went over to the front, young Andrews, of Winnipeg. His father is Major George William Andrews, member for Winnipeg Centre. I remember one morning in the year 1915 when I was passing down the trenches—the German trenches were about 80 yards away—I came across the familiar face of my dear old friend Andrews. He had a rifle over his arm and he looked just as he used to look in the old days at the Dominion of Canada Rifle matches when he and thousands of other Canadian boys learned the art of rifle shooting, which they so aptly applied on the Germans when it came to facing them at the front. I asked Major Andrews what he was doing and he said that he was instructing snipers. As I passed, however, one fellow whispered to me saying that Andrews himself had "picked out" five that morning. I think that five a day was about Andrews' average. Father and son did their duty at the front fearlessly and well.

Then, there is the name of Colonel James Arthurs, of Parry Sound, whose son also was at the front. Colonel Arthurs went over in command of his battalion, reverted, went to the front and fought in the trenches in a subordinate position.

Colonel C. C. Ballantyne, a member of the Government, took his battalion over and did his duty fearlessly and well.

Another name on the list is that of Willis Keith Baldwin, member for Stanstead.

Robert James Ball, of Grey, has a son at the front.

I need not say that Hon. Dr. Beland spent long, weary months in prison in Germany. Two others, step-sons, fought in the Belgian service.

Dr. Matthew Robert Blake, of Winnipeg North, was in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, but he did not get across, through no fault of his; the fault was mine.

A case of distinguished service comes next. Mr. Ferris Bolton, member for Lisgar, had three sons who went overseas, and all three are to-day buried in Belgium.

Dr. Samuel Bonnell, of Kootenay, served at the front. Dr. John Wesley Brien, of South Essex, who had the distinguished honour of being born in the riding which I represent, also served faithfully and well at the front.

Our good friend, Mr. John Hampden Burnham, of West Peterborough, threw off his mufti, donned the uniform, took his training and went over to the front and did fearlessly and well his duty as he was called upon to do it.

Colonel Chabot was also in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, but owing to the condition of his health I did not feel that I should let him go to the front.

Dr. Michael Clark, of Red Deer, sent three sons to the front, one of whom fell. One of those boys went away with the Princess Pats. When I was over there in 1915, I called the regiment out and inspected it. I asked how many of the original regiment were there, and I found that there were only nineteen. Talking to the boys, one after the other, of the original Pats, I came across a lad by the name of Clark. I looked at him and knew in a moment that he came from Red Deer. I asked him what he was doing there, and he said that they were going over the top every time they were called on. The Officer Commanding told me that Clark was the only man in the entire battalion who had never missed once going over the top—a chip off the old block.

Hon. Frank Cochrane had two sons at the front, one of whom has since died.

Mr. William Foster Cockshutt of Brantford had three sons at the front. I think that two were wounded, and I believe that one of them was wounded twice.

Major Richard Clive Cooper, member for Vancouver South, served at the front and was severely wounded.

Mr. Walter Davy Cowan, of Regina, has a son at the front, and was himself on duty with the Canadian Expeditionary Force at Regina.

Major Hume Cronyn, of London, had two sons at the front.

Hon. Thomas Wilson Crothers had one son at the front.

Robert Cruise of Dauphin, has two sons at the front, one of whom, I believe, has fallen.

Colonel John A. Currie, member for North Simcoe, served at the front with distinction at the Battle of St. Julien. I want to point again that the name of Colonel John A. Currie has been confounded with that of another, and deeds have been attributed to him that have not been creditable and that have absolutely no connection whatever with Colonel John A. Currie.

Mr. Arthur L. Desaulniers, member for Champlain, has a son at the front.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Mr. James McCrie Douglas, of Strathcona, served with the Canadian Expeditionary Force. He did not get to the front, but that was not his fault.

Dr. J. W. Edwards, member for Frontenac, has a son at the front.

Hon. W. S. Fielding has one son, a very gallant young lad, who served at the front from the beginning.

Colonel Evan E. Fraser himself served at the front and also two of his sons.

Mr. Charles Arthur Gauvreau, member for Témiscouata, sent two sons to the front, one of whom is second in command of a torpedo boat destroyer and has been in active service for four years. He has been captured by a black-eyed Irish girl, but in spite of all drawbacks he has done magnificent service.

The daughter of Mr. Samuel Francis Glass is at the front as a nurse.

Mr. Robert Francis Green, of Kootenay, has a son at the front.

Mr. William A. Griesbach, member for Edmonton West, is a Brigadier-General. He went over in command of the 49th Battalion and has done splendid service. I regret that he is ill in hospital in England, and was not able to come home recently, as expected.

Hon. Hugh Guthrie has two sons at the front.

Mr. John Harold, member for Brant, has two sons at the front.

Mr. William B. R. Hepburn, familiarly known as "Barney," member for Prince Edward, went to the front and has been one of the surprises of the war. He has proved a most efficient officer, and has done his duty on every occasion to the entire satisfaction of all concerned. He has risen to the rank of Brigadier-General.

Mr. H. C. Hocken, of Toronto West, had one son at the front who fell at the battle of Cambrai.

In my own case, I traversed the entire front from the North sea to Verdun in 1915 and 1916, and the only son I have served at the front four years.

Mr. Norman Lang, member for Humboldt, commanded a battalion, went over, reverted, and did splendid service in the trenches.

Mr. Auguste Theophile Leger, member for Kent, N.B., has two sons at the front.

Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, had only one son. I remember the young lad very well when he was too young to go in for training. He got his training, however, went to the front, and fell. There is a little hard-

ship in connection with his service. He was in an attack and his company came out with very few remaining. His officer commanding told him that he would receive the coveted Military Cross. The next day when the remnant of the battalion were coming out and he was informed that his tour of duty was ended, he persisted in going in again because they were short of officers, and he fell.

Mr. Samuel Charters, of Peel, sent two sons to the front.

Colonel H. B. Tremain served himself and sent one son to the front.

Mr. William Stewart Loggie, member for Northumberland, N.B., is not a very warlike gentleman, but I can say I was never more proud of any man than I was of Mr. Loggie in the beginning of the war. Two of his sons and others of his family were only too anxious to serve and did serve at the front.

Colonel Herbert J. Mackie, member for North Renfrew, was not at the front fighting, but he was in military service testing Russian shells, and he did yeoman service during the war. I am particularly interested in this young man, because I had the honour of having him as a comrade during the South African compaign, when we rode many hundreds of miles together across the veldt. If he has any bad habits, I claim the credit for them.

Mr. Francis M. McCrea, member for Sherbrooke, had, I understand, two sons at the front.

Major Peter McGibbon, member for Muskoka, who delighted the House last night with his address, went overseas and joined the Berkshire regiment in England. In one of the earlier engagements, when they were shot to pieces, there was only one officer of the battalion left, and the little, nervous chap that we saw last night, when he came to face the Germans, did not hesitate to take charge of the battalion, and they drove the Germans completely out of the trenches.

Mr. Alexander McGregor, member for Pictou, has one son at the front.

Mr. D. D. McKenzie, leader of the Opposition, has a son at the front.

General Hugh Havelock McLean, member for Royal, was most anxious to go to the front, offering his services in every capacity; but he had at the front two, if not three sons, besides a brother. One son is a member of the English House of Commons now, having fought through the war and been wounded, and he has proved himself a splendid soldier. Nothing is too good for that branch of the McLeans.

Colonel Harry Fulton McLeod, member for York-Sunbury, took his battalion over and did splendid service at the front.

Dr. Molloy, member for Provencher, lost a brother in battle.

Captain Robert J. Manion, member for Fort William and Rainy River, the gentleman who so ably seconded the Address, served with distinction at the front in both British and Canadian services, and has now returned none the worse for wear as we can all see. He has, if he remains in parliamentary life, a great future ahead of him.

I might mention that I am taking only this year's list. I might have referred to members of the last Parliament who fell for example, Colonel Harry Baker, whom all hon. members knew well and who distinguished himself in the affair at Zillibeke in June, 1916, where he fell with a great many of his men, having conducted himself as a true British soldier.

Mr. Joseph Edmond Marcile, member for Bagot, has two sons at the front.

Mr. J. A. Maharg et Moosejaw has a son at the front.

Thomas McNutt himself an old veteran, has a son at the front.

Major-General, the Hon. Sydney Mewburn, Minister of Militia, lost his son doing his duty gallantly and well at the front.

Mr. H. B. Morphy, member for North Perth, had two sons at the front, one of whom made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. Donald Nicholson, member for Queens, P.E.I., has one son and two daughters, nurses, at the front.

Mr. George B. Nicholson, member for East Algoma, who delighted the House yesterday with his charming address, lost his only son at the front just a day or two before the fighting was over.

Mr. William Folger Nickle, member for Kingston, might be expected, if he had a boy, to have him at the front. You could bet your bottom sixpence that Billy Nickle's boy would be at the front, and he had two sons there. One was wounded three times and the other once.

Colonel Cyrus Wesley Peck, member for Skeena, the worthy member who has just taken his seat to-day, was twice wounded at the front. He has won the Victoria Cross and the Distinguished Service Order with bar.

Mr. Edward Guss Porter, member for West Hastings, lost his only son, his only child, at the front.

Mr. Charles Gavan Power, member for South Quebec, not only was at the front himself and fought well with a good Toronto regiment—and he has had a liking for On-

tario boys ever since that—and he had two, if not three of his brothers also fighting.

Major Daniel Lee Redman, member for East Calgary, who moved the Address, fought and fell at the battle of St. Julien and has risen again.

Mr. John Flaws Reid, member for Mackenzie, had one son in the overseas service

Mr. James Alexander Robb, member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon, Chief Whip of the Opposition, had at the front a young lad whom he raised.

Dr. Charles Sheard, member for South Toronto, tops the list with four sons, three of them overseas and one in the home service, all in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

Mr. William Smith, member for South Ontario, was too old to go to the front himself—he wanted to go, but I would not let him—but his son, a gallant young lad, did his duty fearlessly and well.

Mr. Edgar Keith Spinney, member for Yarmouth and Clare, has one son in the overseas service.

Mr. Frank Stacey, member for Westminster district, had at the front three sons, one of whom has made the supreme sacrifice.

Mr. Donald Sutherland, member for South Oxford, had one son at the front who served in France and Flanders, and later in Egypt and Mesopotamia. His son has done yeoman service in the Flying Corps as well as in the Engineers.

Mr. Alfred Thompson, member for the Yukon, served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force although he did not go overseas.

Mr. Levi Thomson, member for Qu'Appelle, has one son at the front.

Mr. Simon Fraser Tolmie, member for Victoria city, has one son in the flying corps but he unfortunately contracted serious illness and was unable to take part in the fighting.

Our good friend, Mr. O. Turgeon, member for Gloucester, N.B., has a son at the front.

Major Thomas Vien, member for Lotbinière, lost his brother who was killed at the front.

Major Thomas Wallace, member for West York, had three brothers at the front.

Dr. Howard Primrose Whidden, member for Brandon, had his son at the front doing his duty fearlessly and well.

I think I drew attention to the son of the Hon. Rodolphe Lemieux, did I not?

Some Hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: This is the list as far as I have been able to get it, and I think it is proper that it should be placed on record. If there are any omissions, they are unintentional, and I am sure the House will permit me, if necessary, to amend it at any future time. I am very pleased to correct some omissions already.

Mr. E. W. Nesbitt, member for North Oxford, has his son at the front.

I am also told that Mr. W. D. Euler, member for North Waterloo, has a son at the front. I do not know whether Mr. Euler has German blood in his veins, but I am prepared to pay the very highest tribute to Canadians of German origin who went over with the first contingent and who fought as fearlessly and well as any of our men for Canada.

To these let me add the name of Col. Sam. Sharpe, who commanded the 116th Battalion at the front and rendered gallant service.

I had the honour, the same as many others, of being elected a member of this Parliament at the last general election. Long before Union Government was ever heard of, long before there was an election, I was pledged to do my duty as in me lay for the upbuilding of the cause of human liberty and the over-throwing of autocracy in Germany, Austria or any other part of the world where it might raise its hydra head.

Mr. JACOBS: The hon. gentleman has overlooked the Postmaster General (Mr. Blondin).

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am dealing only with the Commons. I would be delighted to add his name. We have from the Cabinet the distinguished names of General Mewburn and Mr. Ballantyne, both of whom I regard as my boys. I am sorry, however, that the Cabinet is not better represented, however few of the ministers have sons of military age to send.

I was elected a member of Parliament to help win the war, and I pledged myself on the platform as well as in this House to support this Government or any other Government in power, in every effort that might be made towards the successful prosecution of the war. In the session previous to the last general election, the Military Service Act was passed. I did not publicly criticise the Act, but I did speak to the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and other members of the Cabinet about it. I pointed out the rocks that were ahead of them. That man certainly had very little political sagacity who did not see in the Military Service Act a first-class opportunity

for every man who wanted to stay at home to do so. That is what I pointed out to the Minister of Justice at the time, and I have never seen any reason to change my opinion of that Act since. I repeat, I was elected to support every measure for winning the war. I shall not here discuss whether the Government since the election has taken the action it should have taken towards winning the war, but I shall simply point out that I am not satisfied that they have done their best.

There are various forms of government, but to my mind there is only one form that should be encouraged in any country, and that is responsible government—government by the people, through the people, for the people. Under this form of government the leader of the party winning the election is chosen Prime Minister and selects his Cabinet, not from those pledged to oppose him, but from among those who travel along the same political lines as himself, and he stands or falls by his responsibility. In 1878 we had a Union Government in this country. It was not a machine-made affair, but went to the polls as a Union Government. The platforms of the opposing parties were laid before the people, and the Government of Sir John A. Macdonald was returned to power with a following thirty-five per cent of which was composed of former Liberals. That was a constitutional coalition. It was not a coalition of labels, but a coalition of ideas. In 1896 the Liberal party was returned to power by a large majority and twenty-five per cent of its following was composed of men from the Tory party, a great many of them being Orange-Tories who had been humbugged on the Manitoba school question. But whatever may have been the cause of that union, it was a legitimate coalition on constitutional lines. Then, in 1911, it is claimed there was a coalition between the Liberal-Conservative party and certain gentlemen in the province of Quebec who did not label themselves Liberal-Conservatives, to defeat the Liberal party in that election.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh!

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am narrating history, not talking politics, although I am ready at any time to show that almost any coalition would be justified in uniting to defeat the Liberal party in the province of Quebec. The Nationalists in the election of 1911 simply took the speeches delivered by the old-time Liberals in days gone by, adapted them to suit the times, and used them against the Liberals.

Mr. MURPHY: Plus the money for circulating Le Devoir.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I understood that was my hon. friend's organ.

Mr. TOBIN: The hon. member for St. Antoine (Sir Herbert Ames) will tell you about that.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I shall deal with the coalition of 1917 at another time. There is no doubt whatever that in 1917 the great bulk of the Liberal party in many of the provinces would have cast in their lot with the great Liberal-Conservative party coalition or no coalition. I believe that every one of the former Liberal members of this House who have joined us on this side would have supported in any case the great Liberal-Conservative party at the last election. There would have been a natural coalition, instead of this patent machine-made affairs of Sir Joseph Flavelle, of the city of Toronto.

I have observed all the Orders in Council passed by the Government under the War Measures Act and I have yet to see any necessity why the Government should have clothed themselves with these powers, except to guard themselves from the members of the House of Commons and from the people at large. I have yet to see any solitary Order in Council passed under the War Measures Act which has advanced the interests of the country in the slightest degree; I have said that before, and I now go further. I have yet to see where the Food Control Board was of any use to Canada, instead of being, as it was, a confounded nuisance to all the country. I have yet to see what good the Fuel Controller has done, except to add from two to five dollars per ton to the cost of coal. I have yet to see the necessity for any of these repressive commissions that have been set up under the War Measures Act. They were not necessary in the administration of the affairs of this country and have done no good. I have not yet seen any justification for departing from the usual form of responsible government in war time. Any argument that can be used in support of all this repressive work in war time, to my mind, can be used with double force in peace time, and if we are going to have autocracy in time of war, let us have it in time of peace, too, and send for the Kaiser to run the country. I challenge any man in the Dominion of Canada to show me the necessity for one solitary act done under the War Measures Act.

There are a great many people who go around saying "I am not a politician. I take no stock in politics," and so on. I have never seen such a man who did not require careful watching. I can well remember the time when Sir Joseph Flavelle, the owner of this Government, delighted in pointing out that men in politics were quite unworthy of recognition, that one engaged in politics was to be loathed, or at least avoided, side-stepped. I have been a careful student of human nature all my life, and I say that I have never seen one of these gentlemen, whether preacher or citizen—well, I will not say preacher—who was not worth watching with both eyes open.

I am delighted to see such an independent House. There is a spirit of independence on this side, and I believe on the other side as well. I do not think for a moment that the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) can lead that array of talent, beauty and ability just in the way he chooses or just in the way that a caucus may decide. He will find a spirit of independence abroad in his following such as he has never found on that side before. And I know that I can speak for the leader of the Government when I say that the Government realize that they will have their hands full if they try to cajole, butter down, or side-track the gentlemen on this side of the House who have just causes of complaint to bring forward. This is not going to be the old-time patronage game. Those in authority are going to move, or the boys will know the reason why. I happened to be looking over an old magazine the other night and came across a picture of sturdy, staunch old John Bull, typical of British manhood. There was no camouflage about old John Bull, no particular attempt at courtesy, no preaching of "moderation" and all that sort of thing. Unfortunately the attempt is made to set up another type in place of the staunch old man, something of the Oscar Wilde type, the smooth, oily, pussy-footing type of statesman. But, thank God, the war has driven him out and re-established plain, staunch John Bull as typical of British manhood. And Canada has been represented by the type of Jack Canuck, a stalwart young fellow—hat on, sleeves rolled up, collar open. I hope there will be no attempt made to replace him with the frock-coated, silk-hatted Jack Canuck as there seems to be some reason to dread in connection with Canadian public life today. I recall very clearly an expression I heard years ago. A gentleman called at our home, and when he had gone, my mother said, "Watch him; he is too smooth to be wholesome." Now, I do

5 p.m.

not want any of the present Cabinet to take that to themselves—not necessarily. Of course, if the cap fits any of them they can put it on. I see two or three of them blushing. My good friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) is partly hidden behind the Minister of Militia (Major General Mewburn), but I can see the mantling blush steal over his features; while the acting leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) is bland as ever, but his cheeks show slightly heightening colour. I do not wish these gentlemen to think that I mean them; but, as I say, if they think the cap fits them, they can put it on.

Now, let us pass along. The acting leader of the Government commends moderation. I am delighted at his change of manner. In 1914 I had the honour, as Minister of Militia to be raising the forces, at a time when consternation bordering almost on paralysis pervaded the land. A government and people inexperienced in the art of war were brought face to face with the gigantic struggle of the ages. There was wide-spread lack of confidence on the part of the people in their own powers. And let me say, Sir, that that was one of the great things I had to do—to get our boys to feel that they could measure up with these machine-trained Germans. I knew what our boys could do. I had marched for years beside the Germans in manoeuvres, and had studied them; and I felt that, old and awkward as I was, I could handle any dozen of them. And I knew what our stalwart young fellows at home, the free-born sons of Canada, could do, even though they lacked training. I knew that they could do just what they have done—trim the Germans to a finish every time they got the opportunity. That is the great thing I found necessary—to work up the confidence of the people in their own power to fight. You all remember that. There was dread of the very name of German—like the dread inspired in France in the old days by the name of "Malbrouk." The clank of the German sword sent a shiver through our people. But, thank God, there were hundreds of thousands of our boys for whom the clank and jangle of the German sword was a challenge that roused them to instant action.

There was prejudice, and envy, and jealously, on the part of one or two of my colleagues and of some others. There were some few attempts at favouritism. There

was criticism and fault finding galore, but in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred when traced up it was found to come from interested sources. Then I had to contend with the general reverence for the British model. I had the honour of telling one of the most distinguished soldiers in the British army—and communicated the information to the Prime Minister of Canada (Sir Robert Borden) a few minutes afterwards—that the halo had gone off the British officer as a model many a long day ago, so far as I was concerned, and that the boys from Canada were going to be trained and managed according to modern ideas—my ideas. Then there was the other tradition that we must have men three years in training before they would be of any use in fighting. It was the old question: Regular versus irregular. But I realized what the French citizens had done in the revolution, when they defeated on many a hard-fought field the best professional soldiers of Europe—machine trained soldiers. I had been an athlete and on many occasions I had met with my companions trained professional athletes, and I never knew an occasion when our amateurs could not work them off their feet without much trouble. I felt that the same could be carried out in war. It was carried out in South Africa, and I took part in it. And in this war it has been carried out by soldiers not only from Canada but from New Zealand, from Australia, from South Africa, from Britain—these irregulars are able to hold their heads high in the company of the best British regulars. I do not wish to say a word to depreciate the British soldiers, the regulars. For next to the second battle of Ypres, which we call the battle of St. Julien, where our boys won a victory never to be forgotten, the first battle at that point, where Rawlinson's splendid corps held the position with only one man to the yard against twenty-five Germans to the yard and succeeded in defeating their foe, stands out in history as one of the great battles of ages.

Then, I had to maintain Canada's rights. Nearly every one thought our soldiers were merely British regulars. I had to fight that out single-handed. I am sorry to say, for the Canadian High Commissioner seemed to consider it his duty to thwart every move I made for the advancement of that cause. We had bad financial conditions in Canada—but of these I do not speak now. At that time, I regret to say, certain distinguished members of the Government were not moderate in their views or in their actions. Why, I have had ministers of the Crown bombard me on behalf of different interests and in order to keep this business, that business and the other business from failing, from going to pieces, I was asked to buy a few hundred yards of cloth here, and a few hundred there. The Dominion of Canada was down to such a state in financial matters that we had to practically dole the contracts out, to give some business here, some there, and some elsewhere and this became a very serious drawback. But this matter will come up at some future time and I shall not go into details farther than to say that in 1914 the German propaganda was being put forward, peace was being talked all over the country and all of these matters were being raised in order to stop action on the part of the Government.

I found myself from the outset handicapped by the attacks of certain newspapers, the Montreal Daily Mail and Evening News, the Toronto Telegram, and another serious infamy was the course pursued by the London correspondent of the Toronto Telegram.. I was persistently maligned without the facts of the case being given and this course was pursued to the detriment of the Canadian service. The same gentleman who edited the Montreal Daily Mail and Evening News has been promoted and is now, I understand, head of the Canadian Official Record, I presume, as a reward for the attacks which he so persistently made upon me in the columns of the Daily Mail and Evening News. He has the honour of being a brother of the Minister of Finance.

I was in Toronto one evening away back in 1916 and I found that a number of the leading citizens—of course they were Tories—had been meeting at the hotel. They had been at the meeting, and they said there was a discussion as to the candidate in a certain division in Toronto and that some politicians not of their number would have to go to Ottawa to get a man with a special brand of politics to run in the constituency. There was a certain distinguished statesman whom it was desirable that they should get. But no one could be found to endorse the proposition. I was amazed. Next day I had the honour of speaking at the Empire Club. My staff officer, Col. Williams, came to me and said: There is some mistake about this because the distinguished statesman who was being reported last night as being unable to get a nomination in Toronto is in everybody's mouth here today as the man who should succeed Sir Robert Borden. They say that the Prime

Minister is a fishworm,—no backbone, not a strong enough man,—and that he must make way for this great statesman. I said: "That is very strange." I could not understand it. But I asked who was So-and-so, and I found that there were eight canvassers in the audience representing the various insurance companies, financial organizations and other business interests carried on under the auspices of Sir Joseph Flavelle who were busy passing through that audience, canvassing as far as they could against Sir Robert Borden as Prime Minister and demanding that he make way for another man. That opened my eyes.

I remember the conspiracy of 1915 to get rid of dear old General Bertram and Colonel David Carnegie, to whom the British Government and humanity owe much, who did such splendid work in connection with the production of munitions in this country. I remember that in 1915, in every restaurant, in every smoking compartment in a car, wherever one went, all over Canada, there was an agent of one kind or another, and when we came to trace that up we found that in ninety-nine cases out of a hundred they were agents of this organization to which I am referring and they were canvassing against General Bertram and demanding that the Shell Committee should be reorganized. I remember that as part of the conspiracy.

Sir Joseph Flavelle became head of the Munitions Board, this work having been transferred from the War Department in England to the Munitions Department. Then, following that, we find a certain distinguished citizen obtaining large contracts both in Canada and the United States for the supply of meats and meat products. We have had some evidence in Canada about meat profits, but we have only touched the fringe of it yet, and we have not got anything about what was going on in the United States. I am informed on very reliable authority that upwards of $5,000,000 monthly was handed over in the last three or four years in the United States under contracts with the British Government and other governments to this gentleman, apparently by reason of the position which he held as head of the Munitions Board, which gave him the prestige that enabled him to get all these things into his own hands, little by little, until the whole affair was brought in as an appendage to the business interests run by this Toronto organization. Its estimated profits will be upwards of $100,000,000 in the last four years on these commodities alone.

Then, having obtained control of the Munitions Board and having obtained large contracts, these gentlemen turned their attention to politics. Their political ambitions were as yet unsatisfied. I remember one Sunday morning entering a hotel and seeing seated at a table Sir Joseph Flavelle who had always tabooed politics, Mr. A. E. Ames of Toronto, who had never been a party man of any great standing, Mr. Rundle—I am not saying a word against these gentlemen; they are all very good fellows in their own way—Mr. Rundle of the National Trust, who succeeded the hon. the Finance Minister, Mr. Gundy, a nice little fellow who has evidently an eye to business whether it be in connection with the handling of munition contracts or the Victory Loan, at least these are the names given me—I found these gentlemen and some others seated at a table. Probably Sir Joseph had obtained a respite from Gabriel during this short time on Sunday morning to talk matters over with these gentlemen. I do not know whether they had any other unction or not. But at all events it would not make any difference whether they had or not.

These gentlemen then proceeded to carry on their work of saving Canada. They went to the residence of Sir Wilfrid Laurier by arrangement at 12 o'clock and I understand that the luncheon was very fine. They stayed there until four and they tried to induce this worthy old statesman to join in a Union Government with them. They were going to be content with Sir Wilfrid Laurier remaining Prime Minister for six or nine months, or a year, then he was to make way and was to be succeeded by one of their friends not a thousand miles away from the seat occupied by the Finance Minister to-day. The wily old statesman sent them away and they returned to the hotel to consult some of the lesser lights of the Liberal party. An arrangement was made, I understand, that a meeting of the warriors of the Liberal party should be held the next afternoon. The Premier of Quebec happened in and I do not know whether it was a patriotic reason or not that brought the hon. gentleman who is now the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) but he also blew into the city on that day. I do not know whether he figured as the second lieutenant or as the first lieutenant. I could not say what part he played, but he was in town. Nothing came of it. At all events the result was that the

wily old statesman declined to have anything to do with it.

Let me recall the circumstances to you. Let me recall to your minds what had happened. There was a speech made in Ottawa some time before that in which the statement was made by Sir Joseph Flavelle that whatever government was formed the French element must be dominant in it, must have a voice in it—in fact, all the peculiar elements in Canada must be represented in that great Cabinet. The following Monday, I understand, there was to be a speech delivered in Toronto by the hon. the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White). It had been placarded, and thousands—some say tens of thousands—of cards of invitation had been sent out by friends in the city of Toronto to come and hear this address, that there was to be a very important message delivered. But the awful correspondent of the Toronto Globe in Ottawa happened to send a despatch that night showing what the game was—that Borden was to be thrown out, or disposed of in some way. He and Bennett were away on a junketing trip in the West at this time, but Borden was to be thrown out, and the mantle was to fall on the shoulders of the young gallant and handsome Finance Minister. Whatever happened, the important message was never delivered. A wet blanket fell on the meeting, and it was said that it was one of the deadest shows that ever took place in the city of Toronto, excepting the meeting addressed by the Prime Minister and Mr. Bennett later on, the following month, when they had to hustle down three battalions of soldiers from the Fort in order to make an audience at all for them. Well, Sir, a change of scene occurred a little later, when, failing to wheedle Sir Wilfrid Laurier into the leadership of this new party, they turned around and the cry became very vociferous to condemn Quebec. She must be ostracised, and all the enemies of Canada and of the Empire must be disfranchised in the coming election.

We were asked sometimes by people in our ridings what this Government had done. Well, to make as nice a story as I could, I always told them: "They have appointed, the Knights of Columbus have appointed, somebody to some job in the riding, and things are going on very nicely; I am relieved of patronage, and I have no more to say in matters of government, but they are getting on very nicely." One of the questioners came to me one night, and said: "They are adopting high-handed methods by the suppression of free speech, they are shutting out all criticism. Knowing a young gentleman who was to speak in the city of Winnipeg, but was held up as if he had been worse than a German, I can speak in the interests of Canada. They are trying to build up an oligarchy in Canada, and the Government is being run by orders in council." He said further: "The Acting Prime Minister may as well take a packet of poker chips in his pocket and let the rest of you all go home."

Now let me deal with certain measures that have been enacted. The Dominion Registration Act, one of the most infamous laws ever enforced, has been borne by the people with more than patience. In other words, we are in thorough training for Kaiserism. The Military Service Act, and the Registration Act, I shall not discuss here, nor the provost marshal and military police work. All this, and the detective work in connection with this class of thing, is contrary to the dictates and wishes of a free people. The press, by means of sweetening, and also by censors, has been worked with conspicuous zeal. In the shape of sweetening we find that $50,000 was given the Canadian press for wiring intelligence from coast to coast, although I do not object to that at all. But there was the fixing of the price of news print at $50 a ton on November 19, 1918. That was extended to January 14, until after the elections had taken place, when the price was placed at $69. Then there is the cost of advertising the Victory Loan, and the advertising connected with registration and repatriation. The Government has been very good in buying 250,000 copies of The Veteran, the organ of the veterans, to send to the boys. Again there is the cost connected with maintaining the Director of Public Information and the Canadian Official Record to be added to the expenditures which I have enumerated—in other words, the sweetening of the press. That is very nice and I suppose the press is supposed to be paid for all this propaganda and camouflage work, and so on, of the various ministers. Let me refer in this connection to certain very interesting procedure which took place. It seems that one of the ministers was getting too much prominence on the front page of this Canadian Official Record every week. A solemn protest was accordingly entered on behalf of the other ministers by a certain gentleman, and it seems to have been heeded, because if you look at the Canadian Official Record now you will see that formerly the Minister of Finance was given front page recognition for weeks

in succession, and it was too much for the other ministers. Now one week attention is paid to the Acting Minister of Justice and the Minister of the Interior. Another week it is the President of the Privy Council, and so on. They are distributing the moneys, these gentlemen who are running neck and neck, for publication purposes, and that gets them notoriety before the public. If you watch it, you will see the official organ going out along these lines regularly now. I do not know whether it does any good or not, but that is neither here nor there.

Now, Sir, the Dominion of Canada trained an army of free men. That army has distinguished itself, and it needs no commendation here or elsewhere. I challenge the world to show where any soldiers in the world have conducted themselves better as soldiers than the men who composed this army. They spent months and months training in Canada, they went to the front absolutely under control, absolutely well trained, absolutely the best shots that could be found, and in no solitary instance, barring one or two affairs of liquor, has there been a solitary case that would be worthy of police court record in the whole Dominion of Canada. The force sent overseas by Canada is something that any country might be proud of. I therefore feel more or less out of touch with the ordinary feeling that is expressed in this House and the country about these soldiers, as to what we must do for them when they return, and how we must coddle them up. I do not think, Sir, that that is the right attitude to take at all. What should be done I will deal with in a few minutes when I come to the question of demobilization and re-establishment. What I want to point out is this: I recommended, while in office, to the British Government and to the Canadian authorities, certain suggestions with regard to the composition of our forces. After building up one division, we had two divisions formed. After creating two divisions, we had four divisions formed, and that made a corps. I wanted to have three divisions in a corps, and three brigades in a division, with an extra battalion in each brigade, besides the divisional corps. The plan was adopted in Germany, it was adopted by the British, but it was not adopted by the Canadians at the front. The obstacles to the adoption of that policy I shall not discuss here further than to say that the two Ministers of Militia—the gentleman here and the gentleman in London—ran foul of each other.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

There was no co-ordination between the two departments, there was no co-ordination between the Militia Department in the Old Country and the High Commissioner's Office—one seemed to be thwarting the other. They tried to thwart them then as they tried to thwart matters in my time. There was a vendetta practically between the boys in England and the boys at the front, there was Government favouritism, and interference, and unworthy ambition on each side of the Atlantic. This handicapped the thousands and thousands of gallant fellows who were anxious to do their duty. However, this little intrigue went on until 1919. My information, which has been borne out by every man who has returned from the front, was such that I wrote to Sir Robert Borden on January 14, 1918, as follows:

Ottawa, Ontario, January 14, 1918.

Dear Sir Robert,—There are a number of important matters—now that the elections are over—which I think should be laid before you for consideration and action, and it has occurred to me that it would be advisable to talk these matters over first before they would be placed in concrete form in detail, or brought up in the House.

They concern such matters as,

1—Six divisions and two corps instead of four divisions and one corps.

2. Little intrigue regarding the supplanting of Haig by Byng, and the action of certain Canadians therein.

3. Appointment of senior officers.

4. Potent influences affecting senior promotions and appointments in the Canadian army.

5. Lens, and somewhat similar massacres—and the object in each.

6. Condition of AFFAIRS IN BRITAIN, and the causes thereof.

Will you please address your reply to Lindsay as I am leaving for home to-night.

Faithfully,

(Signed) SAM HUGHES.

The Right Honourable,
Sir Robert L. Borden, G.C.M.G.,
Prime Minister of Canada, Ottawa.

In reply he told me that he hoped to meet me towards the end of the month, and I came back on three different occasions. On two of them I could not see him; the third time he was away. Following that came the great disaster at St. Quentin. On March 25, 1918, the Prime Minister said in the House of Commons—page 116 of Hansard—after reading the reports from the front:

So far as one can judge, the Germans are undoubtedly throwing absolutely their full force into this attack. It seems to have been met with great success as was anticipated from the first. It is beyond question that very much depends

upon the issue; and I know the heart of the people of the whole country will be lifted up in intercession that the right may prevail.

I then said:

Intercession is very proper, but with the view in a slight degree possibly of helping on the cause I desire to ask the Prime Minister the following questions:

1. Inasmuch as Canadians are engaged in the titanic struggle now going on for the preservation of human liberty, is the Government taking necessary steps to maintain to the highest degree the pride, the courage, the resolution, the steadfastness and the confidence of the splendid and gallant soldiers of Canada, as well as of the Empire at large in this struggle?

2. Have the Government taken precautions in the management of the forces, the appointment and the promotion of officers therein and the granting of honour, awards and decorations thereto, that favour from female society, creed or other undue influences, shall not prevail, but that all shall be awarded on the one basis of merit and fitness alone?

3. Does the Government purpose doing anything to prevent panicky and sensational despatches which merely cause nervous excitement among soldiers and population in Canada and overseas, from being issued by a few mentally epileptic newspaper reporters from overseas?

4. Has the Government any explanation of why the allied forces, splendidly armed and equipped, and in chosen positions of their own, made up of the best men in the world, and numbering from seven to ten men per yard of front—

It is estimated that I was considerably under the proper number. (Reading):

—recently gave way before an enemy not their equal in manhood nor superior in armament, even though they numbered thirty men to a yard of front in attack?

Then came the secret session. Without divulging anything that happened at that marvellous, blue-ruin session, I may point out that my attitude was this: Although we occupied the lowlands, there was nothing to prevent our defeating the enemy with the greatest of ease provided we had the heart, the resolution, the courage, and the organization. We had better men, we had better armament, and our cause was just. I pointed out on that occasion what Rawlinson had done and what the Canadians had done at St. Julien, and contended that with the necessary degree of resolution restored to the British forces, before many months they would be doing exactly what they did do—driving the Germans back over the same ground from which our forces had retired a few days previously.

A short time after this the Prime Minister suggested that I talk over with him some of the matters that I had referred to. I pointed out, however, that the blow which I had sought to avert had fallen, and that it was therefore useless to discuss the matter. On the last day of the session the Prime Minister sent for me and asked me to communicate to him any suggestions that I had to make as he was leaving for England. I pointed out to him that I was not any longer his adviser, and he repeated the question, but I declined to comply with his suggestion. I gave as my reason the fact that the gentlemen with whom he was associated in the Old Country would undo whatever he might of himself be willing to do; that the officer in command of the Canadian forces in the field and the Canadian High Commissioner, who has exercised a malign influence on the Prime Minister ever since the formation of this Government, and others in the old land would exercise this malign influence over him and that it would be useless for me to do what he suggested. He then asked me to give him the names of any Canadian officers whom he might consult. I asked him what his object was; whether it was to have certain gentlemen still further hunted, driven from the forces and ruined, as had happened to every man who was known to be a friend of mine in connection with the service. So I declined. I did speak to the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder) who, I was confident, would keep his mouth shut unless it was advisable to give out the facts. I did give him a few pointers, but I did not feel that I was called upon to give them anywhere else. Every pointer that I gave turned out to be absolutely correct.

However, on February 25, 1919, Sir Thomas White said—p. 33 of Hansard:

It will be an eternal source of pride to the people of this country that the first troops to enter Cambrai, which was the great bastion of German defence on the West, wore the uniform of Canada. It will also be a source of noble pride to the people of this country that on the last day of the war Canadian troops entered Mons, from which the British forces at the beginning of the war had been driven by overwhelming enemy forces.

Well, Sir, from the outset of this war I am on record as standing for the saving of the lives of our boys unless it was absolutely necessary that they should be sacrificed. This wasting of gallant lives went so far that on one occasion I notified the British Government through Field-Marshal Sir John French that this petty nibbling, these foolish attacks—"stunts," they called them—should cease, and that if these movements were to be carried on, the Canadian forces would lose hundreds of men with no possible advantage as a result. They fought the battle of St. Julien without having gone through any of these stunts for training purposes, and they had smashed the German forces to a finish.

They did not need those stunts, the killing off of our boys and the wounding of them day after day for no useful purpose. I told them that if this thing continued I would send them Texas steers instead of soldiers. The Texas steers would afford the German machine gunners practically as much amusement as our poor boys would, and an odd steer might get through the wire entanglements and gore the enemy, while our boys never could get through. But they stopped it. I also demanded that our boys be taken out of the Ypres salient. At this suggestion there was a good deal of sneering and much criticism came from various sources, but the British Government were only too glad to straighten the salient out and adopt the line that I had laid down with Kitchener in 1915.

Now, about Cambrai. I know Cambrai well. General Mewburn has seen Cambrai, and I venture to say that he would not waste the life of a Canadian soldier under his command in attacking that town. I would not, anyway. It is a dirty, little, one-horse town, with narrow streets, an ideal spot for machine gun positions and booby traps. Why any man of common sense would send soldiers in there, unless it were for his own glorification, I cannot comprehend.

Our men were driven back on the 29th and 30th of September, 1918, and the next morning I wrote to Sir Robert Borden, thinking that we might be in time to save some of the lads, though, of course, they were nearly all wiped out that day. Officers who went in with a thousand men came out with 44, 50 and 60. Sons of members of this House went in to this attack and never returned—all through bull-headed stupidity. I wrote to the Prime Minister on October 1 as follows:

Dear Sir Robert,—

Once more I desire to draw your attention to the useless massacre of our Canadian boys, as has needlessly occurred at Cambrai. Mark you, I am not one who thinks wars can be won without the loss of human life, but General Foch has shown the world, what I have always claimed, that mind conquers matter.

I have on other occasions, drawn your attention to the massacres at Lens, Passchendaele, etc., where the only apparent object was to glorify the General in command, and make it impossible, through butchery, to have a Fifth and Sixth Division and two Army Corps.

In the present case, however, around Cambrai, it seems simply a case of "bull-head" and sending up our gallant lads against positions swarming with machine guns, and without our boys being properly supported by tanks, or guns, to destroy these machine gun positions. You may remember I have suggested repeatedly, this sort of thing—guns to destroy machine gun positions—since the outset of the war.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

I have no details other than general and special reports, but I know the locality thoroughly and any General who would undertake to attack Cambrai by suburb or street fighting, should be tried by court-martial. The only way is to "go around the darned thing," as the American attache said to General Buller at Colenzo.

I think the time has arrived when you should assert yourself along positive lines, demand the removal of incompetents and have this needless slaughter—for I can call it nothing else—of our Canadian lads stopped.

You should secure returns of the losses by brigade and battalions during each year or tenure of command, and what each brigade accomplished, and it will be found that, in many instances, the brigades and battalions that have accomplished the most, have suffered the least.

Bull-head and incompetency are traceable by the horrible casualities rolling up into eight and ten times the total force of a battalion or a brigade.

Any ass can sit back and simply order battalion after battalion to go forward to certain death.

General Foch does not want that sort of thing, neither do the people of Canada.

I might point out in this connection that just after the taking of Cambrai, an officer was ordered with his battalion to take a certain village and the country surrounding it. When he went forward, he found himself up against machine guns by the hundreds. He realized that the casualties were very heavy during the first few minutes he tried to advance, so he drew back his men, sent half of his battalion under cover of the contour of the ground right up the valley, until they came suddenly on the men holding the cross-fire, and before the Germans knew it, he had half of his battalion behind their line. It was a case of "hands up," and the Germans surrendered instantly. He lost only two men and had a couple or so wounded. Yet he was brought up and reprimanded by one of the staff officers for not dashing forward as he was commanded, although had he done so, he would not have had a man left.

I might cite another instance of an officer who was ordered to advance where he had three-quarters of a mile of flat, marshy ground to cross, with a muddy little river with "back" water running through the middle of it. He saw his opportunity; he used his brains, and in place of marching his men three-quarters of a mile across the plain, subject all the way to the artillery and machine gun-fire of the enemy, he brought his men behind a bend in the river put them in the river and marched them more than three-quarters of a mile under cover of the bank until he got them under the ridge of the hill and out of the line of fire of the Germans. In

short, he was within fifty yards of the German guns before the Germans knew he was there. He accomplished his task, and yet he was brought up two days later and reprimanded for not having crossed the plain and flats and having himself and his men, perhaps, all shot to pieces. This is the sort of thing that is breaking the hearts of the boys, and thousands of them who are coming back are corroborating these facts.

I do not know what Sir Robert Borden did with my letter. He was out of the city up the Ottawa valley somewhere when I mailed it to him, and I mailed him a copy. I also sent copies to General Haig, General Foch and Mr. Lloyd George. They must have learned what had happened as well as I did; at all events General Foch would know it, and after Cambrai, two weeks later, the cities and towns, such as Valenciennes and others, were passed by and the booby traps were left to be disposed of in other ways.

I have just this to say about Mons. Were I in authority, the officer who, four hours before the Armistice was signed, although he had been notified beforehand that the Armistice was to begin at eleven o'clock, ordered the attack on Mons thus needlessly sacrificing the lives of Canadian soldiers, would be tried summarily by court martial and punished so far as the law would allow. There was no glory to be gained, and you cannot find one Canadian soldier returning from France who will not curse the name of the officer who ordered the attack on Mons. What was in it? They did not take the town, which was only a little one-horse town anyway. It had no strategic value, and the attack was only a bit of bravado as the Canadians had already passed it. What should have been done was to go around these places and take the Germans prisoners, and then make the Germans go in and remove the booby traps instead of having our boys blown up in hundreds as they were in Cambrai.

I have matters of this kind by the ton, but I will not detain the House now with them.

I must hurry on. The question of demobilization and repatriation has been taken up in the House. In the four years prior to the war, Canada absorbed and assimilated, without a ripple, through one little immigration office in Ottawa, 1,462,631 immigrants as follows:

1911	311,084
1912	354,237
1913	402,432
1914	384,878
	1,452,631

I think I know the Canadian soldiers and I think they know me as well as any man in Canada, and I want to tell this House and the country that if they are let alone, 99 per cent of the returning soldiers will demobilize themselves, but they must be given an opportunity and people should not run around and coddle them up and give them pink teas here and there and something else there. Let the Government get a move on and create opportunities for these soldiers. That is the way to absorb men into civilian life. That is the way in which immigrants should be absorbed. Create the opportunities; let the situation hunt the man rather than the man hunt the situation. The boys who are injured, those whose health has been broken, who are maimed, are the wards of the Government and the Government must act promptly in regard to them. Let me say in all kindness, because I do not want to be offensive to this Government: I have been silent here for two long years; I will give the Government every opportunity; but I can assure them that in many of these little matters concerning the soldier they must get an active move on in a very short time or the people of this country will make inquiries and take action to see that the Government attend to this work. There is no object in camouflaging and humbugging the people with propaganda and all that sort of thing. The duty of this Government to the soldier has not been done, or the complaints that have been made here would not have been heard of. I am not blaming this end of the show so much as I do the other end, although there are certain things here that should have been attended to in the interests of the soldier. How many survey parties has the Government in readiness to send out in the spring to survey the great Northwest? Why should there not be a thousand aeroplane parties scouring our great Canadian Northwest and the northeastern part of Canada during the coming year? Why not send all these parties out this summer?

I might as well give a little detail of some of my ideas in regard to demobilization. Why not create opportunities for labour of every description in the country? So far as aliens are concerned, I would punish every one, Allied or enemy, found guilty of treason or who helped the enemy. I would let employers give to the returned soldiers the good places now held by alien enemies and slackers. I would also let the Dominion Government, as a large employer of labour, take the lead in this matter, and not, as is

charged, fill these places up with slackers. I saw by the papers the other night that that was being done in Ottawa. I am not blaming the Government, as this may be due to some sub-agent or heeler, but the Government must assume the responsibility. I have no use for Civil Service Commissions for the purpose of filling jobs. I have every faith in the Civil Service Commission for the duty for which it was constituted. But, in years of service in this House, I stand now next to my good old friend the hon. member for Grenville (Hon. J. D. Reid), I have never dodged my responsibility. I have always held that the member or the defeated candidate should be responsible for the patronage of his riding, because some one must be the responsible head in every riding to look after the patronage. I have never evaded my responsibility, and in my county I have never made an appointment with which any fault was found. Under this Government, we cannot assume the responsibility and this dodging, pussyfooting and side-stepping must cease. This is a democratic Government, a responsible Government; and as a member for a constituency, occupying a seat in this House, I shall insist on the responsibility being exercised by some one other than irregular organizations such as the Knights of Columbus and associations of that kind in the riding that I have the honour to represent.

Mr. TOBIN: The hon. member may leave the Knights of Columbus alone.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Oh, no, I treat all just as they come. In regard to demobilization, the first thing is to get population. I like to look back on the development of the Great Northwest. I see gentlemen occupying seats in this House who will remember the days long ago when one would travel hundreds of miles throughout the Northwest without coming across a house. In 1895 I had the honour of drawing Sir Clifford Sifton's attention to the fact that those places were fit for settlement. Sir Clifford Sifton pushed the roads through, and great credit is due to him for developing that part of Canada. He may not have done it to suit everybody, but he has done it well. The men from the Northwest have been a credit to the British Empire and a credit to Canada.

First of all, get population; get people with money. Develop the country. Build railways and get people to settle on the land and produce, and then you will have banks and churches and schools and lawyers' offices and every other kind of activity. There are hon. members of this House from the Northwest who remember when they went in there ten or fifteen years ago the country was unsettled; but to-day it is all settled, and thirty years from now the portions of the great Northwest that are unsettled to-day will be dotted with cities and towns that are now never dreamt of. I would build railways to new sections opening up. I would give the people drainage facilities. The hon. member for Regina (Mr. Cowan) said the other evening that upwards of a million people could be settled in a certain district out west if they had proper railway facilities. I would build wagon roads alongside new railways. I would also build river bridges. I would build coal roads from the Rocky Mountains to the city of Winnipeg, and on to Ontario, Quebec and from Nova Scotia. I would use four roads for this purpose from the Rocky Mountains to Winnipeg so that every section could be served, and I would have the tracks so arranged and the cars so constructed that one engine could haul as big a trainload as the ordinary steamer. I would develop the fish industry, by providing trawlers, ocean cold storage for fish, refrigerator cars, cold storage houses, and utilize fish offal. The fish industry has great possibilities. I would also develop our timber, both hard and soft, and develop water-powers. I would have central municipal coal yards with control over distribution and prices. I would develop the minerals from the Mackenzie river to Ungava, and would have harbours on the new coast. I would build a railway to the Klondyke, and buy a sea coast strip from the United States. I would have a study made of the chemistry of natural and other products. I would settle the soldiers on the land as far as possible, and afterwards sell land to settlers other than soldiers. We shall need millions of men, instead of a few hundred thousand. These soldiers returning to Canada will not be content with second-rate Civil Service jobs. It has been my privilege to look in the faces of thousands of our boys. I saw in Detroit not long ago a man with a cork leg walk five miles without a whimper. These men do not want coddling. They will tell you themselves " For God's sake, get them to let up on this coddling business. What we want is an opportunity to earn a living. Give us that opportunity, and we will not pester you for elevator and post office jobs." Give the boys a chance to open up new country, and you gentlemen sitting around me who went to the Northwest ten or fifteen years ago not so wealthy as you are to-day will find your success duplicated by our

soldier boys in the years to come. The soldiers are the best men we can get. Physically, some of the poor fellows are not what they should be, but mentally they are better than they ever were. They are more stern, more serious than they were. The war has added twenty years to their lives. As an illustration, I would point to the Mowat family. Sir Oliver Mowat's father was an old soldier. Sir David MacPherson was also an old soldier. In fact, the ancestors of most of the big men of a decade ago were old soldiers who had had stern training and brought discipline and seriousness into their home life. This same serious spirit will be carried into the homes of our soldiers. An odd soldier here and there will go wrong, but so does an odd preacher; but why blame the soldier any more than any one else? Why cannot a soldier have a good time once in a while if he wants it? I am not here to defend that sort of thing, but humanity is the same the world over. But that is no reason for coddling the soldier. Give the boys a chance. They have conducted themselves nobly as soldiers, and before they went overseas and will do so in the future. I do not share the fears of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), who the other evening seemed to apprehend some sort of danger from these returned soldiers. I have not yet found one of them who was not a law-abiding and thoroughly good citizen. I know that there has been trouble in Toronto over aliens, and in my riding also, where some aliens have as much as six or seven thousand dollars in the bank and a big roll in their pockets. When our boys come home, practically incapacitated many of them, and see that sort of thing and the alien wanting to hold on to his job they do not like it. In my riding we have taken precautions to make the employers understand they had better get a move on. I understand that one minister of the Crown has been told to get rid of the aliens at his factory in Toronto and give the returned soldiers a fair show. The soldiers do not want to be coddled; they want an opportunity. Let us give them the opportunity to create new cities and towns and homes and farms, and they will gladly accept it in preference to a second or third class job in the Civil Service. If given the opportunity, our soldiers will prove themselves fit for the very highest jobs in the land.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Lieut.-General SIR SAM HUGHES (resuming): Before the House rose I was discussing the question of re-establishment. But during the recess my attention has been drawn to the fact that a number of the officers of the House and the men who formerly occupied places in the Press Gallery left their positions and marched with the boys to the front. Some of them have fallen, and all have done uniformly good work. I pay tribute to such of these men by name. Here is the honour roll:

Major Bowie, Sergeant-at-Arms.

Major John Lewis, Montreal Star, killed in action.

Captain Ernest Cinq Mars, Croix de Guerre, La Presse.

Captain Maurice Arby, Le Temps.

Private Rènè Chevassu, Le Canada.

Lieut. John MacCormac, The Gazette, Montreal.

Corporal Charles Gauthier, Le Droit.

Lieut. Rodolphe Girard, Croix de Guerre, Le Temps.

Major John Bassett, A.D.C., Montreal Gazette.

Private Vincent Pask, Ottawa Free Press.

Captain Charles Askwith, Ottawa Journal.

Captain Clem King, Military Cross.

Sergeant Benson Guest, Montreal Mail.

Private Allan B. Hobbs, Ottawa Journal.

Private J. W. Gibson, page, from 1908 to 1915.

Captain Irwin B. Johnston, Canadian Daily Record.

Captain James Hanratty, Canadian Daily Record.

Lieut. Charles Cavers, Toronto World.

Captain William Wallace, Military Cross.

I hurried in the hope of finishing my address before six o'clock, and in my haste I did not say fully what I wished to say on one point about the returned soldiers. We need not have any fear whatever of the returned soldiers, if they are anything like properly used. Otherwise it is hard to say what we may look for. I anticipate—and I think the future records of this country, when they are written, will bear me out—that our returning soldiers, four hundred thousand or five hundred thousand are going to be the greatest thinking and acting asset of the Dominion of Canada in the years to come. Like all old soldiers they will be steady, hard men. I believe that the history of all the victorious and Allied countries will show that we are entering upon the Periclean, the Augustine

Age, the Renaissance, the Elizabethan period, the Reformation period, of our time, to be marked by a great outburst of literature, art, and general progress.

Now, I will only take a few minutes to touch upon an aspect of the case more practical than theoretical—the financial aspect. I would refer hon. members to the report of the Department of the Treasury in Washington, of 2nd December, 1918, the report of Secretary McAdoo to the House of Representatives. I have here the official document, but I read from copies that have been made. He refers to the raising of great loans and the advancing to allied countries of a sum upwards of $9,000,000,000 in cash. He said:

The fundamental fact underlying these great economic achievements has been the inflexible spirit and purpose of America to secure for the world the blessings of that kind of liberty and justice in which America was conceived, and without which neither America nor civilization can exist.

Speaking of the third Liberty Loan he said:

(1) With the bonds of previous loans selling below par and industrial and other securities yielding a return much in excess of the interest rate on Government bonds, the question of the rate of interest on the new bonds became acute. It was the general banking opinion that the rate should be 4½ per cent and few believed that it would be possible to sell the necessary large amount of bonds at a lesser rate. The Treasury on the other hand stood firm in the belief that,

1—The rate of interest would not of itself maintain Liberty bonds at par in the financial market.

2—That the price of Liberty bonds, even though quoted at less than par on the exchanges, would not deter the American people from buying at par the same bonds when offered by their Government to secure the necessary funds to carry on the war.

In other words, they would show themselves patriots, not grafters.

3—That the patriotism of the American people was not measured by interest rates nor determined by the fluctuations in the market prices of Government bonds on stock exchanges.

The situation was very complex. There could be no denying the fact that existing issues were selling below par, nor could there be any refutation of the claim, except by actual experiment, that the investing public would not buy the new issue at par when the same bonds could be bought in the open market below par. The Treasury felt, however, that to raise the interest rate to 4½ per cent would mean a corresponding increase in the cost of the war and force still higher interest rates on future issues of industrial and other securities as well as further to depress the price of existing long term bonds. On the other hand, it seemed clear that the time had arrived when every effort should be made to stabilize the interest rate on Government bonds and to reach a point where there would no longer be expectation of further increases in rates.

It was decided, therefore, to recommend that the Congress authorize the issue of a 4¼ per cent nonconvertible bond or an increase in the interest rate of one-fourth of 1 per cent instead of an increase of one-half of 1 per cent. Such a bond, it was believed, would result in accomplishing two things,

1—The stabilization of the interest rate as far as it was possible to stabilize it in the extraordinary circumstances then existing.

and,

2—The elimination of the conversion privilege, which had become no longer necessary for the sale of the bonds and which in itself had a tendency to create a demand for a constantly rising rate of interest on successive issues.

Speaking of the fourth Liberty Loan Secretary McAdoo said:

I have sought to avoid the issue of bonds at such a rate and upon such terms as might result ultimately, when the war is won, in the accumulation of great wealth in the hands of a relatively small proportion of our population, carrying interest at a high rate and exempt from taxes.

The oversubscription of this largest of all loans was the greatest financial achievement in all history and a wonderful manifestation of the strength and purpose of the American people.

The loans made to foreign governments as shown by this report were as follows:

RE LOANS TO FOREIGN GOVERNMENTS.

Country.	Credits established.	Cash advances.
Belgium	$ 192,520,000	$ 173,380,000
Cuba	15,000,000	10,000,000
France	2,445,000,000	1,970,000,000
Great Britain	3,945,000,000	3,696,000,000
Greece	15,790,000	
Italy	1,210,000,000	1,051,000,000
Liberia	5,000,000	
Rumania	6,666,666	
Russia	325,000,000	187,729,750
Serbia	12,000,000	10,605,000
Total	$8,171,976,666	$7,098,714,750

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

These amounts were advanced by the people of the United States through their Government by way of loan.

Regarding these loans, there are two viewpoints: One is that of the country, the people; the other is that of the broker or the investor. It depends on the viewpoint how you are going to regard it. One distinguished member of this House said of the $75,000,000 New York loan: "Just look at the most sucessful loan in history; it went up to 103." It was sold at $94.94 or practically 95 and because it went up to 103 it was regarded as the greatest issue in history. If he was a buyer he could afford to cheer but I do not see how the people of Canada, who were losing $8 per $100, could be interested in any such deal as that. The great trouble in connection with that loan is that the Government fixed both the buying and selling price; that is they fixed both the rate of interest and what they would get for the bonds. I have no hesitation in saying that had the Finance Minister gone to New York with that $75,000,000 loan and said: "Gentlemen, here is a loan; I am paying 5 or 5½ per cent interest on it; what will you give me for it?"—he would have had an offer of 102 quicker than lightning. As it was he said: "I am going to fix the price of $25,000,000 worth at 99 and something and $25,000,000 at something else and the price of long term, or the gilt-edged, part shall be $94.94, practically 95." Of course, it went up. The question that the people are asking themselves is: Who were the underwriters that got the difference in the price at which it was issued through Morgan & Company and the price of 103 to which it rose? Who got that $8 out of every $100 is something that the people of this country are interested in knowing. From the investor's viewpoint it may have been a successful loan if $8 out of every $100 went to the broker or speculator. From the people's viewpoint they were robbed of $8 out of every $100. If the interest had been higher, of course, the price would still have been higher. It is a very convenient way of estimating a loan.

If the Federal Government advance the rates of interest, the people of the province, the municipality, the business man, the farmer, have to pay correspondingly higher rates with the result that this burden will affect every business transaction in the country. As pointed out by my hon. friend from Muskoka (Mr. McGibbon), at the outset Canada had lying idle and drawing no interest whatever, or very small rates of from 3 to 3½ per cent, two billions of dollars in the savings banks and banking institutions of this country which could have been made available. Why then, when these loans were made, did not the people grab their money and invest it in Government bonds bearing 5 and 5½ per cent, especially when the conditions of the loans carried the exemption clause? Why did every one keep his money at 3 and 3½ per cent with no tax exemption instead of investing at 5½ per cent with exemption? Canada's loans since 1915 have all been issued at from 5 to 5½ per cent. The total loans aggregate upwards of $1,500,000,000, and the issue prices have been from 94.94 to par.

The difficulty of locating the amounts paid for commissions is made greater by the fact that one cannot get the actual figures for anything except three of the loans. The Auditor General's Report and the Public Accounts are not printed yet for this year. I have been unable to get anything except the figures for three of these loans which are found in the Auditor General's Report for last year. The conversion privileges are very valuable. The Minister of Finance, in answer to a question of mine last year agreed that there would be $150,000,000 conversion on one loan. Then, as has been pointed out on many occasions, these bonds have been sold as low as 91, 92, 92½, 93, 94 and 95 all over the country. They had undoubtedly been picked up by brokers who evidently knew what was coming; they picked these up and transferred them, having purchased them at lower rates, for 97½, or par, and they got the accrued interest upon them. In that transfer they made from $6,000,000 to $9,000,000 on that $150,000,000 transaction alone. That was not allowed in the United States Liberty Bond issues.

In regard to the exemption of Canadian loans I have a statement issued by a firm—I think—Daly and Company of Toronto. On $1,000,000 there is an exemption of $499,157 and on $1,500,000 there is an exemption of $863,000 and so on right down. The exemption amounts to a very large sum. The cost of the first year's administration of these Canadian loans runs from $113.50 to $111.75 exclusive of the last two loans for which figures cannot be definitely had. The Auditor General's Report gives the figures for three loans, that is the 5 per cent Public Service Loan, 1916, the Dominion of Canada War Loan, 1915, and the 5 per cent Dominion of Canada War Loan, December, 1916.

The figures are startling. They are as follows:

"5 per cent Public Service Loan" in New York, 1916 ..... $ 75,000,000
Cost, $4,098,580, or $5.46 per $100.
The "Dominion of Canada War Loan," 1915 ..... $100,000,000
Cost, $3,408,358, or $3.41 per $100.
The "5 per cent Dominion of Canada War Loan," October, 1916. $100,000,000
Cost, $3,539,410, or $3.54 per $100.

These figures are taken from the Auditor General's Report. Thus, for $275,000,000 the Dominion of Canada has paid upwards of $11,000,000.

Let us turn to the United States and see how they have dealt with their Liberty Loans. The cost of these loans has been as follows:

First Liberty Loan, 1917, two billions of dollars, rate 3½ per cent interest, cost, $2,762,536, or 13 9/10 cents per $100.

Second Liberty Loan, 1917, $3,808,766,150, rate 4 per cent interest, cost $5,539,062, or 14 3/10 cents per $100.

Third Liberty Loan, 1918, $4,176,516,850, rate 4½ per cent interest, cost $8,293,519, or 19 cents per $100.

Fourth Liberty Loan, September, 1918, $6,989,047,000, rate 4½ per cent interest, cost $8,727,658.

The final figures for this loan are not to hand, but an estimate can easily be made of what it will amount to, 19 or 20 cents, the same as for the other loans.

Mark you, Sir, this—and I have the detailed reports here if any hon. members wish to see them—this cost includes about eleven millions of dollars of allotments to Federal Reserve Banks, for which no accounts have been rendered, or if rendered have not been examined, classified and approved. There will be a great many of these accounts which will undoubtedly be rejected, but I am putting them all in, and it makes a total United States loan of $16,974,330,000 at a cost of $25,322,775, or 15 cents per $100, as against $275,000,000 Canadian loan at a cost of $11,000,000.

The thing, Sir, is unreasonable. It is incomprehensible how so much money has been spent on the Canadian loans as has been. Contrast 13 cents per $100 with $5.46 for $100. Contrast 3 per cent to 4½ per cent Liberty Loan with from 5 per cent to 5½ per cent Canadian loans. Why have the Canadian loans cost from thirty to fifty times as much as the United States loans? You can say they are a more highly developed country, they are a larger country. Consider that 21,000,000, nearly 22,000,000 of people in the United States of America—that is one out of about every five—subscribed dollars and cents to their last Liberty Loan, knowing that it would go below par, knowing they would lose interest on it, knowing they would only get 4¼ per cent—and yet that number of people subscribed to these bonds. That, Sir, is patriotism. There was no organization in every polling subdivision, in every district all over the country—possibly for future political purposes; there were no agents, or friends of the Government there to organize and collect subscriptions, or a whole body of sellers on commission, such as there were in the case of these Canadian loans. Last year the Acting Finance Minister admitted that the 1917 December loan would cost upwards of five millions of dollars. Now I have never yet got the figures. I have tried, and I have inquired dozens of times from the Finance Department and the Auditor-General's Department, from all the departments interested, and I have not got the figures yet, but there is a report that the figures will be nearer seven millions of dollars than five when they are all in, and that will not include the cost of administration, which, of course, is very heavy, as you all know, solicitors and clerks having to be employed in this work. This loan is for $398,000,000; the United States Liberty loan for ten times the amount, cost only $5,539,000. Canada has raised for war purposes about $1,500,000,000. This was drawing, we will say, from 2 to 3½ per cent interest without exemption. Much of it is drawing nothing at all. The average interest will now be nearly 5 to 5½ per cent. The Government should have issued the loan, seeing that these moneys were not drawing anything higher, at from 3 to 3½ per cent. Thus, an annual saving of 2 per cent, or $30,000,000 on the investment would have been the result to the people of Canada. And the people who have had their money invested, if they had been patriotic, should have been satisfied with the same interest as they were getting. They would have had the same security as they already had, and would have been that much money in pocket. That way, some $30,000,000 would have been saved to the country. The annual interest on $1,500,000,000 at an average of 5 to 5½ per cent will be $75,000,000 to $80,000,000. This sum is exempt under the income tax rule, viz.: The exemption clauses prevent any revenue from interest on this sum. Thus fully twenty millions more are lost, or a grand total of about fifty millions of dollars annually added to the people's burden for the benefit of the speculator. The war profits tax, and high rates of interest inworking out, will counter-balance the or-

dinary rate and will amount to at least twenty to thirty millions more, which means a total of forty to fifty million dollars that this country could have been in pocket if proper financing had been indulged in. Indirectly, the province, municipality, the business man, the farmer, will all pay correspondingly higher rates. One dollar now thus invested in fifteen years becomes two dollars. The purchasing power of one dollar now will equal two dollars in a few years. Therefore, one dollar now of this money will equal four dollars, as far as the purchasing power of it is concerned.

Who are the real profiteers, Sir? Much has been said against profiteers in this country. I want to say here that I had a good deal to do with the munition makers in the early stages of the war and I think I kept my eyes fairly wide open in the latter stages of it. As I figure it, about twenty-five per cent of them made money, fifty per cent broke even, and twenty-five per cent of them lost nearly all they put in, and yet you will find the people going up and down the country condemning the munition makers. The munition maker that went into this business on his own responsibility and took the risk is entitled to all the credit that can possibly be given him. They are the men who saved Canada from bankruptcy, and put bread and butter into the mouths of hundreds of our people, people who in the early stages of the war were practically starving. They are the men who re-filled the coffers of the country, and practically made Canada able to carry on the war. They are the men, too, Sir, who made the shells that at the battle of St. Julien—where our good friend, the mover of the Address, and others, were bowled out—were obtained from a station ten or fifteen miles back and brought into action, and helped to stand off the advancing German hordes at the crucial moment. These very shells helped to win the war in Europe, and I say that the munition makers who went into the business on an even field and a fair footing deserve every credit. The munition makers who went into the business on a speculative basis deserve no credit. Like the gentleman I have referred to, in selling goods to the Old Country, they were guaranteed against loss and were not interfered with in their profits. I would like, before people too widely condemn the munition workers as profiteers, to consider the case, and find out whether these gentlemen stepped in at the proper time, at a time when it was essential to get the industry started, and what did they make. There are institutions, however, in close connection with the gentleman who headed the Munitions Board, in which millions and millions of dollars have been made, and the strange part of the business is that other men in the industry at the same time were getting such prices that they were unable to carry on.

There is another thing I would like to point out: When the United States came into the war, no matter how, their Government and people wanted to get shells made in Canada. The Munitions Board of Canada objected to their being made in Canada, and let me point out here, there has not been one shell, not one bit of munition work made in Canada for a long time that could not have been made in England just as well. Britain gave the orders to Canada in order to preserve her credit, keep times good, and help things on here, the condition being that Canada should put up the money and it would be counted as collateral on advances made. Therefore, the manufacture of munitions for Britain could have been stopped because Britain had the factories to make them, lots of them. We could have taken the manufacture of American munitions, and I have no hesitation in saying we could have had two billions, if not three billions of American work by merely asking for it. However, permission was refused to make American munitions here.

They were refused permission to manufacture here. The contractors in Canada were not allowed to take these contracts, so they sought to move their machinery to the United States and manufacture there. The Munitions Board interfered and stopped that, and it was only after a number of us had painted the atmosphere a vermilion colour that we got action taken to permit the manufacture of Yankee shells in this country. Had this thing been properly looked after, had a business-like policy been followed in the matter, instead of our having an adverse rate of exchange and trade balance with the United States, these would have been largely in our favour, and the credit to us would have been upwards of a billion dollars rather than Canada being debtor to the United States. These things are worth noting in passing.

I do not know how many similar cases there are, but I know of one case where a gentleman had $5,000 to invest. A friend came to him and said: I want you to invest your $5,000 in Victory bonds. Oh, said the other, I am going to invest that in my business. But, said his friend this will not interfere with your business at all. You can invest in Victory bonds and we will

take the bond as collateral and advance you all the money you want to carry on your business. So he said: All right, I will take $5,000 in Victory bonds. Said his friend: Oh, no you will take $100,000. "But I can never pay for it," said the prospective investor. "That is all right," said the other; "the Government guarantees the bank, and the bank will carry you." So the gentleman takes $100,000 in bonds. The Government puts up the money, the 5½ per cent bond interest balancing the 5½ per cent interest on the loan, as I am informed, and the gentleman is guaranteed that at the end of the year this long term Victory bond will sell at 105 or 107. At all events, I understand that he can sell to-day at nearly 103, make $3,000 on his investment and still have $5,000 to the good. If it goes up to 107 he makes $7,000 in selling the bond, and if he keeps it until the end of the term the chances are that he will be able to pay off the $100,000 and have the bond for himself. In short, there is a general opinion abroad among those who look into the matter that this Victory bond issue is for the benefit of the speculator, and not for patriotic purposes. Five and one-half per cent is a little high for patriotism on loans of this description, with the exemption clauses as they are here stated.

Now, Sir, I want to support this Government. I have not opposed them yet. I am only stirring them up a little now. I am drawing aside that camouflage veil to let a little light in on them, and I can assure them that more than the veil will be thrown aside later unless these gentlemen get a move on and see that this sort of speculation does not go on under the name of Victory. Imagine the absurdity of the placards that were distributed about the country: "Help our boys in the trenches," when there is hardly a man of them who has a son in the trenches. The thing is absurd on the face of it. It is camouflage; it is propaganda; it is deceiving the public, and so far as I am concerned I shall not be a party to it.

In connection with the re-establishment of the returned soldier, it is up to the Government to create good times, to create opportunities, to get population in here, to get money in from the United States. It is up to the Government to sell land to returned soldiers and let them bring their families in; it will build up cities, it will build up railways and canals and open up new avenues of life not only to the 400,000 soldiers who are returning, but to ten times 400,000 in the very near future.

[Sir Sam Hughes.]

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I am like Othello; my occupation is gone. The ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) had the temerity to stand up and say, in so many words, that he would support a Government which he has shown to be the most contemptible Government that ever administered the affairs of Canada. A more terrible indictment of any government in this country has never been delivered from the Opposition benches, much less from the side of the House on which the members of the Government sit. If I did not know my hon. friend to be an honest man, I would have commenced my discourse by saying that " when thieves fall out, honest men come by their own." But the hon. gentleman will have to be replied to from his own side of the House, and from the front benches of his own side of the House.

Unfortunately for Canada, unfortunately for the soldiers, particularly, the indictment that my hon. friend has made of the Government is only too true. It is lamentable. One of the last things that he pointed out was that in the floating of the Victory loans $50,000,000 were lost to the revenues of Canada. Any one who will analyse the negotiations in connection with the Victory Loan and the other war loans of Canada, and who will look at the success of the United States people in negotiating their war loans, cannot help coming to the same conclusion as that which my hon. friend has reached. Whom does this $50,000,000 fall upon? It falls upon our soldiers, those men over whom hon. gentlemen on the other side and some hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have been slobbering for the last four or five months. People have been saying what they were going to do for our brave boys when they came home; but upon whom are these terrible war taxes going to fall more than upon anybody else in this country? Upon our soldiers. When our soldiers come home and settle down they are the nucleus of future Canada; 500,000 men who, by reason of their youth, possess the generative forces of future Canada in a very much greater degree than all the rest of us put together. They, then, are to be the future people of Canada on whom this great debt will ultimately fall. When we are talking about what we are going to do for the dear soldiers, the best thing we can do for them is to stop this terrible expenditure, this throwing away of the people's money, the public money of the country. There never has been a grosser or a more scandalous piece of mal-

administration in the history of any country than there has been in Canada during the last four years.

The revelations of the hon. member are simply marvellous, and I want, on behalf of the honest people of Canada and the honest members of this Parliament, to thank the honourable gentleman for having the courage of his convictions in standing up on his own side of the House, because those revelations will have a more far-reaching effect than if they had come from me, as in that case motives, political or otherwise, would be imputed.

I was astonished yesterday or the day before to hear an honourable gentleman opposite state that this was one of the greatest Governments that we had ever had in Canada. He made that statement in the first part of his speech, but he had not got very far before I saw he perceived the mermaid's head, although he did not see the dragon's tail. He was telling us about the great necessity there was in the Dominion of Canada for a Health Department, and he discovered before he got through that more than one person was looking for the job of head of that department.

One of the most terrible revelations that my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) gave to the House and to the country is something that will come out directly in history. I refer to the terrible sacrifice in Canadian life that has taken place in France and Flanders for the glory of certain individuals over there. That is something that is coming across only in little drib-drabs through the returned soldiers, but when we get it from the ex-Minister of Militia, who knows the circumstances, it is one of the most terrible indictments that was ever made in any parliament on the character of the men who were supposed to be looking after our military affairs.

We all knew that the Canadian boys were made the spearhead of the terrible offensives in France and Flanders. What do we find this Government doing now that the war is over? What gratitude has there been for Canada? The great altruistic, idealistic President of the United States had gone over to Europe and had mystified the European chancelleries with his high idealism. One would think it was the second coming of the great Nazarene to bring peace on earth, good will to men, coming to bring the millennium, producing the beautiful precept of the great Master: "If a man strikes you on one cheek, turn the other." That beautiful precept is, of course, meant for an ideal for people to live up to, to strive for, but is quite impracticable. "Sell all you have and give it to the poor"—a beautiful ideal to be lived up to. Our great southern President,—I mean the President of the United States—was over there and was acting the part of the great idealist, but he kept guard on his nose when he was showing first one cheek and then the other; he took mighty good care to guard his solar plexus. No sooner was the armistice signed than Mr. Hoover the Food Controller of the United States, was taken to Europe and he was put in charge of the feeding of the famine-stricken districts of Europe to fatten the larders of the people of the United States to the exclusion of Canada. What did we find in this country? We found that in the last week of January, the price of coarse grains, oats and barley, dropped, in a single week, twenty-five per cent, the result being that hundreds of hundreds of merchants throughout the country were ruined. What was our beautiful Government doing at that time? Where was our Food Controller? Instead of our Food Controller or some one else of some ability, some one who had enough business capacity to be able to buy and sell a cambric needle intelligently, being sent over, he was kept in Ottawa, and the result has been that we find some individual American firms getting $200,000,000 contracts while our people have been putting up money for some contracts down in the Balkan States which are still under blockade. That is the condition of things which we are up against. That is the satisfaction, that is the gratitude which Canada gets for being made the spearhead of the terrible offensives in Europe. It is enough to break a Canadian heart.

I want to say a few words about Union Government. Hon. gentlemen who occupy the front seats on the Opposition benches are, I believe, with a few exceptions, honest men.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Name the exceptions.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: But it is an unfortunate fact that the laws of nature have not provided for such a thing as Union Government unless it be for some single special purpose. When that single special purpose has been consummated, Union Government is an anachronism; in the nature of things, it does not fit the times. If you superinduce magnetism at the one end of the needle, the opposite magnetism takes places at the other. There is, in nature, no such thing as halfness that has any good to it. All nature is double and

so is every one of its parts. You cannot have light if you have no darkness. You cannot have an "up" if you do not have a "down." You cannot have an attraction if you do not have a repulsion. If I went to pull my hon. friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) out of his chair, I would have to push as much with my feet as I pulled with my hands. I have said that all nature is double; and so is every one of its parts. A Union Government is an unnatural combination and comes into being only for a special purpose. But this country has more interests involved in its government than one. To win the war was one great purpose, and for a time overshadowed everything else. If the Union Government had been formed to win the war, and if the war was the only thing to which it was absolutely necessary for the people of Canada to apply themselves, then Union Government would be all right so long as that condition lasted. But the moment the armistice was signed and the war over Union Government was no longer fitted for the conduct of the affairs of this or any other country. Let me illustrate from history. The Province of Prince Edward Island has the second oldest responsible government of any community in North America. The local Government of Prince Edward Island is older than the American government, older than the governments of the Canadas, older than any other government in North America except Nova Scotia. Once, the province of Prince Edward Island had a coalition or union government on the school question. Hon. Sir Louis Davies, now Chief Justice of Canada, was premier of Prince Edward Island, and formed a coalition government on a fifty-fifty basis—not the promise of a fifty-fifty basis which was broken, but a real fifty-fifty. No sooner had this coalition government passed the legislation for which it was formed than a cleavage set in and the coalition ceased to exist almost immediately. Only one of the ministers of the Conservative persuasion changed his politics; the rest remained true to their old party. In the nature of things such a thing as a coalition government cannot exist. There is no co-ordination between our friends on the other side of the House, and it is no wonder they cannot do anything. The Government of this country has developed into an autocracy; there is no such thing as a democratic government in Canada to-day, and the most unfortunate thing about it is that we have got to keep this Government in power this session. So I was not at all astonished when I heard the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes) say that he was still going to support this Government. I am going to support them too—that is, to the extent of giving them the best advice I can, and criticising them, of course, when I think they are wrong. But there is this to be said. We cannot have an election until the boys come home, so there is no use talking about turning this Government out yet. We have to submit to the inevitable; we have to submit to the results of the conspiracy of 1917—a conspiracy that will go down in history as one of the most diabolical acts of a class of people called politicians.

Now I am going to give my hon. friends on the other side of the House some advice. I shall give it in all sincerity and without the slightest tincture of either a partisan or a politician; I mean that kind of politician that gets glass eyes and seems to see the things that are not, which is Shakespeare's definition of a scurvy politician. My advice to the Government is this: Announce to the House on Thursday that at the end of this session this Parliament will be dissolved and a mandate sought from the people to conduct the Government of this country as a democracy, which we claim to be, and which we believed we were. That is the only way I see out of the terrible difficulty which the country is in at the present moment. With the House in session, and the suspension of Orders in Council in the interim, and the acceptance or rejection of Orders in Council that have already been passed, surely we can keep the Government going for this session, and when the session is over most of the soldiers will be home. In the meantime, I hope an amended Franchise Bill will have been passed, and I do also hope, in the interests of common decency and common honesty, that the Government will bring down such a Franchise Bill as will permit the electors of this country, men and women, to record their votes for their choice, instead of mutilating their votes as the War-Time Elections Act did.

I should perhaps have begun my speech by congratulating the mover and the seconder of the Address. For young men, they certainly did credit to themselves and honour to the House, and I sincerely congratulate them. But I must take issue with them both on some of the statements they have made. Much of what they said was all right, but notwithstanding their splendid effort, in my judgment they both erred. The mover of the Address (Mr. Redman) amongst other things talked about the de-

portation of alien enemies. Have we alien enemies in this country? If we have, they should have been deported long ago. But are the people whom we have subdued our enemies? Is that the spirit in our brave soldier boys who have brought honour to Canada and to the British name? Do our soldiers hold in their heart that terrible revenge that would jump upon a man when they have got him down? That is not what we in our part of the country consider bravery or justice or honour or anything that is good. I would ask hon. gentlemen who preach the doctrine that we ought to destroy these unfortunate people whom we have coaxed and cajoled to this country, and to whom we have given the right of citizenship, shall we be like the Prussian Kaiser and consider that citizenship a mere scrap of paper? I would suggest to these gentlemen that they should be a little careful; otherwise, perhaps they may run foul of the British Royal Family, for they are of German descent. Our great and good Queen Victoria was a beautiful German lady in her young days. Why, the very word "Anglo-Saxon," which to a great many people represents the ne plus ultra of race superiority, is taken right from the German. We are descendants of the German race, those of us who are of English descent, as I happen to be. But I thank Heaven I am a Canadian. My people for three hundred years have been born on this side of the water, and I am a typical Canadian. And for about three hundred years before me, my people have lived, and raised their families, and died under the British flag on this side of the water. As to these aliens, if there are disloyal people among them, send them home; they have no right here. But, if we have loyal German and loyal Austrians here, if we have loyal Turks here, let us make good citizens of them. For thirty years of my life I was " monarch of all I surveyed." During those years I was a commander of men—Canadians, Englishmen, Irishmen, Scotchmen, Greeks, Germans, Dagoes, Negroes, and all the rest of them. I want to say to you, Mr. Speaker, that of all those classes of men the Canadian was at the top—he was the best man of the lot. But I found this, Sir, that the Canadian, after all, was only an improved Englishman, Irishman, Scotchman or German. And, travelling around the world I found that the people who most readily lent themselves to assimilation, who were most ready to establish themselves completely in their foster country, were the Germans. I found this to be true whether they settled in Brazil among the Portuguese, in the Argentine Republic among the Spaniards, in the United States among the Anglo-Saxons—or Anglo-Celts if you like—or in Canada. And I would draw the attention of the House—and I do this simply because I can afford to do it; the hon. members from British Columbia or from some of the Western Provinces could not afford to do it for political reasons—to the fact that some of the worst characters we have in this country are old-country Englishmen.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I hear a great deal of dissent. Mr. Speaker I know what I am saying to be a fact.

Mr. EDWARDS: And some of the best.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: Sure! I would go even further and say perhaps the best. They are so bad because they have the qualities to make them the best. And remember this, the best things on earth, the best things that God has given us, are those that can be most abused. Take a woman as an example. Take whiskey as an example. Take brain power and intelligence as an example. Why, Sir, the worst character we have in Canadian public life—the worst we ever have had—is a man who was once a member of this House, a man so able that there are few to equal him. I am not mentioning any names—everybody will recognize the portrait. Intellect, when debased, becomes the greatest curse we have. These Englishmen to whom I have referred as among the worst characters we have are dangerous for the very reason that they have ability —superability. They take hold of these western dagoes and western Germans, and lead them into all sorts of Bolshevism. They are the leaders of Bolshevism in British Columbia, for instance. On the other hand, as I have said, some of the best men you have in this country are old-country Englishmen. There are good in all classes, and bad in all classes. It cannot be said of men, as the Scotchman said of whiskey,—he said that some whiskey was better than other whiskey, but all whiskey was good. All men are not good. Therefore, I urge these hon. gentlemen to whom I have referred not to discriminate against our citizens, no matter from what nationality they have sprung. Be just and honest; do what is right; and do not let this war hysteria

longer permeate your hearts and brains. Get down to a reasonable basis and try to do some sane thinking and acting.

I want to pay my respects to the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder). I am sorry he is not in the House. The hon. gentleman the other day showed some signs of repentance. His claim to be a good Liberal is an outward acknowledgment of inward shame.

Hence I feel that he should be with us as it is only the hypocrite's tongue that speaks without the heart. I hope my hon. friend cannot be considered an incorrigible hypocrite. Repentance may avert evil. Repentance is accepted remorse. Repentance ends the suit which passion begins. Repentance should be accompanied by reparation and amendment; otherwise, it is like continually pumping an old ship without stopping the leak. I was going to tell my hon. friend that he was a deserter and that desertion is a disgraceful fault. The deserter has the spirit of a coward. He who at the approach of evil deserts his post is branded with cowardice. He who will desert a friend or cause for a price, be that price gold, place or power, will desert again when he gets a bigger price. So, I hope my hon. friend with proper purpose of amendment, can firmly force his jarring thought to peace as Burns has said in his beautiful epigram on Remorse which I quoted in the House last session.

I hope he may see his way clear to follow the light that my hon. friend the ex-Minister of Militia saw to-night when he was looking at the darkness on the other side because, after all, knowledge is relative. Where you see a dark, black cloud there is a silver side to it. There is the antithesis, the opposite, and consequently I can fancy that I hear my hon. friend singing "Lead Kindly Light."

There is just one more point I want to take up and that is with regard to our soldiers. I owe a duty to the soldiers perhaps more than a great many other hon. members of this House, a great many of whom have been soldiers themselves. During the voluntary campaign I went out through my part of the country and explained to the boys that this fight was our fight, and that it was for the maintenance of our present democracy and civilization. I induced hundreds of those boys to go to the front as volunteers. I would not be discharging my duty to those boys, much less to all the soldier boys, if I did not give what appears to me to be the light that is in me to the Government and to the public generally.

In my opinion, the worst service that we can give our boys is to destroy their self-reliance, to destroy their character, to make them imagine that they are paupers, to make them think that they are the wards of the state, when, as a matter of fact, they are the state, and when, as I pointed out before, they are the future fathers of the families of this country. As the ex-Minister of Militia pointed out, all they ask is fair play and a fair show. Of course there are those who have been lamed and maimed, those who have been damaged in one way and another and the state should make reparation to them. The resolutions that I have seen passed by the War Veterans' Associations say that they do not want any charity, that they are not looking for charity, that they do not want to be slobbered over and they do not want the caresses of the politician. What they are looking for is their just due and the best and noblest thing we can do for them is to curtail the expenses of this country as far as possible; that is to say, not to waste money by extravagant expenditure and not to waste it on non-productive employment.

I want to say a few words on the question of non-productive employment. It is an unfortunate thing, perhaps, that a great many people think that if a man is paid for doing a piece of work he is earning something. That is not always the case. You can pay a man to carry bricks from one side of the yard and put them over on the other side and you can pay him to carry them back. There is only one element of virtue in that, and that is the element that makes him imagine that he is earning something. But he is earning nothing. It is only taking money out of one man's pocket and putting it in another man's pocket. It is not increasing the wealth of the world or of the nation. If this Government undertake to construct any public work that is not productive they are wasting money just as much as if they threw it into the Rideau canal or the Ottawa river. Labour represents capital and every hour that a man puts in at labour on an unproductive work represents so much waste. The only virtue in paying him is to prevent him from feeling that he is a pauper. But, from the economic standpoint, it is absolutely extravagance and waste. As the ex-Minister of Militia has pointed out, there is any quantity of work in this country that is productive and will provide labour not only for the returned soldiers, but for as many more if the Government will be careful to find out what these things are and

put the men to work in these employments.

There are a lot of little iron trawlers that the Government used for patrol purposes during the war. I understand they put them up for tender a few days ago and that they have withdrawn the advertisement. very good; that is the proper thing to do if they see that they are not going to sell these vessels for nothing as they sold one the other day for $20,000 less than they could have got the day after.

If we took some of those trawlers, and hired, or chartered, them to some companies, or operated the vessels themselves under Government control, and employed some of the young fishermen who were volunteers, to catch fish in the gulf of St. Lawrence, and in the Atlantic ocean on the banks, that would be furnishing employment that would pay cent for cent. That would not only be productive employment, but yield a revenue in excess of that. Then too, men sent out to explore the country, as the hon. ex-Minister of Militia pointed out, could also be placed at productive work. That is to say any explorations of the north lands of this country, if they are carried out efficiently and intelligently, would more than likely pay cent per cent, and even more, as compared with the outlay that would be involved.

But, Sir, if the Government is going to build ships at $200 a ton, ships that cost in ante bellum days $25 a ton, what will be the result? There is going to be a great deal of non-productive employment, because no ship costing $200 a ton can compete with a ship that costs $100 a ton. Let me draw the attention of my hon. friends on the Government benches to this fact with regard to ships, because I am now discussing a question that I know something about. I have been to sea a long time, but I want to say that to-night I am more at sea than ever. Let me point out that the cost of a ship, other things being equal, has everything to do with the earning power, for this reason: we have got to insure a ship whether it costs $100 a ton or $200 a ton. They carry the same cargo, and if you insure a ship costing $200 you are out the insurance on $100 as compared with the vessel of cheaper cost. In other words, the one ship cannot compete with the other. The same thing is true with regard to the question of wear and tear, which is a very large element in shipping, and is a percentage wear and tear. Consequently, you see that it is absolutely necessary, in order to have ships that pay, that they shall not cost more than the ships they are competing with, otherwise they are bound to be a failure. I am not going to find fault with the Government for starting to build ships last year. When it undertook the construction of ships last year, it did not know that the war was going to end so suddenly. However, we want to get clear of these contracts just as soon as it is humanly possible to do so, and not give orders for the building of any more at these exorbitant prices. If you want to give occupation for the benefit of the men needing it, to prevent unemployment and unrest in this country, put them at works that are productive, and then nobody can find fault.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when my hon. friend on the other side of the House, to whom I have already referred, told us he was a Liberal I knew "the word was on the lip, but the condition was in the soul." A man who says he is a Liberal is not one unless he acts as a Liberal. The man who last year voted, for instance, for the conferring of titles is not a Liberal, because every man in the House and in the country knows that the minute you confer a title on an ordinary individual he ceases to be a Liberal, he becomes an aristocrat, a plutocrat, he is no longer a democrat, and if he is not a democrat he cannot be a Liberal. Another thing that pained me: When my hon. friend the seconder of the resolution, which we are discussing to-night, made that splendid effort of his, and developed and discovered to the House his fine ability as a speaker, and as a thinker, I was sorry to recollect that he was one of the young men who did not—although he faced with all the courage of a Canadian the Hun gas and the Hun gun—have the courage of his own convictions, because last year he talked against titles and voted for them. It was a lamentable thing, but it was not half as bad as the case of the hon. gentleman who made the motion when the right hon. leader of the Government came in and offered what he called an amendment, but which was not an amendment, which actually nullified the original motion, because it accepted the original motion and added in substance after the word "Canada" the words, "except His Majesty shall resign or hand over his prerogative to a party politician in Canada." In other words the right hon. leader of the Government was usurping the power of the King in the conferring of titles, and the hon. gentleman to whom I refer did not have the courage to defend his own motion, but darted around behind one of the back pillars of this Chamber and dodged the vote. The ex-Minister of Militia, in the course of his

speech, spoke about the wonderful exhibition of independence there was in this House. I thought to myself, "If that is what you call independence, dodging a vote upon your own convictions, I do not know what the independence of Parliament means." There are a lot of hon. gentlemen in this House who, as I said last session, sit and listen to the front benches like a lot of young robins, or young crows, with their mouths open, ready to receive worms, shingle nails, or anything else they drop in. That is the kind of food they swallow, and the result is moral and political dyspepsia. But that is not independence. Each man ought to think for himself, and if you want to have good government in this country, I don't care what the question is before the House, every man ought to record his voice and his vote according to his honest conviction. Of course, compromises may be made, I understand that, and there may be cases where a man in order to retain his seat may have to vote for the Government whether he thinks right or not, but the doctrine I have laid down certainly should apply. But that certainly should not apply to the members who sit in this House apart from the Cabinet; it is questionable whether it is even good political morality on the part of members of the Government itself.

So much for independence. I now want to say a few words about this Victory Loan. Any one—I do not care who he is, even if he is a member of the Government—who voted for the exemption of the Victory Loan from taxation is not a Liberal; or if he is he is voting against his conscience. He may be considering that he is choosing the lesser of two evils; that is the only moral ground on which he could rest a vote of that kind. If any Liberal principle was violated more than any other in connection with the Victory Loan, it was the principle which was violated by that clause exempting the loan from taxation. What does that mean, Mr. Speaker? It means that you are exempting from taxation the millionaire, the man who has idle money, with the necessary result that the taxation that ought to be paid by the millionaires is going to fall upon the poor people, the working people. The men of business, the men of affairs, the men who are doing the work of the country, will have to pay the taxes while the big interests who contributed to the Victory Loan will draw their interest and sit like a bump on a log, doing nothing for the good of the country, living on their money and paying no taxes. Yet these people will be protected in their life, in their property, in their liberty, by those who have to pay the taxes. That is not Liberalism. If a man stands up on the floor of this House and, while saying that he is a Liberal, votes for a thing like that, it may truly be said that the words are on the lip but the condition is in the soul—and it is not a Liberal condition.

Away back in 1326 or thereabouts our forefathers waded to their knees in blood in order to draw from old King John the Magna Charta of our liberties, the Habeas Corpus Act, the Bill of Rights that was handed down to us as the palladium of our liberties, and we were asked to guard it with our lives. But this Government, Sir, violated the Habeas Corpus Act. It is true that they got the Supreme Court to whitewash them—and they paid them well.

Men who have sat on the other side of the House, calling themselves Liberals, who have not repealed the 7½ per cent war tax on goods, are not Liberals, because Liberalism stands for equal rights. Liberalism stands for freedom of trade and for opposition to the protecting of and catering to special privileges and the granting of special privileges. The only way my friends on the other side, who say that they are Liberals, can show that they are true Liberals, is to renounce their Toryism, repent and make reparation.

> While the light holds out to burn,
> The vilest sinner may return.

There is some talk about a new party, the Farmers' party. I want to say that the Farmers' party and the Liberal party are one and the same thing. It is not one name for different things, like the Union Government; it is two names for the same thing. I have here a letter from our great chieftain addressed to myself; probably one of the last letters that he wrote on a political question. I shall read a few words of it to show that the farmers and the Liberals are one and the same party. I had written to Sir Wilfrid Laurier to learn what his policy would be when he called the convention which was, as he said, to meet next summer. This is his reply:

> You have noticed that in Wilson's fourteen conditions for peace the third provides for 'the removal so far as possible of economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.'

That was the third clause of President Wilson's conditions for peace. Sir Wilfrid's comment on these words was as follows:

This is in line with the accepted doctrine of the Liberal party and seems to me a condition sine qua non for the removal of war possibilities between the nations. In so far as we in Canada are concerned, the most essential policy would be the largest possible measure of free trade between us and the United States. You have seen that the Western farmers have put that plank in the forefront of their platform as recently formulated. It is simply a reiteration of their old policy which they have never ceased to advocate. This will be equally acceptable to you in Prince Edward Island.

I want to say that it is. To those gentlemen who come from the West, may I point out that while some of the western papers and some of the western members talk about the East being against them, so far as my province is concerned our interests are identical with those of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta. We stand to a man for Liberal principles and free trade, and although I should hate to see my good friend over there beaten, we will send to the next parliament a solid phalanx of Liberals. With regard to the tariff, I want to say that, notwithstanding what Sir Wilfrid Laurier has said, namely, that we cannot settle finally the tariff question until peace is signed because the conditions of peace may make all the difference in the world, what we can do and ought to do at the first opportunity the Government can give to the matter is to accept in its entirety the reciprocity agreement that was offered to us by the United States in 1911. It is the more important that that should be done immediately because the Congressional elections in the United States last fall went Republican and Republicans are, as hon. members know, not overly enamoured of free trade principles. But if it is once upon their statute books and our statute books, after the way in which the Canadians have served the United States and the Empire so well in this great war, because we were fighting not only for the Empire but for them and ourselves, and for them particularly, because they were laggards in getting to work at the war, I do not believe they would have the temerity to change the reciprocity agreement, for that would be looked upon, at least by us, as an unfriendly act. Therefore, let the Government take the 7½ per cent super-tax off at once; let them have the reciprocity agreement ratified immediately, and then at the next session of Parliament, which should be summoned as soon as possible, let them take up the question of the tariff. While I am sorry that this Government has been so prolific in its production of useless commissions—and I am told that the expenditure on them per day is about $8,000 for nothing—at the same time I think the Government would be justified in creating a commission to take up the whole tariff question, such commission to be composed of equal numbers of Liberals and Conservatives, or, if you like, of high tariff men and low tariff men, men above reproach, men who cannot be bought, because unfortunately, in this country there are on the one side of this question the big interests and on the other side the poor unfortunate ratepayers. If you can get a commission that will give fair play, they can determine, in the meantime, what tariff reductions should be made and how far we can go with free trade without injuring the vested interests of anybody in this country. Somebody is bound to be hit in any change of tariff. You cannot make a change in the tariff without hitting somebody, and you are going to hit even people who will eventually be benefited, because in the readjustment that is bound to take place after the tariff is either lowered or raised, somebody has to suffer who may eventually benefit by the change that is made, either up or down.

Mr. HOWARD PRIMROSE WHIDDEN (Brandon): Mr. Speaker, in rising to support the motion that is before the House, I find myself in somewhat of a predicament lest, after we have passed from rather dark tragedy to high comedy, there be a shading away into melodrama.

I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the motion that is before us, not in any formal or stock phrase, but because of a personal appreciation of the words uttered by those gentlemen as voicing the strong and sound sentiments entertained by them, sentiments which have grown out of experiences which many of us would have gladly shared along with them.

I would not be doing the thing that would express my deepest thought if I did not also pay a tribute of respect for and appreciation of the great leader of the Opposition party whose chair is vacant before us. It was my privilege, just before leaving home for this city, in standing before a group of young people, to speak with honest conviction of the worth and work of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. With all due respect to the consistency of the hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Jos. Read), I do not think the fallen chieftain was really the less a Liberal when he accepted his title.

My impression is that the Government has not in this debate so far suffered severely at the hands of the Opposition. In fact, the pin-pricks have been most mild,

and furthest from the presenting of any thing in the way of a constructive contra, there has been but the time worn attempt to belittle the things that in themselves may or may not have been of conspicuous importance. I had hoped to pass on immediately to emphasize two or three things that appeal to me as being of outstanding value in the suggested programme as contained in the Address, but I must refer to one or two matters brought up partly this evening and partly on previous occasions by members of the Opposition.

The hon. member for Prince has, in my judgment, gone out of his way this evening to cater to the aliens.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: There are no aliens in my constituency.

Mr. WHIDDEN: I am sure hon. members on this side of the House will take second place to none in our recognition of the genuine citizenship of foreign born people who have really been willing to be Canadianized.

But as to those who are not willing either outwardly or inwardly, save under the pressure of threatened penalty, to accept the Canadian standard and to believe in the things for which our nation stands, I am satisfied that we should be untrue to the men who have gone overseas to represent us and untrue to all of our gallant allies, if we were not willing now that the armistice has been signed to assume that attitude toward the alien enemy in our land—the man who is alien in spirit—which true freedom-loving Canadians have a right to assume, and a right to retain until the aliens change their attitude or go home. There are still some alien enemies in Canada who are very much in the position of one of their number, who in a western city a few years ago in connection with the taking of some local census called at the door of a settlement worker of great intelligence and of fine patriotism and asked who resided there. On being told, he attempted to put the name down in his book and then asked what the householder's nationality was. This man with many United Empire Loyalist forebears drew himself up and sought to convey the idea in his soul to the little foreign Canadian in his presence. He used the word "Canadian" more than once in trying to explain what his nationality was and the census man said "Oh, Canadian, Canadian! not many of them people around here." We should all be Canadians around here.

Mr. Speaker, until the word "nationality" ceases to be used in the press and in the clubs and in private groups by men of foreign birth as applied to themselves and their own blood—immigrant groups—not until then will it be possible for us to accord to them the welcome which the hon. member who has spoken before me (Mr. Read) seems so willing to extend to them. There is only one nation in Canada. This is not an aggregation of British American Balkan states and please God it never will be. The attitude of the average man who has gone over and fought our battles, the man of the deep passion and also of the deep sense of the difference between right and wrong, as he represented it and as he found it over there, is having something to say to us to-day and will continue to have something to say to us on the question, what shall constitute Canadian citizenship? We shall hear his voice and in the main I am satisfied that he will speak the right word concerning the people within our borders of foreign birth. We welcome them to continue in our midst if they have caught the soul of Canada, if they are willing to try to understand the meaning of that soul as it has been newly fired and newly shaped during these epoch making days of the past four and a half years. I could not quite understand the combination on the opposite side of "our President" and the questionable fault finding of our gracious Majesty King George in his attempt to entertain "our President." This is surely a new combination for the floor of the Canadian Parliament.

Just a word with regard to "the light." It seems to be sinking lower. Whether the oil is failing or the wick is not being sufficiently cared for I am not prepared to say, but the light does not seem to have the charms that those who placed it in the window seemed to think it would have. In fact I am inclined to believe that it serves more as a warning light in its spluttering and dying moments. There are no sinners on the Government side for whom we need to be ashamed. It is true that there may be need for a choir to chant the good old words "Lead Kindly Light," but pray Heaven may give us an angelic choir, and not the choir put up by the Opposition in the present Parliament.

The returning soldier is not going to be patronized, coddled or paternalized by the present Government. The plans of this Government are fully as far advanced as those of any of the governments of the belligerent countries at the present time, and

in many respects they are further advanced than the plans of some of these countries. I believe that one of the great things is for the people of Canada at large to understand the returned soldier's mind. No government can do all that needs to be done for those who have fought for us and are returning to their homes again. The people generally must recognize that the soldier is anxious to become a civilian as speedily as possible and I hope that the splendid officers who are now returning home after having served so gallantly in leading our troops overseas will help to show every private and noncommissioned officer once they have returned to civil life that we are a democratic people, that we are all one. The men who have fought and are returning home are equally worthy of our best recognition and regard. Let no distinctions be drawn; let there be no false ratings; let one and all be the men we know they are—our bravest and our best. The Government is planning for the returning soldiers courageously, thoughtfully and scientifically and these good soldiers will soon find that though some of their old places in the business world may have been filled up that there is still a large place for them, and that upon their soldiers here in the home land there will still rest obligations to live for Canada though they, first and best of all, were willing to die for Canada on foreign soil.

Among the many conspicuous items in the Address which suggest to us in the briefest possible way the Government's programme there are two or three that stand out above all others; and they are what might be called the human or social-agency elements. The war has caused confusion, but it has brought about also new alignments. Let there be no mistake, this is the natural outcome of such a period of conflict upon political affiliations in the best sense as well upon the thinking of intelligent citizens. As a result of what men have fought for there is the emergence of a new thinking, the evidence of a new emphasis, of willingness on the part of men and women the wide country through, and of our Government, that the things that count are the things to be legislated upon first while the things that concern the material can take second place. This has not been a battle for land, or for any material thing; as has so often been said in the press, on the platform and in Parliament, it has been a battle of ideas, it has been a conflict of the spirit—the spirit of the right against the spirit of the wrong. And there is abundant evidence, to all eyes that are willing to see, in the programme which is suggestively set before us in the Address, of the recognition of the fact that the war has produced a greater willingness than ever before in the history of the country for government to legislate for the interests of all the people in building up a nation that will endure. I mention first, good housing. We may have our parish ideas about that. Some of us may naturally feel that we do not need any more good houses where we live, and that the Government is making a mistake. But then no one of us lives in all parts of the country at the same time. I suppose that even those who come from the West, if they were able to live longer in the East, might see some things here that it is hard for us to see on our hurried visits. And I am sure that if eastern Canadians were to spend more time in the West they too would find conditions other than they have supposed. The housing proposal of the Government is an evidence that the representatives of the Canadian people are keeping abreast of the other democratic members of the Allies—and they are all democratic.

The Government, wisely, and in due recognition of the sociological law and economic conditions, has proposed to bring down legislation to put into force for one year after peace is declared the terms of the Order in Council with regard to the prohibition of the manufacture and sale of intoxicating liquor. Let none of our people in Canada be afraid that Canada is going to be a back number in this respect. The back numbers among the nations are those who ignore the demands of the best thinking, the highest conception of the development of the life of the individual and of the state as a whole. And is our Government proposing to do anything that does not recognize to the fullest the right of every Canadian citizen to have a say in this matter? It is certainly intimated that after the soldiers are all home there shall be a vote taken on this question, that the Canadian people shall once more put themselves on record with regard to this important, this vital problem. And I trust when we do take up the proposed legislation in this Parliament, the Canadian people as a whole, while making use of the opportunity afforded in the publicity which may be induced, will not forget the fact that Canada stands next door to a very populous, prosperous and wealthy nation which has just taken a new stand, and that if we forget or ignore that condition it might mean that, instead of pros-

perity and individual freedom on a larger scale being ours, we should become the dumping ground of the worst elements and the worst type of business men that the North American continent could send through our open door.

The proposal for a Department of Public Health has been received with some words of commendation and some words of criticism. There are undoubtedly in this House many who believe that it might be possible to broaden the scope by changing the word from "Health" to "Welfare." But, even if the term "Health" is retained, there still may be possible the co-ordinating of a great many activities, agencies and officials to operate for the best interest of the people and the safeguarding of physical life in relation to coming demands to be made upon it. Let no hon. member of the Opposition imagine for one moment that some unpatriotic physician is looking for an easy task. I hope that some outstanding physician will have something very real to do with this Department when it is established. I am satisfied that the new department will benefit the little children and the older children as well, of our great cities and of all the districts of western Canada. Canada peopled by a foreign population, who if they knew how and were placed under more advantageous domestic conditions would do better for the little ones that come to their home, that come to them in such large numbers as a general thing.

If the schools of our country are to mean all that they should with regard to the mental development of the coming generation, the children of all the provinces of Canada need to be under the constant thought and regard of a great department which shall have a care for them and for all that concerns them as valuable assets of this country in the coming years.

Just a word as to the other social feature that stands out prominently in the Address—that is the proposed legislation in regard to vocational education. I am satisfied that a great deal needs to be done along this line for the young mechanics, and for the children of the older mechanics in our great industrial centres in connection with thoroughly modern and up-to-date instruction in night schools. I am satisfied that a million dollars a year or thereabouts will be a slight beginning in the right direction in order to meet the situation as it is today. We are already aiding agricultural education in a limited way. I venture to suggest, Sir, that at a very early date, possibly during this session, the Government should consider the advisability of widening its interest in, and its contribution to, the work of education.

If our material resources are to be developed as they should be by our Canadian people themselves in relation to the building up of a future great and good country, we, as a Canadian people, must have more provided for us in the way of technical education generally. Is it not rather a shame, Mr. Speaker, that at the present time one technical institution across the line in the great republic to the south of us has a larger yearly budget than the combined budgets of all the technical departments of our Canadian universities and technical schools from coast to coast.

This is not a purely provincial matter and I for one do not believe that the members of this House or the Canadian people are going to be afraid of any difficulties in connection with the British North America Act in relation to it. Let us have the splendid beginning that it is proposed to make in the interest of vocational education this year and let that give place to a larger, and increasingly generous and important programme for technical work in order that our young men and young women may have placed within their reach the possibility of securing instruction along lines that have been so splendidly organized and provided in the Motherland and that we too must provide in the immediate future if we are to meet the demands that will be made upon us in the days of expansion ahead. Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure in supporting the motion before the House and I am satisfied that the country will learn with satisfaction that measures are being introduced, and that legislation will be enacted, that are in the interests of the great body of returning heroes and in the interests of the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific.

Mr. JOSEPH E. S. D'ANJOU (Rimouski.) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to join the honourable members who have spoken before me, in expressing my humble but most earnest sympathy on the occasion of the demise of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whose whole life was identified with the noblest traditions of his race and whose disappearance from the political arena of Canada is so deeply regretted, not only by the whole province of Quebec but by the whole Dominion. In fact, he was the idol not only of the French Canadians, who acknowledged him as their best friend and their most zealous vindicator, but also of the English-speaking Canadians, who admired his genius, the broadness of his views

and his spirit of justice towards all the races inhabiting our beloved country.

The Liberal party in Canada has just lost, in Sir Wilfrid Laurier, the most illustrious and most respected of its chieftains; the province of Quebec, the greater and most distinguished of her sons, and Canada, the man who converted this colony, small though it were before 1896, into a happy and prosperous nation. Therefore, scarcely had the eminent and regretted chief of the Liberal party breathed his last when the people began to talk of erecting monuments to his memory on our public squares. Surely a monument will be erected in every part of the country to the memory of the man who was the greatest of us all. But at this very moment thousands and thousands of monuments are being erected in order to perpetuate the remembrance of the remarkable man who has been removed from our sight, and those monuments, Sir, are to be found in the heart of every Canadian worthy of the name and holding remembrance in veneration. Laurier is no more, but his shadow hovers forever in this House, whose chambers have so often resounded with his powerful and eloquent voice.

Laurier has not died entirely, his mind remains with us and will continue to inspire us so that we may always follow the path of honour and of justice from which he himself never deviated throughout his long and fruitful career. From beyond, our great fellow-citizen will keep his eyes on us, and will be pleased to witness that we are not giving up the good battles which he so gallantly fought during the whole of his life for the defence of the rights of the Canadian people, for, as it was written by Sully Prudhomme, "beyond the graves, the eyes which we have closed, do yet see."

The life of Laurier, made wholly of simplicity, honesty and untiring devotion to his country is, for us of the younger generation a model to be followed. Let us love our country, let us work for our country as Laurier did and we may bear witness to ourselves that we have been useful to Canada, our common country.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. They proved equal to the task and showed a spirit of true independence which bids well for the future. But while I am glad to congratulate the hon. members, I regret, Sir, not to be able to tender my compliments to the Government for having ignored the rights of His Majesty the French language in the present occurrence. Truly, there is no reason to justify their attitude and I protest with the utmost energy against such an outrage upon the rights of the French language in this House and in the Dominion. I may be told that there have been precedents. I care not. Precedents do not eliminate rights which were acquired and formally recognized and sanctioned. It is not a question of begging for justice, liberty and right, for the French language is one of the two official languages of this country, and as such must be respected. As the hon. Premier of Saskatchewan said in the course of a speech which he delivered before the legislative assembly of that province recently, the French language is the tongue which was used by the first inhabitants of this Dominion, by the missionaries who soaked its soil with their blood and opened this country to civilization and Christianity.

The Government had among its supporters a member who was perfectly qualified to second the Address in French. I mean the hon. member for Edmonton (Mr. Mackie), who would surely have appreciated the honour and would have fulfilled the task successfully. The language which they persecute and wish to see eliminated from this Parliament is nevertheless the language spoken by the great Marshal Foch and by the famous General Pau whom we had the privilege to greet here a few days ago, and by all the French poilus who, by their obstinate courage, have contributed more than any other to the preservation of civilization and liberty. It is also the language spoken by the famous 22nd French Canadian Battalion which won eternal fame at the front and whose splendid achievements there are innumerable. Moreover it is the language spoken by nearly three million Canadians, the inhabitants of this country who, though loyal subjects of the British crown are first of all, primarily and always Canadians, following the motto of our late lamented leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and respectful of the rights of other nationalities but mindful of their own, and ever ready to firmly require that they be recognized and respected.

While on this question, may I be permitted to read an extract from a letter addressed by one Mr. Phalen to the Ottawa Citizen recently, in which the writer made the following right observations on the failure of fanaticism:

> No wonder the educated class in Great Britain has given up the narrow idea of "one flag, one language, one school." They are nearer the horrible demonstrations than we are. The

Poles, the Zecho-Slovacks and the people of Alsace-Lorraine are not far from London; and to bring us still nearer, the British Parliament, in July last, adopted the principle of bilingualism for Scotland—a victory for the beautiful old gaelic language.

It will not be long before Canada finds itself all alone still clinging to the discredited policy of unilingualism "One flag, one language!" This sounds well until the time when you remember that in all the countries where it was applied, the "one flag" has given way to several flags and the number of languages has remained the same.

Five years ago, there were two or three flags in Europe, the preservation of which based on the suppression of a dozen languages. The flags are gone, but the languages have remained.

I wish, Mr. Speaker, to call the attention of this House, and of those who are now listening to me, to the pitiable expression on the faces of the hon. members opposite the other day, when the hero of 1870, the renowned General Pau honoured us with his visit.

That was another illustration of the merits of bilingualism, but unfortunately our friends on the other side were unable, on account of their ignorance of the French language, to appreciate the eloquent remarks made by the hon. member for Two Mountains (Mr. Ethier) on that occasion. As they thought probably that the hon. member was resuming his criticism of the Government, they dared not applaud the words of welcome addressed to the glorious wounded of 1870.

Once more, Mr. Speaker, as a member of this House and on behalf of the people whom I have the honour to represent here, I wish to be placed on record as protesting most energetically against the action of the Government, who, deliberately and without any justification renounced an old tradition and seriously impaired the rights of the French in this Parliament and the whole Dominion.

I do not intend to deal with all the matters mentioned in the Governor General's speech. For most of them were discussed on their merit and justly criticised.

However, I must say at once that I look askance at the new franchise measure enabling women to sit in Parliament. There may be found somewhere people who shall think that I am wanting in gallantry towards the ladies; that is of no consequence to me and will not alter my views.

Last year, when the bill enfranchising women was discussed, I gave my opinion upon the principle of the Bill and you may rest assured, Sir, that I still hold the same opinion. To-day as yesterday, I am utterly opposed to any dabbling in politics by women. They do not love their country those who invite them to exceed their attributes and who offer them an opportunity to enter the political arena. The passing of such a measure would necessarily and inevitably destroy harmony in Canadian homes. This is an unpatriotic measure and one detrimental to Canada, and I wish you to believe that I shall oppose it with all my might when it comes before the House for discussion.

The speech from the Throne is especially interesting on account of the matters which are not even mentioned. For instance, nothing is said concerning the policy of the Government as to the abolition of the censure which gags the press of this country. The retention of censure is a nameless outrage and the Government should not wait to be compelled to suppress it. In the name of outraged popular liberties and of all lovers of freedom, I beg the Government to do away at once with censure. With censure removed, we should also witness the ending of the shocking abuse of Orders in Council. For the present Government shall be known in after ages as having ruled by Orders in Council. During a single year, they have had the prodigious audacity to pass more Orders in Council than all the Governments who ruled the country since the time of Confederation up to 1916 had passed during that long period of time.

For more than four years they said war was waged in defence of democracy and freedom among nations. Canada also took part in that horrible struggle in order to ensure the victory of democracy against autocracy, of freedom against bondage, according to the disunion Government who rule the country by Orders in Council and through countless commissions. Notwithstanding which Sir, there is probably not a country in the world enjoying less freedom than Canada at the present time.

We have responsible government no longer and the most sacred rights of the people are trampled upon by a combination of men reflecting the acme of fanaticism and having but one aim: to oppress the people and to get rich at their expense.

The present Government committed enough encroachments to stir up ten revolutions in our country.

To rule the country by means of Orders in Council is an intolerable and revolting policy. However, that is what the Government has been doing since the last elections. They even passed many of them when Parliament was sitting. Such conduct fully savours of Hun methods and

deserves the reprobation of every honest man, of all those who are fond of freedom and would like to see it grow once more on Canadian soil.

I am desirous of calling attention to another encroachment, also a most serious one: the sending of our soldiers into the snow-bound mountains of Siberia. Have our present day potentates taken the advice of the people; have they consulted the Canadian Parliament before deciding upon such a course? No, Sir. As they always do, they disregarded the rights of the people and added another outrage to their record, disreputable as it was. And who are those that were sent in the distant regions of Siberia? Were volunteers enlisted for an expedition of that kind? No; poor conscripts were compelled to go to a place where the Military Service Act of 1917 was putting them under no obligation to go.

The conscription Act was passed in order to maintain our military strength at the front, that is in France. Consequently, the Government have no plausible reason to give in explanation of that silly military venture in Siberia. Such encroachments may involve the most serious consequences for our country. Surely the people will get tired at last and say at no distant date, appropriating to themselves the stinging reproach of Cicero to Catilina:—"How long, O! Borden, wilt thou take advantage of my forbearance?" Unfortunately, when we shall have reached that stage, it will be too late, and our self-styled Union Government having sown the wind will reap the tempest.

Among the hon. members who addressed this House, several raised the question of military defaulters. If you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, I shall say a few words on that very delicate matter.

If a few young men neglected to report for military duty, it is because they thought they would be more useful to their country and to the Allied cause in doing so. Most of them were farmers or sons of farmers. They believed it was better for them to remain here and work on the land, thus contributing to the success of the Allies in supplying them with food which they needed so much to feed their soldiers. The tillers of the soil played an important and praiseworthy part throughout that dreadful war which, thank God, culminated in a complete victory for our armies. Therefore the Government ought to show themselves more lenient toward the defaulters and pardon them all with a full amnesty. After all, these men were not altogether wrong in remaining on the land to work, in order to supply the Allies with food, as the hon. Minister of Public Works stated in his speech on the Address that, in 1917, the transportation of agricultural products was more useful than that of soldiers. These products were obtained through the exertions of these young men, who thought they were also helping the cause of the Allies in digging trenches in the ground to reap larger crops and prevent our soldiers from dying with hunger.

As a member of this House and representing a county, which supplied hundreds of volunteers, two of whom were awarded the Victoria Cross, I beg the Government to stop persecuting the defaulters and to grant them peace henceforth.

However, Mr. Speaker, there are people in this country whom the Government ought to punish, and their reason for abstaining is probably that they are nearly related to them. The men whom the Government ought to punish, either by a fine or imprisonment, are not the defaulters or deserters, but the profiteers, who enriched themselves here during the war, while our boys were giving their lives in Europe in defence of liberty and civilization. Those men like Flavelle and many others whose names I forget just now, were selling their "bacon" and all their goods at exorbitant prices, exploiting the people and reaping the profits, while, over there, our poor soldiers many a time were starving and giving their blood and making the supreme sacrifice for the triumph of civilization and democracy. I believe those are the individuals whom the Government ought to punish. Perhaps the jails would not be large enough to keep them all. Instead of obtaining titles and peerages for them, the Government should rather send them to the penitentiary for a few years at least, if not for the remainder of their lives.

The present Government assumes on all occasions the attitude of a benefactor, of a friend and a father to the soldiers, to those who went voluntarily and fought on the soil of France and shed their blood with the poilus to ensure the triumph of democracy over autocracy. This Government, while pretending to patronize the young men who, volutarily and without the need of a coercive measure, went and fought on the battle fields, either do not know what is going on, or their organization is defective.

In the county of Rimouski, one of the counties which supplied the largest number of volunteers in the Quebec district, we glory in having two soldiers who fought

with such bravery that they were awarded the Victoria Cross. Among others in the city of Rimouski, there is a family which gave three sons voluntarily to the war. One of them was killed; the two others were wounded. One of the three is back from the front and the Government saw fit to give him some kind of a job. They appointed him caretaker of the armoury at Rimouski. This man who is married and has one child gets a salary of $45 a month, along with a monthly pension of $5. Up to now, the young man did not complain, but to-day the Government informs him that if he does not carry on the work for $10 a month, the position will be given to somebody else. However the brave boy is completely disabled and unable to earn a living as he used to do before enlisting.

I belive, Sir, that a Government who, as we know, secured power by exalting the patriotism of our soldiers, who promised everything to them, who used to say in this Parliament as well as on the hustings that there was nothing too good and too fine for our returned soldiers, ought to care a little more now for these men who left voluntarily and did their utmost, many of whom have sacrificed their lives or have returned incapacitated forever, thus being unable to resume their pre-war activities.

The other day, the hon. Acting Prime Minister told us that the War-time Election Act may be expected to remain on our statute books. I take it, Sir, that this Act is the most iniquitous piece of legislation that was ever imposed by a Government on any country in the world. It has enabled the Government and the party in office to steal the elections, and it is the most bare-faced robbery that was ever perpetrated or recorded in history. They have disfranchised Canadians who have been living in the country for fifteen or twenty years, who had been invited to this country by the former Government, who had been granted letters of naturalisation and upon whom had, at the same time, responsibilities and rights had been conferred. And not the least among the rights was the franchise. Those men had perhaps cast their votes at several elections, but because they were of German or Austrian extraction, and the Government thought they would record their vote for the Opposition, they have been disfranchised.

Now the war is over—perhaps too soon to the liking of our hon. friends on the other side who would have rather see it protracted—but, after all, it is an accomplished fact; peace is about to be signed and this Government who were returned to power only for the war, should repeal all the Acts passed for the duration of the war. I take it therefore that the Government is recreant to its duty in letting that Act remain on our statute books. But what can we expect from a Government composed of men who have banded together not for winning the war, but for winning the elections and making money. What else could be expected from a Government who have climbed into office by the means we are all aware of and who will leave no stone unturned to get a new lease of power. Mr. Speaker, all the speeches we have listened to from the hon. gentlemen on the other side were so many appeals to union and harmony in this country. It is all very well to appeal to union but it would be still better to put it into practice, and if those hon. gentlemen are sincere in their professions and really wish peace, harmony and concord to revive here, let them take the means of realising it. Let us put a stop to that campaign of fanaticism and hatred that is being carried on in Canada; let the different ethnical elements of our population come to a better understanding, if we want peace to prevail in our Canadian homes. If we want the unrest referred to by the hon. Minister of Public Works which really exists in this country to disappear and peace and quiet to be restored, let the Government give up administering the country by Order in Council. Let grievances be redressed and liberty have full sway, if we want our country to resume its march onward towards a bright future, and to work out its destinies and occupy the place it is entitled to in the council of nations. That state of things should cease, and as the late hon. Mr. Mercier said: "Let us put a stop to our fratricidal wrangles," and we ought to remember that we are all Canadians, whatever may be our extraction. Loyal as we are to British institutions, we love above all Canada, and it is the duty of members of Parliament, of those who exercise some influence over their fellow countrymen to preach that doctrine and especially to put it into practice. And to the men who will have devoted themselves to that task the country will owe a debt of gratitude.

There are some Ontario people who understand us. There should be more. There are also some to be found in the other provinces, but let us all realise that before being French, English or Scotch, we are Canadians, and that through love of our country it is our duty not to arouse religion or national animosities, and not to

revive the conflicts of the past by heated appeals to racial and creed prejudices. Let the policy of our revered chieftain who has passed away, a policy of peace and harmony which he advocated in his lifelong career, but which he did not see brought to realization, triumph and be carried out.

Let us hope that in the great beyond he may see in a near future all the citizens of every race and religion joining together in an united effort, clasping hands and working together for the happiness and prosperity of our common country, Canada.

On motion of Mr. Michael Clark the debate was adjourned.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 11, respecting The Central Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. McMaster.

Bill No. 12, respecting W. C. Edwards & Company, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 13, respecting The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Morphy.

Bill No. 14, respecting The Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway Company.—Mr. Lemieux.

Bill No. 15, respecting The Western Dominion Railway Company.—Mr. Morphy.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Burrell the House adjourned at 10.50 p.m. until Thursday.

Thursday, March 6, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

List of persons permitted to take intoxicating liquors into the Northwest Territory during the year ended December 31, 1918; Statement showing land sold by the Canadian Pacific Railway during the year ended 30th September, 1918; Annual report of the Department of Indian Affairs for the year ended March 31st, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Copy of correspondence between the Secretary of State for the Colonies and His Excellency the Governor-General relating to the gift of two submarines to the Canadian Government.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Report of the Committee appointed under Order in Council to examine into the conditions of the Printing Bureau.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

BANKRUPTCY ACT.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General): Moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 18 respecting bankruptcy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. GUTHRIE: The principle of this Bill is embodied in a somewhat similar Bill introduced in this House last session. That Bill was referred to a Special Committee of members of the House, which Committee dealt with the subject somewhat exhaustively, and reported a measure to the House, but at a time when the session had so far advanced that it was impossible to make further progress. The present Bill embodies very largely the same principle which was contained in the former Bill, which in the interval has been pretty generally distributed among the various commercial and mercantile associations. There are one or two radical changes in the present measure which I would like to have the opportunity of elaborating to the House when the Bill comes up for its second reading.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

ALLEGED TRADE DISCRIMINATIONS AGAINST CANADA.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Preliminary to asking the Government a question I desire to draw attention to two cablegrams which appeared in the Montreal Star, the first in the issue of February 4, in these terms:

> London, March 4.—Sir George Perley, at the luncheon inaugurating the tour of the Canadian officers to the industrial centres in England, organized by the Federation of British Industries, urged this most powerful Imperial commercial body to use its influence to obtain changes in trade restrictions in order to allow Canada equal opportunities with other nations.
>
> He gave the impression that there was no intention on the part of the authorities to favour the United States or Japan. The regulations, however, were not working as expected, and many protests are now being made to bring about a speedy change.

The second cablegram appeared in the Montreal Star of March 5th in these terms:

> London, March 5.—A deputation of British M.P.'s, members of the Unionist Business Committee, which influences about one hundred votes in the House of Commons, made strong representations yesterday to the president of the Board of Trade respecting practical discrimination against the Canadian manufacturers in the present working of the British import restrictions.
>
> The deputation strongly emphasized that by granting import licenses to United States goods, which were denied the Canadian manufacturers, the British officials were running directly counter to the policy of Empire preference, as formerly adopted by the Imperial War Cabinet.
>
> Lord Shaughnessy, who returns to Canada on Saturday, in discussing the question with the

Star representative, said he had no belief in a trade that comes as a result of sentiment. Canadians were ready to go into the open market and face competition. That is the only road to success.

But Canadians have the right to expect, all things being equal, that goods should be ordered by Britain from the Dominion overseas in preference to other countries. This was not asking favours, but fair play.

Lord Shaughnessy added that he had no knowledge of any strong reason in favour of the present practical discrimination. " The whole thoughts of the British people, in Parliament and outside, seem centred in home affairs, and fail utterly to grasp the existence of a great Empire and what it means," he concluded.

I desire to inquire whether the Government continues to be without information on the subject referred to in these two cablegrams, and, if not, whether such information as the Government has received will be imparted to the House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, when the matter referred to was first drawn to my attention on February 27, I despatched this cablegram to Sir George Perley:

"Despatch in yesterday's Montreal *Gazette* from London stating that Harris and Jones have protested to Lloyd George against discrimination by Great Britain against Canada in favour of United States and neutral countries. Please take up matter and cable me particulars of discrimination and what protest has been made and by whom."

To this the following reply has been received from Sir George Perley:

"Have telephoned Harris who knows nothing of interview. Jones is on the ocean. Harris wrote you fully February 14th regarding restrictions under license system."

As to information in the possession of the Government on this important matter, I desire to say—as I intimated, I think, upon the last occasion on which I spoke with respect to it in the House—that the Prime Minister, Sir George Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, and Mr. Lloyd Harris, have been in continuous touch with the heads of important departments, and the chairmen of important committees, with regard to this general question of trade restrictions. As I stated the other day, it has not been intimated to me in the many communications which I have received, that there is any discrimination. Further than that I have no information. The question undoubtedly arises out of the system of restrictions of import licenses which Great Britain, for reasons which appeared wise to her, has recently adopted, and which sometime ago were publicly announced. Should any further information bearing upon the subject come to my attention I shall be glad to make communication to the House.

[Mr. Murphy.]

GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): I would like to refer to a matter of some importance connected with a document I have just laid on the Table, which is the report of a committee of experts appointed to inquire into the conditions of the Printing Bureau. I direct attention to this matter because this morning's paper contains nearly a couple of columns concerning a meeting held by the employees of the Bureau last night. I desire to say that there have been various matters under discussion between the employees of the Bureau and the Minister of the Department, which have been looked into from time to time, but which have not yet been dealt with in their entirety because a year ago last March an Order in Council was passed suggesting that the conditions at the Bureau were so complicated that it was deemed necessary in the interest of the country to have a committee of experts appointed to examine into those conditions with a view to efficiency and economy. That report was only recently received, and it was laid before the Government by the Civil Service Commission who were empowered to make the appointments. The report was placed in the hands of a sub-committee of the council, who now have it under consideration and the employees of the bureau were informed by the King's Printer of this. Having in view the nature of that report—which was to the effect that in various branches of the bureau there was such great inefficiency and such an amount of overmanning in the service, and that the cost of the whole operations of the bureau were so excessive—it seemed to me impossible, and I so directed the King's Printer to inform the men, that the minister could recommend to the Government, or that the Government could take any action at the present moment, in respect to either adjustments of wages, or hours of employment, or the settling of any grievances, until the report had been fully considered by the Government. The Government now has it under consideration; in the meantime, I have laid the report on the table of the House.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East), for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in

reply to his speech at the opening of the session resumed from Tuesday, March 4th.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I should satisfy neither my conscience nor my heart if I participated in this debate without at least a brief reference to the passing of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, notwithstanding the ample justice that has already been done to his memory.

Sir Wilfrid's position in the life of Canada was so unique and so unapproachable that the suddenness of his death struck the entire nation like a cataclysm of nature.

I have mourned in my time with two entire peoples. Nearly twenty years ago the people of the United Kingdom assembled day by day to sympathize at the bedside of William Ewart Gladstone during a lingering and painful illness. It is equally true that on that fateful 16th of February, just passed, the whole of Canada and millions beyond her bounds came by common consent to wait until the end, by the bedside of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Not since I saw Gladstone pass for the last time from Westminster Hall have I witnessed such a tribute as Canada paid a little over a week ago to her mighty dead, and I shall never look on such a spectacle again.

There were striking parallels between Gladstone and Laurier. Each was a remarkable man to look upon, and in both, external form bore an exact proportion to internal qualities. Each was the foremost orator of his nation,—one would not be far wrong, perhaps, if one said, of his time. Both had that which was so well characterized by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) as the indefinable something called personality. Both had a generous and unsurpassed general culture. Both had tremendous versatility of talents, and these various qualities gave to both in an unexampled degree the almost slavish loyalty of their followers and in an unexampled degree also the unstinted admiration of entire nations. Both were favoured by Heaven with the greatest of its gifts: a happy home life. While, of course, our sympathy goes out unstintedly to Lady Laurier, I am not at all sure, Sir, that she is not deserving of receiving equally our admiration for the magnificent courage with which she supported her helpmate in life throughout his entire activities and followed him to the last moment when she could look upon what was left of him above the ground.

And so these men stand out before us and will stand out in history as the exemplars of a full-orbed manhood.

I will permit myself one word more about Sir Wilfrid. I do not think I should be far wrong, Sir, if I claimed that the remarkable attachment of his fellow-countrymen to him was produced more by his qualities of heart than by any other of his great achievements or characteristics. Some one has said that disposition is more than intellect. Burns states the same thought inimitably when he says:

> The heart ay's the part ay
> That makes us right or wrang.

And a higher authority than Burns tells us that "out of the heart are the issues of life." It was the characteristics of this great heart of a great man that attracted people to him. He had that simplicity of heart without which, Macaulay says in his essay on Chatham, there can be no real, true greatness of character. That simplicity was nowhere more manifest than in his wonderful hospitality in his own house. I think he was a man possessed of the truest hospitality that I have ever met—the truest hospitality for this reason: that he possessed in a degree I cannot remember in any other man of his class the power of making the visitor feel as easy as that visitor would have felt if he had been in his own house. Sheer human kindness was the quality of his heart. I have seen him, Mr. Speaker, when he did not know a human eye was upon him, give a moment of the time of the Prime Minister of this great Dominion, which is as valuable as gold, to pat upon the head and suffuse with blushes and smiles the face of a little child, causing one to think that he could only do it because he had himself the heart of a little child.

And he had that great quality of heart, magnanimity. He once said to me: you cannot afford to have resentment in politics. The House will forgive me, perhaps, for mentioning that I myself had a touching evidence of the fact that he remembered his creed—when I had the misfortune, with thousands of others, of losing a son in the war last September, quite the kindest and most perfect letter I received amongst many scores of letters was written by Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

He is gone, and we in this House know, perhaps better than it can be known elsewhere, what a gap he has left. He was happier than Gladstone in the manner of his death. He died as he would have wished to die—quickly, suddenly. It was as if he marched up to the gates of the Beyond with the same stately tread with which he had

walked his whole pathway, and it requires no great amount of imagination to catch the voice coming to him: Enter, grand, old warrior, veteran of a hundred fights; good and faithful servant, as thou hast served most thy Crown will be of the brightest.

It is a relief to the mind to think with a feeling of profound thankfulness that we have, in the mover and the seconder of the Address, evidence that all that was best and brightest in Canada did not remain in France and Flanders. Our losses there were very heavy. Fifty-five thousand young men taken from a country like Canada is a terrific toll upon our much needed manhood. We should be the more thankful that we have in the mover and the seconder representatives of that much larger body of Canadians who have come or are coming back, upon whom more than anybody else, perhaps, the Canada of the next generation depends. I join with the other members who have spoken in congratulating them upon their ability and also upon their achievements. It is pleasant to look on lives so full already of performance and so full of promise for the future.

It has, in the course of this debate, became a trite remark that we meet under different circumstances from those under which we met for the last session of Parliament. We have reached the end of the war—at least, it is hoped so. I do not see the possibilities of an immediate revival in any of the Central powers for war purposes. Now that we have reached the end of the war, I want to claim for Union Government a place which I believe history will give it in increasing degree, and for the Government that preceded the Union Government: that they knew from the beginning and until the end what their objective was; they knew the difficulties, and they did not shrink by one hair's breadth from the sacrifices that were necessary to reach that objective. When men go about an objective in that spirit, with the right cause and with the blessing of divine Providence, they are very likely to reach it. And it is a matter of profound congratulation that we, to-day, in Canada stand right abreast with the Allies, having reached our objective. How complete was the victory of the Allies is illustrated by two incidents. It was a remarkable spectacle, there has been no such spectacle, I think, in the history of the world as to see the Kaiser leaving his own country by the back-door, so to speak; to see him of the shining armour, him of the flaming sword, him of the mailed fist, going cap in hand for security and asylum to one of those little nations that just by accident escaped being one of the nations which his great nation had crushed at the beginning of the war. That was, I think, a complete enough victory for the most revengeful of mankind. But if we needed more satisfaction for our feelings, I think it was afforded on that day when into a Scottish port—Scotland was sure to be around when there was anything to be picked up for nothing—there sailed, like a few summer canoes, all that remained of the German fleet, while every German on that fleet gave silent assent to the old song: Britannia Rules the Waves.

Canada's participation in the production of these results was early; it was ample; it was continuous, and it was there at the very end. The Princess Pat's were the first colonial regiment to put their foot upon the soil of France, and when they wanted troops to lay the foundations for the breaking of the Hindenburg line, they specially trained the Canadian troops for the purpose. And on that second of September—a date which some of us have good cause to remember—there could not be a Canadian heart that did not swell with pride when he read of the fight in which the Drocourt-Queant switch fell before the onslaught of a detachment of the British army which was composed largely of Canadians, and the Hindenburg line crumbled from that moment.

Reference has been made again and again to the fact that our men were in Mons at the end, recalling to us the fall of Mons early in the beginning of the war.

I should like, Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted, to offer every man in this House with French blood in his veins my gratulations that these magnificent results and achievements of the Allied armies were brought about under a commander who has added one more shining name to the long list of the illustrious marshals of France. I should like to point a moral which I think this circumstance is calculated to carry to the minds of all of us. If one compares Foch with Hindenburg, it is a case, almost, of comparing mind with matter. That comparison is sufficiently suggestive to remind us that after all the subtle and imponderable influences of mind and spirit, the powers behind right are greater in this world and surer to prevail than the forces behind mere physical power. I hope I have laid well to heart the philosophy of the lines:

> The moving finger writes and, having writ,
> Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
> Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
> Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

There is little to be gained by fighting over again past political battles, but I want just at this point to claim that the conscriptive draft which brought about such a change in the political condition in Canada, did three things for Canada and for the world.

In the first place, at a crucial moment in those fortunes and in the history of the war, the general election held on the draft was decided in such a way that Canada's voice went to the hearts of friends and foes alike as the voice of a people who knew what business they were about, knew its tragic and drastic nature, and knew how to stay with that business until the end.

In the second place, the draft enabled my hon. friend the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) to stand in the great heart of the Mother Country, in the city of London and tell our own people, as he told the people of the Old Country, that every Canadian battalion was going into those last fierce fights at full strength. That is not a thing for which Canada has any apologies to make or regret to express. There is not a man in this House who in his heart is not proud to join with me in congratulating the country and the Government that that was the case.

In the third place the draft to my knowledge enabled the Government to bring home earlier than they otherwise could have done numbers of weary, war-worn sons who had been in this fight since the very beginning, and who in other circumstances would have been nursed to go back to the fighting line when they were not fit for it. I am content to leave to history, just at that point, the political battles of Canada for the last few years.

And now we come to a new era. We come to what is being referred to almost ad nauseam as the period of reconstruction. Well, it would be impossible for me, Sir, to contemplate that period for a moment without remembering that I am one of those who are sometimes referred to as Liberal-Unionists, and who were referred to by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) the other evening as "separated brethren." On this side of the House we have been content for a year and a half to know ourselves as Unionists. In fact we came very near being a united Canada a year ago last December. But I cannot overlook an invitation that was first extended to us by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), whom I congratulate upon an eminence to which he has attained by the possession of many excellent qualities—and perhaps a little by some even of his faults. I am nearly sure he looked straight at me when he gave that invitation, and I should feel myself guilty of rudeness if I did not respond to it. At the same time, however, that we received an invitation to go, my hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) extended to us an invitation to stay. Well, this is extremely flattering, but slightly embarrassing. I am sure I do not look the part but I never felt so much like a coy young lady with two ardent suitors, and I think it is the part of the coy young lady in the meantime to continue for a little the double courtship, and not to run the risk of those who marry in haste of falling upon a swift and disastrous divorce.

There are several things implied in the invitation coming from the other side of the House. In the first place, it would seem to imply a belief on the part of hon. gentlemen opposite that we took the wrong road in our national history a year and a half ago. Well, we do not admit that. I associate myself most fully with my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder), who, in that excellent speech he delivered to the House the other day, said that he had always had the support of his conscience in what he had done, and he did not confess to being at all a sinner in the matter. We do not admit that we took the wrong road, and if hon. gentlemen opposite are suffering from a delusion of that kind I should just like to argue the point with them—and I never saw my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition in such a condition in this House that he was not prepared to argue any point on which he did not agree with me. I would argue it in this way: I would just put to them one simple and pointed question: If Great Britain, if France, if the United States, if Italy, had pursued the war by the method which found favour on the benches opposite—I shall not characterize it otherwise—would it have been over now? If it would not have been over, it would still be going on. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition will not dispute that proposition. But then, if it had been going on because a wrong method of prosecuting it was followed, upon whose shoulders would have been the blame for the extra loss of life and treasure? I always like to defend the course of my action on grounds of logic, and I take it that that is a fair attempt at logic anyhow. I am almost sorry that the leader of the Opposition has already spoken, because he always tries to be logical—whatever his success may be.

Now that is the first implication in the invitation of hon. gentlemen opposite, and what is their second? It is not only implied in this invitation that we took the

wrong road, but it is very freely implied, and indeed it is stated, that we left Liberalism.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I think I hear a mild "Hear, hear" from an hon. gentleman opposite. Well, if the point I have already made has anything in it, it would be so much the worse for Liberalism. But did we leave Liberalism? Whence have we to derive our Liberal traditions? It would be no use asking my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy), who takes an intimate and well-informed interest in old country politics, to derive any inspiration from Mr. Lloyd George, because I am quite sure that Mr. Lloyd George does not possess a particle of his confidence; but surely the case of Mr. Asquith is different with him, and Mr. Asquith was at the head of the Government in the old country which introduced compulsory military service there. I differed from my hon. friends opposite on the question of compulsory military service; I also differed from them, and was almost alone on that side of the House in that respect, on the question of the extension of Parliament. But Mr. Asquith was responsible for several extensions of Parliament in the old country.

He protested against an election up to the end of the war, and kept on protesting against an election even in the early days of reconstruction. So, after all, if I have fallen from the grace of Liberalism I have fallen in very good company, for I still have the company of Mr. Asquith and the entire Liberal party of Great Britain—and that is not a bad record for a Liberal who was raised in the atmosphere of British Liberalism. We do not admit that we left Liberalism—not for one moment.

There is a third thing implied in this invitation that has been extended to us from the opposite benches, and that is that we should turn to those on this side who were formerly known as Conservatives and say to them, at this moment in our country's history: We joined you amidst the storm, the strain and stress of a danger the most violent that ever threatened the world; we have weathered the storm with you; now that the sky is clearing and the sun is peeping out again, without a moment's hesitation or notice, we take leave of you. Would hon. gentlemen opposite respect us if we took that course at this moment? We are not built that way. We left our friends opposite for what we believed to be the national good, which the old poet Virgil described as the noblest motive that could guide the citizens of any country. And when we make another alignment it will be because that same guiding star leads us. We joined these others, and if we can we will stay—if we cannot stay we will leave, but always for the good of our country. That is our Liberalism.

There is another implication—and it would be a most important one if there was anything in the invitation to go over—and that is that there is something to go over to.

Mr. McMASTER: The portfolios are all on the other side.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I did not catch my hon. friend's remark.

Mr. McMASTER: You say you have nothing to come over to. I say, the portfolios are all on the other side.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I have no portfolio. And I did not say even that I have nothing to go to. I said there was an implication that there was something to go to—I was stating the opinion of my hon. friend, not my own. He had better not reply to mine until he hears it; he might show less temerity after hearing it. I have tried to image to myself that little home shack that my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition drew to our attention, with the latch, and the string, and the light. I followed the description, for I listened carefully to every word of my hon. friend's speech. I am bound to say, having regard to that speech from the point of view of constructive ideas or political policy, that I think he ought to have added to his figure—when he told us that the lamp was burning in the kitchen and the string was on the outside of the door, he ought to have added the warning: "Bring your own provisions."

Now, I ask any hon. gentleman on either side of this House to read the speech of my hon. friend if he has forgotten it and to find out what constructive planks of Liberalism were set forth in that speech. Why, Sir, there is far from being a fatted calf awaiting those who return.

Little Mary was rich by comparison, for she at least had a little lamb.

What was the main feature of my hon. friend's speech? It was: Why does not the Government do something? He seemed to find some complaining tones in the speeches of the mover and seconder of the Address, and he asked: Why does not the Government do something? That was not a new cry on his part. We on this side can remember him saying that same thing at

any time when it occurred to him while the war was on. He demanded to know why the former Minister of Labour (Mr. Crothers) did not do something. I suppose that hon. gentlemen pleased him in the end,—he left his portfolio to some one else. Why does not the Government do something, was his plaint during 1917. And the Government did something; they brought in the Military Service Act during that session. Then the hon. gentleman changed his question to: Why in the world did you do it? On this side of the House hon. gentlemen did not want to have an election; they thought it was not good for the country. I was alone on the benches opposite in supporting that view. The Conservatives on this side of the House were the true Liberals according to the Asquith view, for they did not want to distract the country with an election during war time. The hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) said: Why don't you do something; have an election anyway. Well, he had his election, and no doubt while that election was going on, down on the rocky coast of Cape Breton he repeated his plaint to the sad sea waves: Why doesn't the Government do something? Surely, they did plenty during the election; I believe my hon. friend himself only held his seat by the skin of his teeth. And now we re-assemble in the second session of the new Parliament, and again he says: Why doesn't the Government do something? Why does not he tell the Government some of the things he would do? Has he done what every fair opponent should do—and I do not wish to attribute unfairness to my hon. friend; he has been extremely good-tempered and well-conditioned in his new position—has he informed himself of what the Government is doing? Was it nothing to do, as I have said, to stand by the Allied forces until the end? Do these hon. gentlemen opposite think that these shiploads of men are being brought with unexampled rapidity overseas, demobilized and sent to their homes, without the Government doing something? Is he informed as to what the Government are doing in the noble and God-like work of looking after the maimed and the blind, and fitting for new occupations many who can never work at their old trades again? I cannot recall that the hon. gentleman in his speech even gave us an opinion on what the Government proposes to do as outlined in the speech from the Throne. I may be doing him an injustice, but I cannot recall that he said a word about building ships, about constructing roads, about building houses for our people. I am not now either commending or condemning these various projects; but at least when the Government is taking these new departures in the life of the nation and making these proposals, it is not in order to come and say: Why does not the Government do something?

Now, my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), who made an interruption just now the relevance of which I fail even yet to see, furnished us with a kind of plank. He made some considerable reference to the tariff, and indicated, what I am very glad to know, that he has low-tariff ideas. Well, I will say to my hon. friend that, portfolio or no portfolio for me, or for him in the future, he had better get busy and instruct his own leader about the tariff. I have been in this House for ten years with the leader of the Opposition; I have listened to nearly all the speeches he ever made and I cannot remember ever having heard him say "tariff". He probably has done so but this is a subject that he fought shy of. There is a reason and my hon. friend from Brome knows it. He will not get up in his place now and assert that there is quite the enthusiasm for tariff reform manifested in the speech of the leader of the Opposition that there was in his own speech. On the question of the tariff, in my humble judgment—and I have tried to inform myself—those who represent what was formerly the Liberal party occupy a less advanced position than did the whole Liberal party of a quarter of a century ago, so far as their policy has been stated up to the present time. What was the policy of the Liberal party over twenty years ago? I think I can state it from an authority that will not be disputed. I want to give a few extracts, if I am permitted, from some speeches delivered in the year 1893 or between 1893 and 1896, and that is just about a quarter of a century ago:

> I submit to you that the ideal fiscal system is the British system of free trade.

That was a statement of the policy of the party that would at once have attracted all British Liberals under its banner.

> "Let it be well understood that from this moment we have a distinct issue with the party in power. Their ideal is protection; our ideal is free trade.
>
> "I come to expose to you the policy of the Liberal party. Let me tell you that the policy may be summed up in the good Saxon word 'Freedom,' in every sense of the term—freedom of speech, freedom of action, freedom of religious life and civil life, and last, not least, freedom in commercial life."

"I denounce to you the policy of protection as bondage; yes, bondage, and I refer to bondage in the same manner as American slavery was bondage; not in the same degree, perhaps, but in the same manner. In the same manner the people of this country, the inhabitants of the city of Winnipeg especially, are toiling for a master, who takes away, not every cent of profit, but a very large percentage, a very great portion of your earnings for which you toil and sweat."

That was the official statement of the policy of the Liberal party given more than twenty years ago by an authority that no one can dispute. Is that their policy to-day? My hon. friends opposite are silent. Is that the policy of the hon. member for Brome?

An hon. MEMBER: Yes.

Mr. CLARK: But my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) said that he was in favour of tariff for revenue. He is a product not of a quarter of a century ago but of the intervening period when the policy which had formerly been enunciated was lost sight of or not pursued with any great degree of enthusiasm. Now, I mention this as showing that I was rightly informed when I stated that the invitation of hon. gentlemen opposite implied that there was something to come to.

As a matter of simple fact, Mr. Speaker—and this is a statement which I make very deliberately and of set purpose, and it is important that it should be made in this period of the history of Canada—the great majority of the people of that part of Canada from which I come have been able to see, in the history of the last twenty-five years, very little difference, if any, between the records and performances of the two parties. Difference in profession there has been but in performance there has been very little difference and the sooner that it is authoritatively stated, so far as I have the authority derived from constant observation to state it, the better. That is the view of a large majority of the people of western Canada.

Mr. McMASTER: What about reciprocity?

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend, of course, and I, supported reciprocity. We did not get a chance of performing on it. But, has not the present Government performed on it; has it not given free wheat and free potatoes; so that, as I hinted, the profession was on the one side and the performance on the other.

Mr. PEDLOW: May I may be permitted to interrupt the hon. gentleman? I would like to know——

Mr. CLARK: My hon. friend has already spoken in this debate at considerable length. I listened to him for an hour and a quarter without interruption and I must ask him—although I do not want to be discourteous—to give me time to get out of the way for another fellow. I do not want to go at any great length, or at any length at all, into the programme which the Government has put before us. But I would like to be permitted to lay down what I conceive to be important principles that ought to guide us irrespective of all party names in the very serious work of trying to "reconstruct" Canada—if you will allow the word. Mr. Speaker, I am afraid, from the speeches to which I have just made reference, that hon. gentlemen opposite are more concerned about the reconstruction of a party than about the reconstruction of the country; I am afraid so. I wish I could think it otherwise, but there has been a good deal of evidence that that is their frame of mind. That was the meaning of the invitation to which I have referred at such great length.

We, on this side of the House I claim, are more concerned about the reconstruction of the country, and let me say to my hon. friends opposite that there is no earthly chance of their getting the high encomiums and support of the people of this country until they change their policy if I have rightly diagnosed and described it. In the months and years immediately ahead of us, the first principle of reconstruction that I would lay down is, that we ought to endeavour to keep up the same patriotic fervour as we displayed during the war. If it was then worth while getting fervid about sending our sons by the hundred thousands across the seas to fight for great principles and to fight for liberty, it is worth our while in Canada surely to be equally fervid about fighting and struggling for the good of our own country.

And, let me say at this point, that I think we ought to cultivate the sacrificial spirit of the men who went across the seas—we ought to cultivate the spirit of those men. Mr. Speaker, there is a frightful moral chasm between nearly all of us who stayed at home and enjoyed in varying degrees the prosperity of war times, and those boys who went across the seas to die, if need be, for $1.10 a day. They have done their work. It is now up to us, as civilians, to do ours; and if, for the rest of our lives, we have to make sacrifices in this country from the humblest workman to the richest plutocrat—if we have to make sacrifices of the very strongest and most drastic kinds—

our shrinking flesh should suffer all that is coming to us in that regard.

With that spirit of sacrifice should go the spirit of helpfulness, and here I would like to make an appeal to my hon. friends opposite. I do not intend to specify members, but there have been hon. members opposite who seemed to me to have pursued an unworthy line of talk in this House. One wonders what is their motive in saying words here which can possibly arouse discontent among our returned boys and their relatives. Some one talked about Canadians having been made a spearhead in the recent war. Why, Sir, that is surely an unworthy thing to suggest. I have met lots of men from the trenches, the best of the world's manhood, and I have not found that in the trenches there was the slightest jealousy, or envy, or rivalry between the sons of Canada, and the sons of Ireland, Scotland, and England. I have not found anything but unstinted praise on the part of Canadian soldiers for what Tommy Atkins did in the war, and I am perfectly sure that Tommy Atkins has been equally generous to Canadians. I should be glad for the sake of the fair name of our country, that there was no more oratory of that particular kind. I do not for a moment fear the political consequences of such talk, because no one will be quicker than our returned men to recognize that there might be just a shade of suspicion about such solicitude expressed in such terms by men, who, to say the least of it, were not too enthusiastic to keep these same men, when in the fighting line, from being overrun by the Huns. I do not think it will be easy to infuse a doubt into the minds of returned men as to the willingness of those for whom they voted in such numbers in the last election,—because they knew that they were behind them in this fight without a doubt, and to the finish—I do not think it will be easy to infuse a doubt into those minds as to who is willing to do the best, the very best that the country's resources will allow us to do, for these men now that they have come back to our shores.

Now, if I might, I would like to say to the Government, and to the members of this House, irrespective of the side upon which they sit, that I think those of us who really want to face reconstruction intelligently and wisely, should be prepared to remind ourselves, and our entire people, that the great problem of reconstruction is a world in debt,—not a nation only, but a world in debt. That is the problem that to-day faces us and all the belligerent countries. And I think that if we can keep that in mind it will modify the relationships between parties in this House, it will modify the asperity of the criticism which we might be inclined to heave at the heads of the Government when they are not doing what we think they ought to do. It will modify the attitude of the various classes of the community in presenting the claims of their particular class upon the Government and Parliament of the country; it will modify the strength of the application of men for an immediate raise in their salaries; it will help our national life all round, and will help to our higher and better citizenship if we can keep it continually in mind that the nation and the world are for the moment heavily in debt.

If I were to venture to undertake to say a word of advice to the Government, I should say that they would be wise if they avoided palliatives and half-measures; they would try as Parliament ought to help them to try, to get down to the roots of things, and to look for a period—which perhaps we have not quite arrived at yet,—when we shall undoubtedly have industrial depression and great economic and national difficulties to face. I do not think there is the remotest doubt about that. If we do not have it, Mr. Speaker, then history has taught me nothing about the economic consequences of war.

I am not going, as I said before, to mention in detail the measures referred to in the Speech, and I am at least to that extent following the example of my hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition. The legislation with respect to roads, and these other matters that I have spoken of, it will be the duty of this House to discuss; and so far as this side is concerned, I think I can guarantee my hon. friends opposite that all these measures will be discussed with a degree of independence that will surprise them, because we are not dominated by party spirit on this side. That does not mean, Mr. Speaker, that we are prepared at a moment's notice to vote this Government out of power until we see something to take its place—I put in that saving clause. So far as my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Joseph Read) is the particular spokesman of my hon. friends opposite, he declared the other night—contrary to the spirit of a year and a half ago—: "We cannot possibly have an election until the boys come back." So up to that extent, I take it, hon. gentlemen opposite are in absolute agreement with me. I do not want to go into these things in detail, but I might for the sake of illustra-

tion say, that, in my judgment, the making of roads is not a basic occupation. That is true of the building of houses, it is true even of shipbuilding: the basic, economic occupations of a country are those which go down into nature and take the wealth out of the soil, out of the timber, out of the rivers and the lakes, and the oceans; if you like, out of the mines. Those are the basic occupations of this, or any other lands.

There is another principle of reconstruction that I am sure we want to deal with in this House—I shall do so at any rate, and I think we all of us favour free discussion of public questions, and in this respect I agree with my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) that this talk of shelving the tariff, or not speaking of the tariff, can only be compared to the man who wanted to build a house without discussing the materials of which he was going to build it. I am a hundred per cent with my hon. friend from Brome on that subject. I am not going to try to anticipate the Budget, but I am going to refer to some of the fundamentals of reconstruction, and to do so by the use of a few words which will suggest thoughts and show how absurd it is to think that for any length of time we can avoid the discussion of the tariff or any other subject.

Whether we are going to supply pensions and look after the sick and maimed and the injured and mutilated, whether we are going to supply employment to all our people, I think it will be agreed that one of the things we must do in the face of our great national debt is to produce wealth in the country. Now, no one will have the temerity to say that the tariff has nothing to do with the production of wealth. We may take one view or another of what the effect of the tariff is upon the production of wealth, but that it has a bearing on the subject I think every one will agree who thinks about economic subjects at all. It is, of course, open to any hon. gentleman to argue that Great Britain in this war—and we must learn the lessons of the war—was a remarkable example of financial failure under free trade. I do not know that any one who would argue that would carry the mind of his hearers very far. It is equally open to anybody to argue that Germany was a remarkable example of financial success under protection. But whatever we may think about that point, I want to make it clear to the House that if we are to learn the lessons of the war we cannot postpone the discussion as to which view is right along those lines.

[Mr. M. Clark.]

Allied to the question of wealth is surely the question of trade. Now, our trade has been remarkable during the war. What is the lesson of the war on the question of our trade? What was the economic cause of the extraordinary amount of trade we did during the war? It is possible to answer that question in one word: markets. We did the business because we had the markets. We produced to an extraordinary extent; we got the prices; we had safe customers in the shape of foreign governments; we had the markets, and we did the trade. I never could see it myself, but I suppose it is a debatable point whether you will do the most trade with obstacles or without obstacles. The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) believes in the obstacles, to a certain extent; he believes in a tariff for revenue. Well, the tariff is an obstacle to trade whether it is for revenue or for any other purpose. I am one of those who is advanced much further than the member for Brome on the trade question. I am innocent enough to believe that you will trade better, just as you will run a race better, if you do not have obstacles. But whatever the views of other hon. gentlemen may be, we cannot avoid discussing that question.

Then, about the industries of the country. We have been told that tariffs are necessary to build up our manufacturing industries. Why, Sir, this war afforded the remarkable spectacle in Canada of industries turning their plants around to produce things that they had never produced before, producing them in enormous quantities, and selling them at tremendous and immediate profits. Why were we able to do that during the war? The answer is the same as I gave a moment ago in regard to our trade; we did it because we had the markets. That is to say, the exigencies and the pressure of the war overcame the obstacle, or any obstacle that there was in the way of the tariff. I take it that is the lesson of the war on this particular point.

The Government are interested in shipping. I do not blame them. We have to discuss shipping on the estimates of the Minister of Marine during this session, or on some other occasion. I have always believed that shipping is in the same position as these other matters to which I have referred. If you have a purely protectionist country, I think it must be evident to the most casual observer that you do not need any ships. If you have a perfect wall around your country and cut yourselves off

thoroughly from other nations, it is obvious that however you might need cathedrals or jails or anything of that kind, you would not need ships. Well, the converse also would seem to be true; if you want to have successful shipping you will not put up a wall of that kind. But this may be my insular stupidity which I have brought from England with me. It appears so simple to me that a child would accept it for the truth the moment it was presented to it. I wish hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House would, on this question as on the others to which I have referred, cultivate the teachable spirit of the child.

I suppose we shall have to discuss taxation, Mr. Speaker. I am afraid so; it will be a prominent subject of debate for many a long year. And it is absurd to talk about discussing taxation without gradually coming to discuss the tariff, because, for better or for worse, the tariff has been our main method of taxation in this country. We shall have to discuss tariffs when we come to taxation, or else we shall be parliamentary ostriches, and that would not be complimentary to us.

The cost of living is a question which this or any other government and this or any other parliament must tackle in the immediate future. Notwithstanding the large wages which have been prevailing in this country, I am afraid it is too true that a considerable number of our people have been living from hand to mouth in spite of the artificial good times that have been created by the war. If you cut down the cost of living, you would help conditions very much all round; you would lessen the rapacity of people for large profits and increased salaries. That question must be attended to; it is vital, and its solution would solve very much besides.

We are going to discuss the possibility of settling soldiers on the land. The tariff has a direct bearing on that question. It was argued by those who had carefully studied the question before the war that it was impossible to produce the splendid wheat that we produced in western Canada at a paying profit, at the price we were getting for it. Wheat in southern Alberta was then, I suppose, bringing about 65 cents a bushel, and having regard to the price of implements and the price of land, it was argued by many economists and men in the business that wheat could not be produced at that price to pay. If there be anything in that contention—I see that my hon. friend the President of the Grain Growers' Association of Manitoba approves of what I am saying—then at the very threshold of land settlement for soldiers we are met with the question: Are you justified in putting soldiers on the land to produce wheat or to produce any other agricultural products under these conditions? We must not try to settle any of these problems on war conditions—and war conditions as to prices largely remain at the present moment—because it is impossible that war conditions in these regards are to continue.

I have mentioned these things just to indicate some of the questions that will be before us in this period and to try to guide the House, independent of any old party affiliations, to right lines of thought. I cannot forget, Mr. Speaker, that I come from western Canada It is impossible to hide from our eyes the fact that in western Canada at the present moment there is this remarkable state of opinion to which I have referred. A few days ago I had a letter from a valued constituent touching on many subjects. That letter began with the statement to me, for my guidance as his representative, that in the part of the country in which he lived he rarely met a man who described himself either as a Liberal or as a Tory. That is a remarkable indication of the state of flux in which the opinions of men are in this country. The fact of the matter is that, perhaps, the most important thought for our guidance in this whole reconstruction period is this: that while it is a truism to say that the external forms of government and external conditions of countries have been tremendously affected by the war, it is quite as significant that everywhere men's thoughts are in a state of revolution; they are everywhere prepared to accept new ideas. And that is the frame of mind in which we should, either as members of the Government or as members of Parliament, approach public questions.

When I say that I am from the West, I want to add this: that I am no sectionalist. I could not be as a western man, if I wished at the present moment, because one of the most remarkable features of our internal politics just now is that the West is rapidly making converts to its views in the province of Ontario.

I notice that my friend from Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Joseph Read) who has very large way of doing things, said the other night that there was no distinction between the farmers' movement and what he called the Liberal party. That is not my recollection. I think the hon. member was speaking outside the patent facts of comparatively

recent political history. Long before the reciprocity pact, the farmers of the West were asking for free agricultural implements, but the reciprocity pact, if I remember it correctly, proposed a reduction of 2½ per cent on agricultural implements which would not have meant very much to anybody. There is a great difference between free implements and a reduction of 2½ per cent from fifteen per cent, so I shall not allow my hon. friend to mop up, so to speak, this support of the farmers. It would be a very convenient way of doing party business, but my hon. friend says he is a patriot and stands for the nation first, and I am not sure that he was not thinking of a party when he made that statement, because it is not quite correct. I do not stand for any section in this country. Our boys fought for a united Canada and I believe in a united Canada. I believe in this nation from shore to shore, and I believe that we shall fight our difficulties as a united people just as our sons have fought the battles across the sea. But I think all the same that if I were in the cabinet, or even if I were an eastern manufacturer, I should keep a sharp outlook on what the West is doing.

I want on this head to make a special appeal to the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White). He knows I have a great affection for him, and when we sat on opposite sides of the House, I had such an affection for him that I undertook his tuition in economic affairs. And he is by far my most promising pupil. He is not only my most promising, but is my most influential pupil. I need scarcely tell him to keep a sharp lookout on the West because he has already shown in his brief but brilliant political career, that he does keep a sharp lookout everywhere and that he has a teachable mind on these economic matters. He is sometimes a very much traduced man. We hear it said sometimes that he is connected with corporations. I have known some of the people that threw these stones, and one would want to throw a good brick back at them one's self if one wanted to go into that kind of politics. I wish, however, to claim for my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) that he has as free a mind as I have found anywhere in the public life of Canada. I have great pride in my pupil's mind. It is a penetrable mind, and it has been penetrable to western ideas. That is why I talk to him at this particular juncture. It would be no use my starting on a hard case like the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie). At the beginning of the war, I myself, was responsible for bringing western economics into this House in a very pointed form, and I told my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) to put on an income tax. That was new to my hon. friend and he did not see his way to do it, and he made some speeches, saying what was quite true, namely, that it was a difficult tax to collect and you could not jump at these things like a bull in a china shop. But my hon. friend came on, and he told us in several speeches that an income tax was, he feared, impracticable, but not impossible. Why, the fact now is that he remains a member of the Government which imposed an income tax, and the head of the department which did it, and I believe he is very proud of it now. I was, therefore, not wrong in describing the Acting Prime Minister as being a teachable and penetrable man and being my most hopeful pupil. It is no discredit to him to change his mind. The man who, in the course of a great war, does not change his mind, has no mind to change. It is only hon. gentlemen opposite who held false ideas of Liberalism to the point at which they joined a choir with the hon. member for North Cape Breton (Mr. McKenzie) as choirmaster, and chanted "As it was in the beginning, is now and ever shall be." And they thought, when they were doing it, that they were Liberals. That is the chant of the oldest fashioned Tories.

Mr. McMASTER: It is in the English church prayer-book.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: When Sir Robert Peel, one of the greatest financial leaders of the nineteenth century, was elected in England in 1841, he was elected to maintain the Corn laws. In 1846, without again going to the people, he abolished the Corn laws. Like a wise statesman, he saw the conditions changing, the country needing different things—just as those of us who left my hon. friends opposite saw what these hon. gentlemen could not see—and he abolished the Corn laws which he was elected to maintain. So my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) is in apostolic succession to some of the greatest statesmen. Lord Beaconsfield, when Mr. Disraeli, was member of an administration which destroyed the Liberal Administration of that day on the question of franchise, and then within a year he came in and introduced a franchise more drastic than the franchise of the Government he had destroyed. Dis-

raeli changed even more rapidly than did Sir Robert Peel.

Mr. McMASTER: Pardon me, the hon. member is hardly right. He accepted an amendment proposed by John Bright. That is the way "he dished the Whigs."

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: My hon. friend is dealing with a later period in history than that with which I am dealing.

Mr. McMASTER: 1868.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: 1867. In 1868 there was a general election in which Mr. Gladstone was returned to power. My hon. friend must study history a little more before he is so cock-sure of himself. We will, however, accept the phrase and take our history as being roughly correct, and my hon. friend is not disputing that Disraeli did "dish the Whigs" and that he did change his mind. I am not scoring any arithmetical success, as two and two is four and one is five; I leave those phases of politics to my hon. friend.

Well, now, these changes of thought are not put down in history to the detriment of the reputation of the statesmen who changed their views. On the question of free wheat my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister also showed that he had an open mind. He delivered a long speech in which he said that during the war he did not believe in giving free wheat; but he remained a member of the Government that did. I have very great hope that I do not appeal to him in vain to keep his mind still open. Let the western breezes blow through it; they will blow away some of the cobwebs he picks up in Toronto, and he will do clearer and better thinking and proceed to a position in Canadian statesmanship that he has not yet attained. I feel sure of it. I feel most hopeful of my hon. friend, for he is not only a statesman with a capacity for changing his mind. I cannot think he is absolutely impervious to political conditions. I am sure that every man in Government and Opposition circles must have regard to this fact about the people of the West; they can demonstrate on occasion their ability to stand as one man when the national good requires it. They stood as one man in December 1917, and if I were an eastern stateman or an eastern manufacturer I would say: "These are people that we had better keep our eye upon; they are worth watching; they are a factor of increasing numbers and increasing strength in the political life of Canada, and we must watch what they are doing."

There is another consideration about the West that I want to urge. The West wants no special favours whatsoever. We are asking for no special or class privileges. I hear people talking as if the farmers of the West were selfish men who wanted the Government to do something for their particular industry. On the contrary we are so confident of our ability to build up our own industries that we defy and challenge the world. We produce better wheat in western Canada than they can produce elsewhere in the world, and we are prepared to sell it against all comers. The same is true of our beef produce. Anything we do in the West we do well, and we defy competition. We want no special favours, and I take it that in that respect we are good Canadians. I do not understand the Canadian who says: I cannot compete. When I was quite a young man in the Old Country I remember a sculler named Edward Hanlan coming over to England and beating the Englishmen so easily that he stopped in the middle of the race to scoop some water out of his boat. He did not say he could not compete! Did the men in the trenches in the recent fighting say they could not compete? They were never content unless they were right at the front. They did not complain of being made a spearhead. You could not help them being spearheads. That is the kind of Canadians I believe in, and that is the kind of goods we produce in western Canada. The Canadian who says, I cannot compete; I must have special help, special pap from the Government is a kind of Canadian that should be put in a glass case and exhibited in the British museum. He is not in full line with the manhood of Canada. I am sorry if that seems an extreme view, but after all it does not seem a very special request to make of a Parliament or Government to ask that we be put on exactly the same footing as others and that others be put on exactly the same footing as us.

And if I may speak for western Canada I of Canada will come to my views all at once. I have far too good an understanding of the difficulty of making progress to expect that, but I do say that I have brought before the House considerations which are well worth the attention of both parties in this House.

And if I may speak for wesern Canada I would say: Take off our shackles, and give us the freedom that our boys fought for. Our courage and our energies are as great as our prairies are wide, and we believe that our economic views are as clear as our atmosphere. Regardless of our political

future, when occasion required it we in the West stood as one man and voted as one man behind the men who stood in the breach for the world's liberty.

We are grateful that we share in Canada to-day, through the providence of the Almighty, the security and the freedom which has been purchased by blood. We want to go into the future animated by the same spirit that has animated us during the war, and we in western Canada will be found giving unstinted support to the men who are prepared with courage and with clear-sightedness to build an edifice of happiness, prosperity, and the highest manhood on the foundations laid at such tremendous cost.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased indeed to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address on the ability and success with which they have accomplished their task. In this I only endorse the unanimous opinion of this House and of the press of the country.

I desire also that my first words should be words of thanks and congratulation to the brave soldiers of our Canadian army. I yield to no man, not even to my eloquent friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) in my admiration of the boys who have represented us at the front. In the terrific struggle which the victory of the Allied armies has now ended, our soldiers have heroically done their duty, and more than their duty. Always in the front line, amongst shells and bullets, amidst clouds of deadly gas, under a rain of iron and fire, they have unceasingly given to the Canadian nation and to the whole world numberless examples of collective and individual heroism. The gallantry, moral energy and physical courage of the Canadian soldiers have become a tradition in the Allied armies. Our soldiers have written a glorious page of history. To the families of those who have fallen on the field of honour —and my hon. friend from Red Deer is the head of one of those families—let us extend our deep sympathy. Our dead heroes rest in a far-distant land, but we must not forget that they are not buried on foreign soil, for it has been well said that every man has two mother countries—his own, and France.

In order that the terrible sacrifices which have been made shall not be in vain, statesmen are now assembled at a Peace Conference to frame policies and devise means to prevent a recurrence of such a cataclysm as we have just passed through.

I am glad indeed that the speech from the Throne refers to the founding of a League of Nations, and that the Right Hon. Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has declared himself in favour of such a league. The democracy of the world is rallying behind President Wilson in support of that great project, and in some cases doing so despite rulers and kings, and compelling the doing away with the old order of things. The peace that is to be achieved must be a peace that regards the future instead of the past; it must not be only a lull in the storm, as was said by one of the Allied statesmen recently. This war, as we have often been told, was a war to end all wars, and wars cannot be ended unless the old system is changed. The mere fact that the Turkish state, a disgrace to civilization, had to be maintained to ensure what was called the balance of power is, to my mind, a sufficient reason to discredit the old system. Some fear that by entering a league, nations may lose part of their freedom and even their separate entity. They say that internationalism will replace nationalism. That is a mistake. You cannot be an internationalist unless you are a nationalist; there cannot be a League of Nations unless there are nations. The control of armaments will inevitably mean a certain limitation of national freedom of action. But where will be the change? Who shaped the British naval policy before the war? Sir, the naval programme of Britain was determined by the naval programme of Germany. The British tax payers had to submit to larger taxes at the whim of the Kaiser and Von Tirpitz. Likewise the military programme of France was dictated by the military programme of Germany.

The hon. Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) said that to assure the power of the league a military force will have to be maintained. I should have liked my hon. friend to be more expliicit. It will be a sad disappointment to many if military expenditures have to be maintained after this war. Sir, the people of the world are to govern themselves. For some of them the period of transition will be a period of struggle, of agitation, of chaotic disorder, but they will adjust themselves to the new conditions, and order will ultimately prevail. Russia, Austria-Hungary, and Germany were the only remaining absolute monarchies in Europe. They lie in the dust. Their disappearance makes international agreements possible between people and people, and the democracy of the world will see to it that no "scrap of paper"

shall again be torn. The peace of the world will be guaranteed, not by military power, not by naval power but, I hope, by the supreme moral power, which in democratic countries is public opinion. The evils of war are great enough to warrant great efforts to free the world from them.

The hon. Acting Prime Minister also stated that Germany must be compelled to pay the fullest indemnity, and he very properly referred to the fact that Canada did not desire the war, and that her war expenditures ought to be reimbursed by the German people. I should be glad indeed if the wishes of my hon. friend could be realized; but I cannot think that the Canadian people ought to rely too confidently on the payment of that indemnity. The indemnity as stipulated to be paid is not merely an arithmetical operation, it is not a mere arrangement of figures. A large indemnity such as that which Germany would have to pay if Canada's claim is to be considered—for we can only come after the devastated territory of France and Belgium have been repaired—cannot be paid in cash. Germany could only pay by producing and exporting goods that would otherwise have been produced by England, France, or some other country. Mr. Lloyd George said during the recent British elections that Germany must pay, but she must not be allowed to dump her goods upon England. But she must dump goods upon England or dump them upon neutral countries, and so displace the British goods, or the indemnity payments cannot be made.

The hon. gentleman said that the ablest statesmen of the world are assembled at the Peace Conference. Let me here express regret for one thing and the sad circumstances under which we meet this session induce me to speak with the greatest moderation. There was a great Canadian statesman who should have been at the Peace Conference. Sir, President Wilson has amongst the members of his deputation there a political opponent. On the main committee the British Empire is represented by Sir John Simon who was defeated on December last as a political opponent of Mr. Asquith and who has been throughout the war a consistent opponent of conscription in Great Britain. But here of course we have a "union" Government, and only friends of that government were qualified. The fact remains that minority parties, parties not actually in power, are part of a nation and should have a voice in decisions which will affect the rights of those nations for generations after their existing governments have given place to others.

While I believe that Canada has to be represented at the Peace Conference, I just as strongly believe that the Prime Minister of Canada should be at home now conducting the affairs of the country. The Prime Minister of a country is not an ambassador. Last year, Parliament had to be prorogued somewhat early to allow the Prime Minister and some of his colleagues to proceed to London for the Imperial Conference. We were told that there was urgent need of their immediate departure. Important business was hurried on in this House without due consideration, so much so that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) had to register a vigorous protest. Our distinguished representative had to wait for weeks before the Conference actually met. True, the wires were kept busy recording their very strenuous work there for a time, especially that of my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) whom I see taking his seat. At times there was not much to report. We were told that the President of the Privy Council was getting older every day, and that the Prime Minister of Canada was impressing England by being favourable to that now almost extinct garment, the frock coat.

This year our representatives left Canada when the armistice was announced. I am not sure that the armistice was actually signed when they left. They were the first representatives to arrive, but their presence did not prevent Mr. Lloyd George from running an election campaign or the President of the United States from conducting public affairs at Washington for many weeks after our representatives had crossed the sea. The Prime Minister has had all the time and opportunity necessary to press his views on the Conference, and he should now come home to look after the tremendous task which confronts him. Surely, one of his colleagues might be left there to meet the Bolsheviki if the conference finally takes place. I would respectfully suggest that the hon. Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) should have the appointment. He would be the best man to handle the situation if they tried to put up any raw deal over on him. The Montreal Star was telling its readers some time ago that the Prime Minister was coming home for a holiday. I hope his colleagues will persuade him to work here and go holidaying elsewhere.

This leads me to a subject with which I desire to deal briefly. In the absence of the Prime Minister, the Acting Prime Minister should give us a full and comprehensive statement of the history of the constitutional changes which have been created by the formation of the Imperial War Cabinet and by the adoption of various policies formulated at the last Imperial Conference. The press of this country, supporting the Government, is not in agreement as to the meaning and functions of the Imperial War Cabinet. The Toronto Globe, which has still a modicum of Canadianism left in it, contends that it is a mere consultive body and not at all an executive body. The Toronto News, the organ of Imperialism in Canada, states that it is an executive body. Speaking at London before the Imperial Parliamentary Association on June 21, 1918, the Prime Minister said:

> A great step in the constitutional development of the Empire was taken last year by the Prime Minister—

That is the Prime Minister of Great Britain.

> —when he summoned the Prime Ministers of the Overseas Dominions to the Imperial War Cabinet.

Later on he said:

> If I should attempt to describe it, I should say that it is a Cabinet of Governments.
>
> I venture to believe, and I thus expressed myself last year, that in this may be found the genesis of a development in the constitutional relations of the Empire that will form the basis of its unity in the years to come.

Ambiguous as the language of the Prime Minister is it conveys the meaning that a constitutional change has effectively been made since he says that a great step in the constitutional development of the Empire was taken last year when the Prime Minister of Great Britain summoned the Prime Ministers of the Overseas Dominions to the Imperial War Cabinet. Furthermore, we have been told that the functions of the War Cabinet would not cease with war but that this body would remain a part of the constitutional structure of the Empire. If that be so what right and what mandate had the Prime Minister of Canada to accede to this scheme? Canadian policies have been framed and decided upon in Canada since the days when responsible government was granted and they must continue to be framed and decided upon in Canada. Is it that Canada's policies are to be decided in London by a body of men in which Canada would have one representative out of twelve? True it is that the decisions arrived at would have to be ratified by the Canadian Parliament but that is a somewhat illusory safeguard as it would be open to the Prime Minister to use his influence to place the decisions of this body upon the Statute Book of Canada and he might always rely on his parliamentary majority to enable him to do so. The words of the Prime Minister that the new body upon the statute-book of Canada and loquent catch words, and nothing else. There is no such thing as a cabinet of governments. According to strict constitutional rules and practice there cannot be a cabinet unless there be also a parliament to which that cabinet is directly responsible. I do not wonder that the Round Table should be delighted and should regard that new scheme as a distinct advance, for they fully realize that an Imperial cabinet cannot exist without an Imperial Parliament and that is their ultimate game. Sir John Willison is a consistent advocate of Imperialism. The following quotation from a letter written by him is very significant.

> My imperialism means equal citizenship for Canadians in the Empire. That we have never had. That we have not yet secured. Nor do I believe that we can acquire such citizenship through War Cabinets or periodical Imperial Conferences. For the time these are useful as means to an end, but we know that, after all, actual ultimate control over peace and war rests in the Imperial Parliament.

According to Sir John Willison the Imperial War Cabinet is a means to an end, namely, the creation of an Imperial federated parliament, of which Sir John Willison is a consistent advocate, a Federal Parliament in which Canadians would be in a small minority and which would levy taxation on Canadian citizens.

Sir, Canada is a nation and she will never become a province. At the Imperial Conference of 1917 a resolution had been adopted that all discussion and constitutional changes should be postponed until after the war when a conference for the purpose of considering these matters was to be called. I exceedingly regret that this resolution should not have been adhered to and that our Prime Minister should have agreed to a scheme which he has himself described as an important step in the constitutional development of the Empire. May I also point out, and it will apply to other matters as well as to this—that Confederation is an agreement. It was the result of the agreement of four colonies. It is in effect a treaty, and that treaty cannot be altered nor modified without the consent of all the contracting parties to it. The provinces have agreed to part with many of their rights, and to entrust them to the

Federal Parliament, but the Federal authority has no right to delegate any of its powers to another body without the consent of the parties to its original contract.

I now come to our internal affairs, and I have a word to say to my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) at the beginning. I have not much to criticise in his speech. Indeed, I congratulate him upon many things he said. His eulogy of his former leader was a masterpiece of eloquence such as I have seldom heard in this Chamber. But what I object to is the somewhat patronizing attitude that the hon. gentleman took a little later on. We, the Liberal parliamentary party, are a contemptible little army according to the Hindenburg of Red Deer. We all thought when he crossed the floor of the House that the heavy artillery was going, and I am sure he agrees with us on this. But, Sir, there is something we can say, with all modesty. We are not so numerous as the gentlemen on the other side, but we have some qualities. The first is that we are a united party. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition can sit there with a sense of security which I am sure the Acting Prime Minister would like to enjoy. It is the sense of security which is produced by the certainty that nobody, either behind him or alongside of him, has a knife or a dagger. My hon. friend has declared himself as concerned about the fate of our party. Our future appears to him very dark. I thank him for his solicitude, but will he permit me to remind him that he may be mistaken. What has taken place in a constituency called Red Deer, very recently, might have taught my hon. friend the wisdom of modesty in prediction. I hope my hon. friend will not take these remarks otherwise than in good part. He knows that he and I have always been friends, he knows that I am a great admirer of his, in spite of the slight imperfections he may have. I will now proceed with my remarks.

I believe that the first war machinery that should be demobilized is the present Government. Self-destruction is a painful operation, but in the interest of the country my hon. friends ought to make the sacrifice and demobilize themselves. Theirs is an unnatural alliance at the present juncture. The doctrine that a political truce should exist during the period of reconstruction, and that the great questions of policy should be left aside and untouched, is sheer nonsense, and my friend from Red Deer demonstrated that himself in part of his remarks. We are not living in Utopia. The very fact that the resources of Canada, as the result of our war effort, have been strained as they have been, compels us to face grave and great problems, and the two traditional opposite sides, which are the interests and democracy, cannot but face each other when the settlement is effected. One or the other must give way; it is impossible for gentlemen of different ideas on those problems to sit with each other, and be consistent with their ideals and principles. Principles are eternal, expedients are temporary. Burke has said that inconstancy is a sort of natural corrective to folly and ignorance. This, under ordinary circumstances, is not flattering, but it is still worse when inconstancy is forced upon unwilling people in order to allow them to perpetuate or prolong an equivocal situation. I agree with the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, that all citizens at this period must be animated by a spirit of pure patriotism, and adopt as their goal the welfare of the country; but in order to reach that desire they must strive to assure the success of the policies which they, in their conscience, deem to be the best to obtain that result. The idea of reconstruction means that a new order has to be created, and that changes have to be made to build up the country upon new and firmer foundations. How can it be done if the reformers and the progressives of the country stand pat and let the opportunity pass by? I fully understand that the reactionaries, the Tories, the protected monopolies—all those whose private interests lie in the perpetuation of the present order of things—should advocate political neutrality. Political neutrality means no change at a time when changes are possible and even necessary, when the democracy of a country asserts its right to shape the policy of government, when every nation is bent upon discarding the privileges of the few and safeguarding the interests of the many. But political neutrality on the part of a reformer is a crime against his country, and a betrayal of his principles.

The people whose voices are most loudly heard about reconstruction are those who do not want reconstruction at all. They claim that during the reconstruction period nothing should be done; things must not be disturbed; methods of business should not be changed; tariff policies should not even be discussed. They instinctively feel that the fewer innovations just now—with these people it is always "just now"—the better. They have mobilized under their banner all the appetites, and they masquerade as reconstructors. But, Sir, it is imperative that

new policies should be devised. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. F. B. Carvell) told us the other day that when all the revenues of the country shall have been used to meet the obligations of the present year, we shall still be short $100,000,000. Where shall we get the money to pay this enormous amount? Still, Canada must not be bankrupt and shall not be bankrupt. It is indeed unfortunate that to a large extent our financial situation is the result of extravagance and maladministration. I would need only to quote the speeches of the Minister of Public Works to show that for every dollar of legitimate war expenditure, another dollar has been given to graft and profiteering. Still, all our obligations must be met, and a new system of taxation must be devised.

Sir, a protective tariff that is so high as to prohibit goods from coming into this country is not a fair method of producing a revenue. I have a word to say here to the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder); I regret that he is not in his seat. He stated that there was a cleavage on the tariff as between the East and the West; that the two sections of the country were practically arrayed against each other. This I emphatically deny. Eastern Canada is not an adjunct of Toronto. The minister is very clever, but he cannot bind me with what he used to call the financial rings of Toronto. He cannot do it; he is bound with them, I am not. The voice of Toronto—I would like my friends from the West to put this into their minds—is not the voice of the East. Toronto is making a noise altogether out of proportion to its importance. The rural interests of eastern Canada—and they constitute the great majority of the people,—are prepared and willing to work with the western farmers to obtain a lowering of the tariff. And, unless I am much mistaken, my fellow citizens of the prairies will not sacrifice their right of redress for the mess of pottage which the Minister of Colonization and a few others are enjoying in the Union Cabinet.

The tariff question must be settled now. I take this opportunity of asking certain members of the Government, those who have been called the "separated brethren," to apply to the consideration of this question that sort of mind described by Milton, namely: "A mind not to be changed by time or place."

There was a statement in the remarks of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization with which I entirely agree. He said that Canada will never be a great country unless we put an end to national strifes and a better union of her citizens is secured. Every true, patriotic citizen of Canada realizes that national unity is indeed necessary. But such unity, Sir, cannot exist without liberty, without justice, without respect of the rights of all citizens. Let every Canadian respect his fellow citizen, whatever his race, creed or nationality may be. Let us do away with the spirit of race domination and national exclusiveness. Sir, the war should help the solution of that problem. Prussianism has been crushed in Germany; Prussianism should be crushed in all the countries of the world. Down with this Prussian spirit of domination in Europe; but down with it, too, in Canada. Let us all do our share to accomplish the great work of national union and harmony. We who have had the privilege of learning our political doctrines under the guidance of the great statesman whose loss we mourn, shall endeavour to remain true to his teaching and inspiration. From the grave where he has been laid, Sir Wilfrid Laurier still leads us. We shall never forget his great lessons of tolerance, moderation and equal justice for all. "Live and let live" ought to be the standard principle of Canadians.

Mr. Speaker, one of the great reforms to be accomplished is the re-establishment of government of the people by the people and the full restoration of the rights of citizens. The press must be free; censorship must be done away with; freedom of speech must be revived. Certain restrictions were justifiable during the war, but the condition of war no longer exists, and I cannot conceive that any democratic man in Canada would approve of such an act, for instance, as the imprisonment on the eve of Christmas day of a Canadian citizen for the crime of having in his possession an edition of Plato's Republic. Sir, this is an outrage to liberty and decency. The press should be free; the control of the mind of the whole people by way of censorship or otherwise is the very method, in all its purity, pursued by Prussia.

It is that nefarious system that has so moulded the conscience of her people as to produce that moral spirit which has startled the world. No such system should be tolerated in Canada, and the industry of shaping public opinion must be abolished. In that regard, I advocate the disappearance of the new national newspaper under the President of the Privy Council. It is a useless waste of money and its existence creates a dangerous precedent. In this connection, let me say, not only for

this newspaper, but for all sources of information, that a lie is always a lie and never constitutes a truth even when it masquerades as propaganda. Moral unity and true progress cannot be brought about by arbitrary methods and compulsion. Liberty alone can achieve that result. In that respect I do not hesitate to say that in Canada as elsewhere, the strongest bulwark against Bolshevism is Liberalism and the principles for which it stands. Canadians who would spare their country the violence of revolutionary changes, that great mass of the people which is between the opposite sides, namely, the interests and Bolshevism, will wish God-speed to the forces of reorganized Liberalism which will ultimately unite for political action.

Having mentioned the word "Bolshevism," I wish to express my regret that speakers on the other side of the House should have seen fit to represent in a most unfair manner the remarks of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) the other day. The methods of cheap political agitators and yellow journalism should not be emulated in this House. It is always their tactics to disqualify in advance the person they purpose attacking by branding their victim as a crook or a coward or a traitor. By abusing their opponents, they endeavour to prejudice the issue and close discussion. Profiteers, monopolists, trust magnates, the protected interests, have always tried to associate reform and progressiveness with revolution and crime.

I regret that some of my friends who still call themselves Liberals should have shown, to such a degree, the influence of their present association. That the Tories should adopt such methods, I do not wonder. It is the old game. The next election cannot, of course, be fought with the slogan "A vote for the Liberals is a vote for the Kaiser." That fellow is out of business now. A new cry must be found, and evidently it will be "A vote for McMaster is a vote for Lenine and Trotsky." Is it not possible to place Canadian politics upon a higher and more honourable level?

There is another matter to which I wish to refer in connection with the Address. A new Franchise Bill is announced, and when it is brought down we shall discuss it. But I regret that the Government does not immediately repeal the War-times Election Act, that iniquitous legislation which will ever be a blot on the fair name of Canada. The late Government, before going to the country, ran away from the judgment of those who had elected them and were their natural judges. They resorted to closure for the purpose of tampering with the electoral laws of the country and manipulating the franchise. In order to frustrate and thwart the will of the people, they proceeded to disfranchise Canadian citizens entitled to all the rights of British subjects in this country. It was merely an act of political gambling. All citizens must be equal before the law. Every citizen of a democratic country has a right to his proportion, an equal share in the Government of the country. As Jefferson said, "Governments derive their powers from the consent of the governed." Those are the principles of liberty and responsible government. And the Allies have proclaimed to the world that they have been fighting for the maintenance of those principles. When President Wilson, on April 2, 1917, made his famous speech before the two chambers of the United States Congress, requesting them to declare war on Germany, he uttered the following words:

> But the right is more precious than peace, and we shall fight for the things we have always carried nearest our hearts—for democracy, for the right of those who submit to authority to have a voice in their own Government, for the rights and liberties of small nations.

And he added:

> To such a task we can dedicate our lives and our fortunes.

But here in this country our Government had to be judged by a sort of family jury and citizens who did submit to authority were deprived of their rights and have no longer a voice in the Government of this country. They are not represented in this House, and nobody has a right to speak for them in the Parliament of Canada. This House is not the true expression of the popular will. I am speaking only of the principle of the legislation. In practice, it was a still more damnable machinery, and in point of fact citizens of friendly or neutral countries were, under that law, actually disfranchised and could not record their vote. That law was a crime against popular sovereignty. All Liberals resented and opposed it. The Toronto Globe and the Toronto Star fought a vigorous campaign against it. They said that it was most undemocratic, arbitrary and Prussian in its character. The Toronto Globe has for its motto those words of Junius:

> The subject who is truly loyal to the chief magistrate will neither advise nor submit to arbitrary measures.

But the Toronto Globe and its friends submitted to the arbitrary measure they

have condemned and they were quite willing to profit by that measure. It was most unfair to enact that legislation, but it is not any fairer for gentlemen who have denounced it as a fraud and a crime against liberty, to help carry out the very same legislation. And yet the good old Toronto Globe said after the election that the victory achieved with the help of that Prussian law, as the Globe itself styled it, was a victory for democracy. I urge the Government to repeal that law. Let us see it wiped off the statute-book this session.

There are other subjects I should like to discuss, but I shall have an opportunity later on. In conclusion, I would assure the Government that we on this side of the House are only too willing to co-operate with them and do all in our power to help solve the great problems that confront the country in this trying period. Our only aim is the good and prosperity of our common country, but we shall always follow the course which we conscientiously believe to be the best means to reach that happy end. We may not be successful, we may fail in our endeavour, but we are working not merely for political successes, but for the upholding of the great principles of Liberalism by which we shall always stand.

Mr. JAMES McISAAC (Kings, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I desire to add my humble tribute to the eulogies that have been passed on the late leader of the Opposition (Sir Wilfrid Laurier). I also desire to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address. It seemed fitting that both the mover and the seconder should have worn the khaki. Both had done good service for the country, both had fought the enemy, and were therefore peculiarly qualified to give expression to the desires and ideals of the returned soldier. At one time, when the Hun was pushing forward, liberty, civilization and everything we held dear trembled in the balance, but now the war is happily over. It is not necessary to dwell at any length upon the causes that have brought the war to a successful conclusion. We all realize the genius of Marshal Foch, and Marshal Haig and the ability of the other Allied generals. It was, however, the hammer blows of the Allied armies that did the actual fighting, and in this the Canadian armies had their full share. The brave sons of Canada were in the van in all the big attacks, and wrote the name of Canada in letters of gold on all the battlefields of the great war.

Another factor without which victory could not have been achieved was the British Navy. We have all heard of the freedom of the seas. It was the navy's part to preserve the freedom of the seas both before and during the war, and we all know how well it accomplished that task, enabling the soldiers and the munitions of war to be safely transported from all parts of the world towards the places where they were required.

Important and onerous as were the duties cast upon this Government during the war, equally important and onerous are the problems that will have to be solved in the period of reconstruction, but we need have no fear that the Government which has conducted so well the affairs of the country and Canada's part in the war will not be equally successful in the work of demobilization, repatriation, and reconstruction. The period of reconstruction calls for the exercise of the greatest wisdom, prudence, and foresight, but the resources of Canada are so ample that with wisdom and good judgment all the problems confronting us will be satisfactorily solved.

The war, and the conduct of Canada in the war, and the conditions arising out of the war, inaugurate a new departure. Canada has shown what she is able to accomplish by furnishing the best soldiers that took part in this world war. In consequence of the war, or at least concurrently with the war period, Canada has risen to eminence and distinction so far as finances are concerned, and takes her place side by side with the Mother Country in the matter of furnishing the loans to government to carry on the public business. And now, while the subject of peace and of peace terms are considered, now that the Peace Conference is in session, the Prime Minister of Canada and his colleagues of the cabinet sit there with full powers as representatives of this country, side by side with the diplomats of the great nations of the world, negotiating a world peace. That surely is an advance, a marvellous advance for Canada. She has risen to new heights, to a new plane of importance. And these new conditions, this rising to new heights, involves equally new and great responsibilities. All this is a new departure and old ideas and old methods will have to give way. We must look to the future, and not to the past; we must consider the present, and take advantage of and exercise the privileges that are afforded us, while looking forward to even greater things. Not only did our soldiers, many of whom made the supreme sacrifice of life itself that we might enjoy liberty and freedom, not only did these men do nobly, but our civilians

as well, men and women, did their share nobly and well in supporting and carrying forward the necessary work for those who were fighting abroad.

The programme set forth in the speech from the Throne is varied and ample. I have no intention to refer at any great length, even in my own humble way, to many of the matters in that programme. But I think we shall all agree that nothing too good can be done for the soldiers who have fought and bled and offered their lives for our liberty. Whatever measures the Government can devise within the bounds of the resources at their command, I am sure, will meet with the full endorsement of all the members on this side of the House.

Then there is the question of alien enemies in Canada. I, for one, sincerely hope that the Government will exercise its utmost powers in carrying out whatever regulations may be enacted to drive these people out of the country. They have no right here, and they have done much harm; I hope the Government will leave nothing undone to suppress them. As to immigration, that is a very important question, and I am sure the Government will exercise the greatest possible care with regard to it. We want no immigrants in this country except the very best, and we want none here who are tinged with any ideas of the alien enemy, the Bolshevists or any of that description.

At a time like this, when there is so much to be done, when such great responsibilities rest upon the Government and Parliament of Canada, one might naturally expect our friends of the Opposition to assist in solving the problems that confront us, that they would be willing to lend their aid to bring about the best conditions, that they would throw out from time to time some hints, some elements of a platform that they would be willing to stand upon, and so assist the Government in carrying on their work. But, so far in this debate, I do not think anything of that kind has been offered. It is true, one hon. gentleman made an apology for the Bolshevists, but I do not think that is a very encouraging or satisfactory means of assisting in the work of reconstruction in Canada. Another hon. gentleman thought well to sneer at the King, at the Prime Minister, and at everything pertaining to the Government of the Dominion. That is the second plank of a platform, so far as we have heard. And there has been another: my esteemed friend the hon. member for Prince (Mr. Joseph Read) last night seemed disposed to extend the friendly hand to the alien enemy. He expressed the wish that a warm place should be found in the hearts of the people of Canada for those who had done so much to injure our cause. These, as far as I have been able to observe, are the three planks of their platform as they have thus far been made known to us in this House.

I wish to say just a word more about my esteemed friend the hon. member for Prince, he was prolific in his advice and he pronounced very strong censure upon those who had at some time sat upon the other side of the House but who had come over here. He thought that their conduct was somewhat inconsistent. You would almost imagine from the way he developed this feature of his speech that he himself had been most consistent in his political allegiance. No one would suspect from what he was saying that he had been boxing the political compass, that from being an ardent Conservative he, without very much notice, became a very extreme Liberal. It is said that it was no question of public policy that brought about this remarkably quick turn in his political affiliation. It was, as far as I can understand, a grievance regarding a damaged cargo of potatoes.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JAMES McISAAC (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House took recess at six o'clock I was, in my humble way, describing the position that Canada has taken in the world, not only in consequence of the great deeds of her soldier sons, not only because of her achievements in matters of finance, but now, by reason of her being represented at the Peace Congress, with the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, and his associates of the Cabinet, sitting there side by side on an equal footing with the diplomatists of the great nations of the world. We, I think, have reason to thank the Prime Minister for the great part he has taken in bringing Canada to that proud position, and yet, Sir, from the Opposition side we constantly hear the remark made that the leader of the Government should be in Canada, instead of being in the Peace Congress doing the best he can to look after the interests of Canada. We may be sure that Sir Robert Borden is, and always will be, found, where he can accomplish the greatest good for Canada. Is there a man in this House possessing a spark of patriot-

ism who will deny that the place where the Prime Minister can accomplish most good for Canada, where he can best advocate our rights, and where he can best discuss questions of paramount importance to this country arising from the war, is in Paris with the diplomatists of the other Allied nations. That, Sir, is my honest and sincere conviction, and it is most extraordinary that hon. gentlemen opposite should indulge in such reflections rather than contribute to this debate something of a tangible and beneficial character. I am sure the Government will be only too pleased to receive ideas from them—advice, if you will, or suggestions—as how best to carry on the onerous and responsible work that devolves upon it arising out of the war. But, Sir, one hon. gentleman after another rises on the other side of the House with no suggestion whatever of the nature of constructive statesmanship to offer, or anything that might in any way assist the Government in carrying on the great duties that devolve upon it. On the other hand, everything that can be resorted to is done to slight and belittle the Government, everything is said that might bring Canada and its Government into ridicule. For example, the hon. member for Prince, Prince Edward Island (Mr. Read) gets up and discusses by the hour things that have no relation whatever to the matters at issue. The hon. gentleman dwells in the briefest way upon the subjects enumerated in the speech from the Throne, but speaks at length about all other matters in the world, and describes his voyages all over the globe. He is a sea captain, he tells us; he has been meandering round the world, and he recalls his experiences on those travels for our benefit. That, I am sure, is a vast and important contribution to the constructive legislation that is necessary to help Canada along in this important juncture in her affairs.

We have heard too of a light that is in a window, and a certain latch-string that is on the outside of a door. My own opinion, Sir, is that that light shall flicker, waver, grow dim and die out, and that latch-string, exposed so long to the elements, shall bleach and wither and drop into decay before any hon. gentleman on this side—who have come here, as I am convinced every one of them have done, to do their best in an honest way to assist the Government in carrying on the important affairs of the country—will so far forget themselves as to leave the substance for the shadow, and abandon the important business they have undertaken. In view of the exigencies of the situation why should hon. gentlemen on the Opposite side consume the time of the House in talking of matters that have no bearing at all upon the problems calling for solution, or upon the important and onerous business that the Parliament of Canada has been sent here to transact? There are many important questions dealt with in the speech from the Throne that merit long and serious consideration. They will come up in due order when they will receive the attention they deserve. It is not necessary at this stage of the session to say very much more with respect to them, so far at least as I am concerned. There are questions perhaps of a more or less controversial character that will come before us, questions upon which possibly all the members on this side do not exactly agree; but hon. gentlemen supporting the Government have come here for a grave purpose, they have come here to carry on in a serious manner the business of the country. I am sure when they come to sit down and compare notes they will be able to arrive at a reasonable compromise even if upon some matters they cannot absolutely see eye to eye. That is my firm conviction.

In view of all the circumstances, why should not all the members of the House determine to join hands? Why not all determine that they will unite and exert their utmost endeavour to push forward the great work that Canada has to undertake, and do their best in a patriotic and generous way to assist this country to the proud position among the nations that she is destined to occupy.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in the first place that I join with the other gentlemen who have taken part in this debate in extending my congratulations to the mover and seconder of this motion. I must say that it is gratifying to know we have in this House two young men of such independent calibre, who have already rendered such great services to the country, as the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the adoption of the Address. And the plea which they have advanced for unity in this country is certainly commendable. I feel that not only will all members of this Parliament agree with them, but the large majority of the people of Canada will agree that it is high time, after the great services that have been rendered by our men at the Front, that unity should exist in this land, and words of strife among our people should cease forevermore. I am glad, Mr. Speaker, to say that I had the pleasure of listening

to a gentleman, who went overseas with the Essex Battalion, when he addressed a large gathering in the city of Chatham. That gentleman was of the same opinion as the two hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded this motion. He said on that occasion that it was gratifying to him—he being a former Presbyterian minister in the city of Windsor, in the person of Major Tolmie—on many different instances to see soldiers of all denominations and creeds worshipping in the same church on every Sunday morning, feeling that they were to give a good example to the people they had left at home.

I also wish to say that I join the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in the splendid reference he has made to the late leader of the great Liberal party in this country. Very little further could I say in that regard beyond what has already been said by members of this House, except to add this: I believe it will be many a day before another man will be selected who will enjoy the same confidence and respect on the part of all classes of people in this country that the late leader did. I am glad to pay this slight tribute to that great statesman on behalf of my constituents and myself.

I am also glad to say, Sir, that representing, as I have the privilege of doing, possibly one of the largest urban and rural constituencies of Canada, I can join with the first portion of the remarks of the hon. member for Red Deer, in that the people of my constituency, irrespective of party, of creed or nationality, stood by every vote that I gave in this House in the interests of the prosecution of the war. I am glad to say that not one dissenting word has come from any of my constituents. At my convention they said to me: support any and all measures as far as the prosecution of the war is concerned, irrespective of what side of the House they may emanate from. This I have done since this Parliament was formed. But having done this, I come to the point where I differ from the hon. member for Red Deer, because I feel that he who sat on this side of the House for so many years and who advocated free trade as they have it in Great Britain, now is an advocate of free trade as they have it in the Union Government. It was very noticeable a few nights ago that the member for Red Deer sat with his colleague the member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), and these two gentlemen whispered into each other's ears like bride and groom. When the member for Red Deer said this afternoon that he felt like the young lady, then I thought that he must be the bride and that the member for Brantford must be the groom. It was also noticeable that on that same night, before going to his sweet slumbers, the member for Brantford consulted the member for Red Deer as to whether the latter was going to speak that night; for if he was, the member for Brantford would not be able to hear the sweet sound of his voice. The member for Red Deer, however, assured the member for Brantford that he would not speak until to-day, and the member for Brantford went home and rested. It then dawned on me, Sir, that there might be something in the report of the last caucus of the followers of Union Government as given in the Toronto Globe of March 2. The report says:

> Even more remarkable was Mr. Cockshutt's remark at the Unionist caucus when he invited Dr. Michael Clark, one of the best-known Unionist Liberals from the West, to get up on the fence with him. "You get up on the fence from your side, and I'll get on it from mine, and we will straddle it," he is reported to have said.

If the member for Brantford and the member for Red Deer are straddling the fence on the tariff question, let me assure them that the old posts of that fence are rotting, and before long it will topple over, carrying with it those members on the other side of the House who are upon it. The wave of public opinion will carry it away, and these hon. gentlemen will clamber over here for safety, and without looking for the key, will be ready to knock the hinges off the door in an attempt to get away from that wave of public opinion which is so strong against any straddling of the fence at this particular time.

The hon. member who has just sat down (Mr. McIsaac) wants to know where we stand on trade questions and on other questions in this Parliament, I will speak for myself. In the first place, I commend Government for the admission into this country of free farm tractors. The member for Red Deer will not deny that the first request for free tractors emanated from this side of the House and was turned down by the gentlemen with whom he is associating himself at the present time. But public opinion, Mr. Speaker, was so strong from one end of this country to the other that before Parliament could meet in 1918 the Government by Order in Council placed farm tractors on the free list. Will the hon. gentleman deny that? Will the hon. gentleman deny that the first request for free tractor ditchers, in order that the lands of the producers of foodstuffs in this

country should be properly drained, emanated from this side of the House? I believe that when he spoke on that occasion he supported the proposal; yet to-day he says that there is no difference between the policies of the two parties. You may call the parties whatever you like, but the voters of Canada, whether Liberals, Unionists, farmers, labourers, or whatever they are, will have something to say as to who will be their representatives and as to what is to be the policy of this Parliament on such matters. I take exception to the assertion of the member for Red Deer that there is no difference between the two parties on the trade question. Away back in 1897, when the Liberal party came into power, that question came up and the people were consulted in open meetings throughout this country as to what the tariff should be. The member for Red Deer will not deny that many articles were put on the free list at that time; I remember two of them particularly, binder twine and cream separators. Cream separators were put on the free list in 1897 or 1898, and I challenge any member of this House to deny that we now have a number of the very best cream separator manufacturers producing the very best article to be had. This article has been on the free list, unprotected, from that time to the present and it has practically not advanced one dollar in price from that day to this, notwithstanding the fact that it has competed with all the cream separators that have been supplied by the greatest manufacturers in the United States. If the manufacturers can produce cream separators in this way when materials put into them are advancing in price, is that not an argument in favour of our having free agricultural implements? I stand for free agricultural implements and am prepared to support that principle at any time. We have great food monopolies in this country, and the only way in which food can be produced more cheaply is by getting farm implements at as low a price as possible. The Minister of Public Works (Hon. F. B. Carvell) speaking in Hamilton a few nights ago said that the only way foodstuffs could be reduced was by pounding down the price of wheat, while right within his hearing, right within gunshot, was the International Harvester Company, which has doubled the price of agricultural implements since the war began. As a matter of fact, they increased the price of them the very moment that the Conservative party came into power. Let me say to the Minister of Public Works that in order to have cheaper foodstuffs the people must be enabled to obtain more cheaply the articles with which they produce them.

I see the hon. member for Brantford here. Let me repeat what I said at the last session of this Parliament. We have in the city of St. Thomas a concern which produces agricultural implements—ploughs, harrows, rollers, and so on—I refer to the Erie Iron Works. This firm has produced these goods at prices 25 per cent less than the figures of the price list issued by the Cockshutt Plough Company, the International Harvester Company or the Massey Harris Company. These are facts which the ex-Minister of Labour (Hon. T. W. Crothers), who ought to be familiar with the facts, will not deny. If it is alleged that that is not true, all the Acting Prime Minister has to do is to ask for an investigation before a committee of this Parliament. Does the member for Red Deer know what he is doing when he stands up and connects himself with these high protectionists at this time? He is causing the returned soldiers who are taking up farming as a profession and borrowing $2,500 from the Government, to spend a large portion of this in unnecessary profits which the implement manufacturers are receiving.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) may smile. He can, as he did the other night, fill pages of Hansard with eulogies of what our boys did at the front —for what? To produce the very condition that is going to extract unfair profits for the manufacturers of the machinery with which our boys are going to till the soil in order to produce foodstuffs to prevent the people of this country from paying extravagant prices. I say, without fear of contradiction, that while this state of affairs lasts, the Government is neglecting its duty and is not doing as the Government of the United States has done. The Government of the United States, seeing that a ring was being formed by the International Harvest Machine Company and that there was not sufficient competition, appeals to the courts and has that combine dissolved, and in that country we have to-day competition so far as agricultural implements are concerned.

Will the hon. member say from his seat in this House that the prices which are sent out by the different concerns and which are exactly the same, are prepared in separate offices, when they come out in such form; or is it not true that the three different companies know just what the prices are going to be and that the prices are ad-

vanced from time to time to suit their own wishes? I challenge contradiction in this regard, and I challenge contradiction further when I state that, when steel and iron dropped in price last January and the farmers appealed for cheaper agricultural implements in this country, agricultural implements again took an advance of, I think, ten per cent. If we are going to give a square deal to the consumers, to the men whom we are trying to locate on farms, it is for the Government to see whether the statements I am now making are right or wrong and to see that the men are not robbed nor have their money unfairly extracted from them in paying large commissions on the implements which they require to till the soil. If the Government were right at the last session of Parliament in placing at the disposal of the people of Canada 1,000 tractors at wholesale prices, they are right and justified now in giving to the men who are locating on these lands, the returned soldiers in particular, the implements they require at the very first and lowest cost, and in preventing great profits being made out of those men.

So far as the Government policy of good roads and good housing is concerned, I am heartily in accord with the policy of having the best roads and the best housing that can be given to the people of this country; but we should take this matter up very seriously, because, as the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) stated the other night, our debt now amounts to $2,000,000,000, and we must be very careful in approaching these matters. I am willing to give my support to these measures which, I believe, will be in the best interest of the country. In passing, however, I want to say that as far as the Daylight Saving Bill, which was prepared and put through this House at the last session, is concerned, it caused great hardship and inconvenience in this country. I was absolutely opposed to it then, and if the Bill is reintroduced at this session, I shall oppose it.

With regard to the different commissions and boards which have been appointed to look after work which the members of this Government and of this Parliament should do, I want to go on record as being absolutely opposed to them, because I do not think we have ever before had a greater demonstration in this country of the uselessness, extravagance and unfairness of such boards as the Canada Food Board. The report of the Canada Food Board was tabled last week, and during the period which it covered, namely, from February 1 to December 31, 1918, a period of eleven months, the cost to the people of Canada by way of licenses and fees amounted to over $500,000. Out of that amount, how much do you suppose, Sir, went into the treasury of this country? $39,000, the balance being for salaries, railroad and other travelling expenses of the Canada Food Board and its officials. Is this the way in which the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) is going to justify his action in remaining on the other side of the House? Is he going to allow the people to have extracted from them $500,000, $39,000 of which goes into the treasury and the balance goes for salaries and travelling expenses. This board has passed regulations which are a source of injury to the people of this country and which the people oppose most bitterly. It has passed regulations that have caused more ill feeling against the present Government than anything else has done. Think of that board costing the country thousands of dollars in salaries and its officials touring the country in Pullman cars—for what purpose? To find out who were paying too much money for their foodstuffs? No. Let us see further what they did. They passed regulations which gave to the people of the country foodstuffs that were not wholesome and which should rather have been fed to the stock throughout Canada. I am not afraid to make the statement that this has caused many diseases to break out in different sections of the country. After those diseases broke out, what happened? This great board, when smallpox and "flu" and other kinds of contagious diseases were raging in different parts of Canada, at considerable expense sent out orders: Take back your flour over 25 pounds to the dealers from whom you got it; let them dump it into the barrel and let some other person who has no disease eat it along with the germs. Take the sugar in the same way. Take back your sugar, you people, whatever you have over a certain amount and let those great patriotic societies, such as the Daughters of the Empire and the Red Cross, that are sending over little parcels of sugar to the boys at the front, who are fighting our cause, send over that sugar, let our boys get some of those germs, and let those diseases break out, and possibly have the entire army laid up, in that way, playing into the hands of the Huns. This board went on with all their extravagance at the expense of the people of this country. Let me state, for the benefit of the high protectionists on the other side of the House that they did one great thing for which we must give them credit. I notice they went into the cook-

book business. Of the cook-books which they had prepared, they sold some $7,000 worth, but it cost them some $13,000 to get those cook-books. I suppose the hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) will say that we should have had protection on the cook-books so that we might then have been able to break even. That is the way in which this Board carried on its work, and I want to enter my protest against this useless spending of money at a time when we need money so badly and require every dollar to be guarded with the greatest care.

With regard to the Civil Service, I will tell them where I stand. I believe that the Civil Service of this country should be reduced by one-third, and I think the Government will do well to appoint a committee to see that the Civil Service was reduced by at least that amount, thus saving hundreds of thousands of dollars that is at present expended unnecessarily. The men in the Civil Service who are rendering good service to the country could then be paid proper salaries and the committee would see that money was not thrown away unnecessarily. The saving in this regard would be sufficient to pay a large amount of the pensions that we hope will be paid to our returned soldiers; or the money could be expended in giving a better rural mail service throughout this country, and in giving the men who have rendered such service a fair day's pay for an honest day's work. If there is one department of the Government that is underpaid it is the mail service, and particularly the rural mail service, and I say it is a sin and a shame, particularly as in the future many of these positions will be held by returned soldiers. I urge the Government to see that these men receive fair and even good remuneration for the work they perform.

There is another matter. In camps all over this country there are men who have reached the military age within the last year or so, and who, if released, could secure positions that are waiting for them. I believe every member of this House has received requests for the release of these men, but the Government will not let them go. Why hold these men when there are positions waiting for them in civil life? In the city of Chatham, whose chief engineer has been overseas and rendered good service at the front for two or three years, all public works have been held up pending his return. The city did not wish to fill his position, and did not like to entrust the construction of pavements, sewers and other public works to a temporary man. The city council on January 1 requested the Government to release Major Adams so that the public works of the city could be gone on with and employment given to the men seeking work, but nothing was done. The Minister of Militia, I believe, replied that nothing could be done. It seems ridiculous that public works of this kind should be held up by the Government's retaining the services of these men.

In conclusion, I would say that I personally am prepared to support all measures introduced in this House which I think will be in the best interests of the returned soldiers. There is nothing that the Government can do for these men that will not receive the endorsation of the great majority of the people of this country, and it is up to the Government to do something for them. If they do not the blame will lie with them, because there will be very little opposition from this side.

Mr. JOHN WESLEY EDWARDS: (Frontenac): Mr. Speaker, I desire first of all to add my congratulations to those which have already so fittingly been bestowed on the mover and the seconder of the Address. Seldom, if ever, in this House has that duty been so generally approved; seldom if ever has the approval been more merited. I note, however, that the efforts of the hon. member for Calgary East (Mr. Redman) did not commend themselves entirely to the hon. member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) who had a somewhat serious complaint to make. His complaint was that the hon. member for Calgary East knew more than he had put on the pages of Hansard. As to that, what a striking contrast was presented by the hon. member for South Renfrew, who not only placed on Hansard all he knew but very much that he only thought he knew. In this connection, I might observe that the comic effects of many of the observations of the hon. member for South Renfrew are heightened by the self-sufficiency and conceit of the artist.

I also wish to add my congratulations to those which have been bestowed upon the hon. leader of the Opposition in winning the great Liberal Free-for-All and the $7,000 attached thereto. It is remarkable what speed and endurance an old race horse will develop if he is headed towards home and a good feed of oats. I need not remind you, Sir, that Scotchmen are partial to oats, and the hon. leader of the Opposition is Scotch—plain Scotch sometimes, for he is very blunt and direct in his remarks, and at other times, when his

remarks are interspersed with humour, Scotch and soda, sometimes more Scotch than soda, and sometimes more soda than Scotch. The hon. leader of the Opposition, however, is a very worthy type of a very gallant race, and the best wish I have for him is that he may continue to fill the position of leader of the Opposition for the rest of his natural life and that his years may be very, very long. I think in expressing that wish I am also expressing what is in the best interests of Canada.

The hon. leader of the Opposition assisted by a small choir composed of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) and the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) held a sort of revival meeting on the other side of the House a few days ago. After a few words of prayer or rather a few quotations from Scripture, which fall very frequently from the lips of the leader of the Opposition, the choir sang that old hymn: Where is my wandering boy to-night? The leader of the Opposition then proceeded to notify hon. gentlemen on this side that there was a candle in the window and that the latch string was outside. He did not state what window the candle was in, but the omission was supplied by the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough, who said that it was in the kitchen window. When extending an invitation to members on this side of the House to return, one would have thought that they would have illuminated the front of the house and put a service flag in the window, or at all events given some manifestations of joy to encourage the wanderers to return home. But no. They told Liberal-Unionists on this side of the House that the only way they could get back home was around by the woodshed and through the back door. They had some veal there leaning against the back fence. The Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) would know at once that it was only a grade, and a mighty poor one at that. However, a very pathetic appeal was made by the leader of the Opposition, and a very urgent one by the hon. member for Brome. A still more urgent appeal was made by the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough, who told the Liberal-Unionists on this side of the House that if they did not hurry up they would not get any veal. I have as yet seen no indications on the part of Liberal-Unionists to accept the invitation and hurry to the other side.

As the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) very properly and pointedly said: What is there to go back to? If you are looking for a similarity of ideals, whether on trade matters or other matters, I do not see that there is anything to cause hon. members on this side of the House to go back to the other side. Certainly so far as the war and affairs arising out of the war are concerned, I am quite confident that the Liberal-Unionists on this side will find themselves in more congenial company than they would if they were to cross to the other side of the House.

It has been said by some hon. gentlemen opposite that the War-time Elections Act was simply for the winning of the election, and that the Military Service Act was for the same purpose. Of course, hon. gentlemen on that side are actuated by pure motives at all times, and hon. members on this side have not been so actuated. I want to take a peep at history, and not very ancient history either. In August, 1917, there was a meeting of Liberals in the city of Toronto to talk over the political situation and discuss the possibilities of coalition and that sort of thing. They spoke very candidly one to the other, and their proceedings were reported, though they did not intend that the public should be informed of what they said. One gentleman, speaking of the Liberals as a win-the-war party said:

> Win-the-war party? This is not a win-the-war party. Every gentleman here says the whole aim is to win the election. That is the policy of the party.

Another gentleman, formerly a member of this House for Glengarry, said, that as he had in his constituency both Scotch and French, he had taken the course in this House of voting one time with the Government and another time against it, for the purpose of appealing to both these sections in his county. Hon. George P. Graham, in explanation of his position said that he voted and acted as he did in the House with the knowledge and approval of his leader. He stood on the floor of this House and said that he voted for conscription in July, 1917, and advocated it, on principle, and that he would advocate it again on principle. Fancy the position of the Liberal party as represented by that expression of opinion on the part of Hon. Mr. Graham. He was voting and acting in this House with the knowledge and consent of his leader, yet voting and acting in this House in a manner directly opposed to that taken by his leader at that time. We can only come to the conclusion that in Ontario Mr. Graham was acting with the knowledge and consent of his leader in supporting conscription, while

a different policy was being supported in Quebec.

Another gentleman present at that meeting now occupies a seat in this House, the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy). He said:

> Like other gentlemen who have spoken I regret the diversity of opinion that exists, and I am confused on account of it. In fact for a month or more past I have been like Eliza in Uncle Tom's Cabin, floating along jumping from one cake of ice to another, and now I want to strike shore somewhere, and I want to land soon.

Well, the hon. gentleman, judging from his remarks the other night, is still floating, and on thin ice, too, and on many questions still quite a way from shore. He found fault with the polling of the soldier vote in England. But there are only two gentlemen in this House who received a larger proportion of soldier votes in England than they received in Canada, and of whom it can be said, because of that larger proportion in England, that they gained an election which they would not otherwise have gained. That is: it is only fair to assume that the Union Government of Canada would have obtained as large a proportion of soldiers' votes overseas as they obtained in Canada. If you give to them only the same proportion of soldiers' votes overseas as they received of the soldiers' votes on this side, and hand the rest of the soldiers' votes over to their opponents, there are only two seats that could have been affected adversely to the hon. members now sitting in this House. So, I think Eliza will have to jump on another cake of ice so far as this point is concerned.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Kennedy) also referred to the franchise legislation. He said that franchise legislation should be fair and just. I presume we all agree to that as a statement of principle. The only question is what a man considers fair and just. Is it fair to give the franchise to the slacker, the defaulter, the alien enemy in this country? Is it fair to place these men in the same position as men who have done their duty throughout the four and a half years of war? Is it fair to recognize in the alien enemies of this country citizens on an equal plane with those who have loyally stood by the country in its hour of need? According to the hon. member for North Essex, and several others who have spoken on that side that would be a proper course to pursue. I take issue with them on that; I say that that sort of legislation would be simply putting a premium upon treason and cowardice, it would be unfair legislation—unfair to those in this country who faced their responsibilities as citizens and were prepared to take all the chances that went with doing their duties as citizens.

The hon. member for North Essex and several other hon. members opposite,—the hon. member (Mr. McCoig) who has just taken his seat, I believe, is one—find fault with the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) because he is not in Canada at this time. They say that the Prime Minister should be in Canada now attending to tariff matters, attending to railway matters. The hon. member for North Essex said that Canada is not concerned with the settling of Balkan boundaries nor the policing of Constantinople. That seems a strange stand for a man to take in view of what this country fought for through four and a half years of the most terrible war the world has ever known.

Canada is not concerned in the settlement of the boundaries of the Balkan States. Is it not true that that part of Europe was a seething bed of revolution and a serious trouble for years, and that that trouble arose very largely from the unsettled conditions of the people because the boundaries were not properly arranged and certain races found themselves under the jurisdiction of other people and rebelled against that sort of thing? If Canada has any interest in world peace, it seems to me to require no argument that she is very much concerned in seeing that there shall be a rearrangement of the boundaries of these countries which will make it impossible, as far as we can do so, for such a war to take place again. Is Canada not concerned in policing Constantinople? Is it possible that any hon. gentleman will argue that we Canadians have no concern in the fact that the Turks have murdered in cold blood over a million Armenians whose only fault was that they had accepted the Christian faith? The hon. gentleman may argue that it is more important to us in Canada to settle at once our tariff differences than to endeavour to arrange matters over there and place Turkey in such a position that she cannot in the years to come murder and mutilate, as she has done, not only during this war but for years before this war?

Mr. Speaker, I think we in Canada should be proud of the fact that we have a Prime Minister who is recognized by the statesmen of Britain and France as a man of superior ability, as a man possessing talents which can be of the greatest assistance in bringing about a rearrangement to make impossible the state of things which has filled every honest and decent person with horror during the last four and a half

years. The Prime Minister is a man whose soul is sick with horror at what has taken place during the last four and a half years, a man whose vision is broader than the bounds of Canada, or of the British Empire, a man who feels himself to have an interest in the whole human race and what affects the whole human race, and who is playing his part and bringing honour to this country in trying to effect a settlement which will last for all time to come and which will place these countries where they properly belong. I think the expressions which have fallen from the lips of some hon. gentlemen opposite in regard to the absence of the Prime Minister at this time do very little credit to them. The tariff can wait for a few months if need be. The Prime Minister's place at the present time, I submit, is over in Paris, giving them there the benefit of his ability in the effort to effect a settlement of this great war and bring matters to a proper conclusion.

I shall not undertake to add to what has been said already in the way of paying tribute to the achievements of our soldiers overseas. I could not hope to say anything as eloquently and as well as it has been said by many hon. gentlemen who have referred to what our soldiers have done. We are face to face now with the problem of reconstruction and the soldier enters very largely into that problem. I think I am logical in saying that, so far as the soldier is concerned, the problem of reconstruction and repatriation is greater in the constituency which has a thousand soldiers returning to it than in a constituency which has only half a dozen soldiers returning to it. There are certain constituencies in Quebec, for instance, where it will not be any problem at all. If you can judge from the number of soldiers who went from these constituencies by the soldier vote polled, then I submit the problem of repatriation, as far as they are concerned, is no problem whatever. There are several constituencies in Quebec, according to the soldier vote polled in Canada and overseas, that have only three soldiers to repatriate. Things cannot be very much disturbed in a constituency where they only have to repatriate three soldiers supposing that they have all lived through the war and returned. In the constituency of Kamouraska, for instance, there were only 15 soldier votes polled on this side of the water and overseas. Things cannot be so terribly out of tune in that part of Canada in so far as the soldier or repatriation is concerned.

I propose to place on Hansard some figures showing what various parts of Canada have done in regard to sending soldiers in this war. That is something that has not been touched on as yet and I propose to place these figures on record now. The Military Service Act came in for considerable criticism in this House although it passed with the approval of all the provinces of Canada except one. The Government tried honestly under that Military Service Act to keep faith with the men overseas and to keep faith with them by disturbing conditions in this country as little as possible. In order not to disturb conditions more than was absolutely necessary in this country, in order to leave to farming and industrial pursuits those men that could least easily be spared, provision was made in the Military Service Act for certain exemptions and exemption tribunals were appointed. As time went on it became very apparent that the very machinery of the Act which had been provided for the purpose of retaining here those men that could least be spared was being made use of to defeat the purpose of the Act which was to get the necessary number of men to go overseas.

In that connection I may say that out of 403,135 registrations in the Dominion of Canada all but 25,508 asked for exemptions and that was pretty general in all the military districts. But I wish to point out this, and it is exceedingly significant, that those military districts that asked for the lowest number of exemptions in proportion to registrations were those military districts that had already contributed the greatest number of men, and those districts which asked for the greatest number of exemptions were the ones that had already done little or nothing. For instance, in the district of Quebec 39,351 registered, and 39,072 asked for exemptions, and if you look at the figures in connection with the enlistments up to the time of the enforcement of the Military Service Act, the enlistments from that district were the lowest of any district in the Dominion of Canada.

Well, Sir, every person knows that as time went on the Germans made their attempt to break through on the Western Front. The French line was bent back towards Paris, that part of the line held by the British was bent back towards the channel ports, and things looked very dark indeed. The Government of this country, and the Government of Great Britain and the people of France saw that every man that could possibly be spared must go to

the Front if we were to save the situation, and steps were taken here to cancel all exemptions; it was absolutely necessary if we were going to keep faith with the men overseas that men should be sent to support them in their efforts to maintain the position on the Western Front. Great Britain had already been drained of almost every available man, and was short of food, yet she went out and took over thirty thousand off the farm, and there was not any kick or row in the Mother Country about it.

On March 31, 1918, the number of recruits obtained from the several provinces were as follows—I will give the number of recruits in March, 1918, and also on August 15, 1918, in order to show what was done here by the Militia Department in trying to obtain the necessary help for the boys overseas. Up to March 31st, 1918, Ontario had contributed 193,689 recruits, and up to August 15th, 1918, 235,925 recruits, an increase of 42,236. Quebec had contributed on March 31st, 1918, 55,206, and on August 15th, 71,891, an increase of 16,685, that is for the whole province. Maritime Provinces on March 31st, 1918, 45,662, and on August 15th, 1918, 56,937, an increase of 11,275. Manitoba on March 31st, 1918, 64,624, and on August 15th, 1918, 72,593, an increase of 7,969. Saskatchewan on March 31st, 1918, 28,540, and on August 15th, 1918, 36,980, an increase of 8,440. Alberta, on March 31st, 1918, 38,188, and on August 15th, 1918, 44,238, an increase of 6,050. British Columbia on March 31st, 1918, 46,895, and on August 15th, 1918, 51,947, an increase of 5,062. That is to say, on the 31st of March 1918, we had 482,806 recruits, and on the 15th of August, 1918, we had 570,521, or we had added in that time 97,717. I submit to you, Sir, that these figures are creditable to the Militia Department and to the efforts of the Government of this country.

I want to carry those figures a little bit further. I want to be perfectly fair to every part of the Dominion in regard to this matter, showing what each did towards helping to win this war. I want to place these figures on record because I think they have a very direct bearing upon the question of reconstruction in this country, and they should be taken into consideration by the Government when it is formulating its plan for the expenditure of money throughout the different parts of this Dominion. If we deduct from the population of each province all Europeans, Asiatics and foreign born, except those from Belgium, France, Italy and Rumania—and I except those because I think it is only right to assume that any residents of those countries in Canada would be willing to do their part with us, and to enlist as our men were enlisting to carry on the war—if we deduct those Germans and Austrians, and so on, from the populations of the various provinces I find that it gives us this result: That out of every one thousand recruits each province should have furnished in proportion to its population as follows: Ontario 368, Quebec 275, Maritime Provinces 138, Manitoba 67, Saskatchewan 59, Alberta 47, and British Columbia 46. That, Sir, is the proportion which each province should have contributed in proportion to its population. Now I will place on Hansard what each province did contribute as against what they should have contributed

—	No. of Enlistments.	No. that should have enlisted in proportion to population.	No. above or below quota according to population that should have been furnished by each province.
Ontario	241,258	217,330	23,928 (Excess).
Quebec	80,097	162,407	82,310 (Below)
Maritime Provinces	59,206	81,498	22,292 "
Manitoba	73,434	39,568	33,866 (Excess).
British Columbia	53,765	27,166	26,599 "
Saskatchewan	37,666	34,843	2,823 "
Alberta	45,146	27,756	17,390 "

I might say that these figures take us right up to the 15th of November, 1918, and that in the case of British Columbia that province was pretty nearly one hundred per cent in excess of its fair quota or proportion of population.

I want to impress on the members of the House the fact, which cannot, I think, be controverted, that had each province enlisted men in proportion to its population, Quebec would have contributed 82,310 more men than it did, the Maritime Provinces

would have enlisted 22,292 more men than they did, and Ontario and the Western Provinces would have had 104,602 men available for agricultural and industrial purposes. I know full well that in various parts of Ontario there was a great lack of help on the farms; men were scarce. The same was true, I am told, in various parts of the Northwest, in the Prairie Provinces. But what would it have meant to Alberta, for instance, if they had had 17,390 men to help them produce and take off their crops? Had these other parts of the country done their full share, that would have been the result so far as Alberta is concerned. What would it have meant to Ontario to have had 23,928 men scattered throughout the province on the farms and among the industrial concerns? You cannot avoid the lesson which these figures teach when you are considering the problems of reconstruction and repatriation. These problems are necessarily greater in the Western Provinces and in Ontario than they are in the provinces which did not contribute their fair share of men during the war. That is all I have to say in regard to that; I thought it advisable to place these figures on Hansard in order that we might have them there and learn whatever lesson they have for us.

The member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) made some remarks with reference to the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). Among other things he said that when the member for Red Deer came into this House he advocated the principle of free trade as they have it in England. If my memory serves me correctly, at one time that motto was nailed to the Liberal masthead. The difference between the member for Red Deer and the members of the Liberal party is found in the fact that while the Liberal party hung that out as their motto and said that they were for free trade as they have it in England, they used that motto only for election purposes. Whether or not we agree with the trade principles of the member for Red Deer, we must concede that he has at all times been absolutely consistent in advocating free trade principles on this side of the House, on the other side of the House and throughout the country. There has been no straddling by the hon. member for Red Deer. I do not agree with that hon. gentleman on trade matters any more than he agrees with me, but I respect a man who has the courage of his convictions as he has, and who has never lost an opportunity since he came into the House of advocating the principles in which he honestly believes. His position in that regard is vastly different from that of the member for Kent and from that of every hon. gentleman on the other side of the House. Who in this House or in the country would dare to say that the trade history of Canada has ever shown the Liberal party to be consistent in the matter of trade or trade policy? Free trade as they have it in England, tariff for revenue, unrestricted reciprocity with the United States—I fancy that at present there are as many trade policies on the other side of the House as there are members. Yet they ask us to come down at once with a tariff policy. The member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) said that the tariff matter must be settled immediately, but he did not offer one single suggestion or give us the slightest idea of what his own views on tariff matters are. The member for Kent found fault with the member for Red Deer. Will the member for Kent say that he is in favour of free trade for Canada? Will the leader of the Opposition say that he favours a policy of free trade for Canada? Will the member for Brome say that he favours a policy of free trade for Canada? Not one of them will speak. Then, for Heaven's sake, let them keep silent; let them not criticise a man who has always been a consistent free trader in this House and out of this House.

Talking about straddling the fence, what was the position of the member for Kent in the last election? Pretty nearly every one knows that he was playing for the soldier vote. He was on the fence, representing himself as being with the Government so far as the soldiers were concerned,—looking for the endorsation of both leaders, if he could get it. He played that up to the limit and he succeeded in getting a fair share of the soldiers' vote. But as a straddler—well, he is an adept at straddling. As a matter of fact, he kept straddling the fence so long that there was a danger of there being two McCoigs instead of one.

The hon. gentleman speaks about the increase in the price of agricultural implements during the war. Yes, the price of agricultural implements did go up during the war. So did the price of beans, of which they raise large quantities in the county of Kent, I believe. So did the price of tobacco. So did the price of potatoes. The price of many articles went up during the war. I should have been very much surprised had the price of manufactured articles not gone up, as everything else went up.

The hon. gentleman would have us believe that members on that side of the House are in favour of free trade. The

history of the party does not show that. What was the position taken in regard to agricultural implements in 1907, for instance? The member for Kent was supporting the Liberal party at that time, cheering and hurrahing for the Liberal platform. In 1907 the question of the duty on agricultural implements came up in this House. The member for Kent was not a member of the House at that time. He came into Parliament the next year, but he came in as a strong supporter of a party which had refused in 1907 the appeal of the Conservatives in this House for the reduction of the duty on agricultural implements from 17½ to 10 per cent. When the Fielding tariff was brought in, in 1907, the proposal was to bring the duty down to 17½ per cent, and Dr. Schaffner, now Senator Schaffner, then the member for Souris in this House, moved that the duty on agricultural implements be reduced to 10 per cent. Every Conservative member in the House at that time voted for Dr. Schaffner's resolution, and every Liberal voted against it. Therefore, in so far as the tariff on agricultural implements is concerned, I think I am quite reasonable when I say that past history would encourage the hon. member for Red Deer ((Mr. Michael Clark), or any other free trader, if there is any other out-and-out free trader in this House, to hope for more from the Conservative party or Unionist party than he could expect to get from the old Liberal party.

There is another matter to which I wish to refer for a few minutes. I am sorry to have to refer to it, but I do not think that I should take my seat without making some reference to Civil Service reform. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) a few days ago brought up in this House the matter of the Civil Service and offered some criticism. I was in the House during the whole time that the hon. member made his speech, and not only did I follow him very carefully in the House, but to make certain of what he said I very carefully read his speech as reported on Hansard. I could not, however, find in the hon. member's speech a single sentence, line or word which would justify any person of accusing him of religious bigotry. He presented the matter in a moderate and fair manner. Not once in the whole course of his speech did he mention the word "religion." And yet, because his criticism of the Civil Service affected the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission, Mr. Foran, that gentleman is reported in the press the next day as saying that the remarks of the hon. member for West Toronto against him were actuated by religious bigotry; that the hon. member for West Toronto assailed him, Mr. Foran, because Mr. Foran was a Roman Catholic. I repeat that from beginning to end of his speech, you cannot find one word to justify that accusation by the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission. Have we come, Sir, to a state in this country that an hon. member of this House cannot, from his seat, without being characterized in the press as a bigot, criticise a civil servant who happens to be a member of the Roman Catholic church? Is that the situation with which we are face to face in Canada to-day? It looks very much like it. Not only do I resent that accusation by Mr. Foran, the Secretary of the Commission, but I resent the editorial which appeared yesterday or this morning—I forget which—in the Ottawa Journal.

I am going to refer to a case which will throw some little light on this question. I understand from the press that one of the ministers is going to refer to the Civil Service, and I am very glad to speak before he does, because this is a matter which he can add to his list, and he can give us some explanation on this as well as on the matters on which the hon. member for West Toronto touched. There appeared in the Canada Gazette on December 28 this advertisement:—

> A Publicity Agent to take charge of the publicity work of the Department of Immigration and Colonization at a salary of $4,000 per annum. Candidates should possess the following qualifications:—Ability to prepare and direct newspaper, magazine and farm journal advertising campaigns, both in Canada and elsewhere, in setting forth the settlement opportunities in Canada; knowledge and experience with (a) follow-up systems, (b) the production and circulation of motion pictures, and (c) the natural resources of Canada; ability to direct lecture campaigns; a personal acquaintance with writers, publicists and organizations now dealing with the opportunities and land settlement problems of Canada.
>
> Application forms, properly filled in, must be filed in the office of the Civil Service Commission not later than the 24th day of January.

In answer to that advertisement, I desire to place on Hansard an application made by a gentleman who seems to me to possess the qualifications called for in the advertisement. He writes as follows:—

> William Foran, Esq., Secretary,
> Civil Service Commission,
> Ottawa.
>
> January 24, 1918.
>
> Sir,—I have the honour to attach herewith formal application for the position of Publicity Agent of the Department of Immigration and Colonization.

I am at present in charge of the Publicity of the Vocational Branch of this department, which involves considerable research work, and feel that I have qualifications and experience which would fit me eminently for the vacant position.

In my late appointment (prior to the war) as manager of the Copy and Art Department of the Norris-Patterson Advertising Agency, I was brought in touch with many of the leading Canadian advertisers, the preparation of whose copy was in my hands, and the continued success of these advertising campaigns is evidence of the quality of this copy. In many cases it has been my duty to advise on and instal follow-up systems, and especially in the preparation of catalogues and booklets, my experience has been very varied, embodying, as it does, a knowledge of the technicalities of the printing and engraving industries.

As regards the Farm Press, it has been my privilege to handle a number of advertising accounts of manufacturers, appealing particularly to the farmers of Canada, and this has involved a study of farm conditions which was essential before contact with this section of the community could be made.

For the International Varnishing Company, I prepared a lecture with over 200 slides describing the winning of the raw materials in different parts of the world that composed the varnish of commerce and of the processes and manufacture of this commodity—this lecture being part of an educational campaign, directed to the retail merchants of Canada. This is directly along the lines of Cinema Publicity.

I am considered a forceful public speaker, and have had not a little experience along this line, and could adequately plan and direct such campaigns as would be desirable.

In conclusion, I would direct your attention to the fact that I have a most intimate acquaintance with Publicity in all its forms, my work in my late position calling for the origination and design of advertising publicity of every kind. This work brought me in the closest touch with the newspapers and periodicals throughout Canada, and in a large degree with the Farm Press, and my position as Editor of "Economic Advertising" gave me extended acquaintance with leading Canadian, English and American writers and publicists.

I shall be happy to wait on you at your convenience,

I have the honour to be, Sir,

Your obedient Servant,

(Signed) Donald Tuck.

I might add to that the following partial list of campaigns handled wholly or in part by Mr. Tuck:—

The Campaign (1913) for advertising the benefits of Advertising; the Convention Campaign (1914), of the Associated Advertising Clubs of the world, E. W. Gillett Co., Limited, Ames, Holden & McCready, Pedlar People, Limited, International Varnish Company, Cudahy Packing Company, B. Greening Wire Company, American Chiclet Company, H. R. Williams Machinery Company, Canadian Shredded Wheat Company, Gidley Boat Company, Monarch Knitting Company, Steele Briggs & Company, and many others.

Mr. Tuck was notified by the secretary of the commission on February 6 that the position had been given to Mr. R. J. E. Stead of Calgary, as the best qualified candidate. He wrote asking for further particulars and for the names of the board of experts or examiners to whom the secretary of the commission had alluded. That information was given. The personnel of the board of examiners is as follows:

Sir John Willison, formerly editor of the Toronto Globe and Toronto News, now Canadian representative of the London Times; P. D. Ross, editor of the Ottawa Journal; Dr. George H. Locke, Librarian of the Toronto Public Library and Associate Director of Public Information. Dr. Locke, was, unfortunately, ill and was unable to attend the meeting and his place was taken by Dr. A. D. DeCelles, Librarian of Parliament. The Department was represented by the Acting Deputy Minister, Mr W. W. Cory.

I have nothing to say with regard to the ability of the gentlemen who composed the board of examiners who no doubt are very able men but I would direct attention to the fact that they are writers and not men whom you would naturally regard as competent to select a publicity agent. Mr. Foran in one of his letters tells this gentleman that fifteen returned soldiers were among the applicants for the position. The gentleman whose application I have just read is also a returned soldier who had been in the service three and a half years and certainly possesses to my mind the qualifications which would entitle him at least to a personal interview by the Commission. Now, Sir. I make these points: Mr. Stead was appointed on December 19,1918 and drew the salary of the position from that date. Yet the vacancy was not advertised until December 28, 1918. Now get those dates right. I say that Mr. Stead was appointed on December 19, 1918 and the advertisement appeared in the Canada Gazette on December 28, 1918. I say further that no opportunity was given to the candidates to appear in person before the Commissioners. I say also that despite the fact that fifteen returned soldiers had put in their applications, and that one in my judgment had every qualification for the position, the Civil Service Commission disregarded the stated policy of the Government and appointed a man who was not a returned soldier. I submit further that the Board of Examiners in this case did not possess the necessary qualifications to judge of a candidate's fitness for this position. The men composing the board were literary men with little or no publicity experience. I am told that Mr. Stead has not the very wide qualifications for a publicity man called for in the advertisement, that he is a story-writer and a poet. I

complain that no opportunity was given to candidates to submit to any written or oral test, and that competition was eliminated by the absence of such a test. Now, Sir, is not a member of this House justified in criticising such a state of affairs? Mr. Stead was selected by whom? By the Civil Service Commission? Not at all. They delegated their powers to the committee I have already named. Once more I call your attention to the fact that one of the members of that committee was Mr. P. D. Ross, editor of the Ottawa Journal, the gentleman, I suppose, who wrote the editorial criticising severely and unjustly the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). It is all right for Mr. P. D. Ross through the columns of his paper to criticise a member of this House for daring to offer any criticism of the Civil Service Commission, because he was one of the subcommittee appointed to select one of his friends for a Government position. You can see the Ethiopian in the wood-pile there, Mr. Speaker, and you don't have to put your glasses on to see him.

I have not one word of adverse criticism or disrespect to offer with regard to the members of the Civil Service Commission. Two of these gentlemen I know, and have known for a number of years, and I have the highest respect for them. The other member of the Commission I do not know, but I have no reason to consider him anything else but well qualified for his position, and a gentleman. It is not the Civil Service Commission that is to blame for the conditions that exist to-day. Who is to blame? The members of this House are to blame because we placed upon the shoulders of the Civil Service Commission an amount of work which no Civil Service Commission under the canopy of heaven could possibly do. For proof of my statement I have only to go to the commissioners themselves, who have furnished the proof over and over again by delegating to subcommittees the work which they are supposed to do. For one position I am told there were 1,300 or 1,400 applications and that a thousand or more of the applications were thrown into the waste-paper basket without ever being looked at. A subcommittee pawed over the other three hundred and made a recommendation to the Civil Service Commission, who notified the appointee that he was the lucky man. There were 62 applications for the position of superintendent of penitentiaries, and another subcommittee was appointed to look over those applications and report to the Commission. A subcommittee was appointed to look over the applications for publicity agent, to which I have already referred. Yet Mr. P. D. Ross, the editor of the Ottawa Journal, says that the members of this House are angry because patronage has been taken away from them, that all that the members of this House exist for is the distribution of patronage, and that now that has been taken away from them they have nothing to do. So far as I am concerned, and I believe the majority of hon. members are in the same position, I have not recommended more than half a dozen men during the whole time I have been in this House. I say that it is as ridiculous a thing as can be imagined to place in the hands of three men at Ottawa the making of all appointments to the Outside Service throughout this country.

What in the name of Heaven does the Civil Service Commission here in Ottawa know of the qualifications of a man for a fifty-dollar post office in the county of Frontenac? There is only one person in the county who must not even express an opinion as to those qualifications, and that is the man who represents the people of the county and is responsible to them. To talk about responsible government and then have a condition of this kind seems to me absolutely silly, absolutely ridiculous.

The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) called attention to the fact that there is a school here in Ottawa run by a gentleman who prepares candidates for the Civil Service. I am informed that he is an intimate friend of the Secretary of the Commission. He was formerly in the public employ under the Laurier Government, and, I believe, was dismissed from his position because he was carrying on this business of preparing candidates. Later he was reinstated, and now holds his position in the Civil Service and makes use of that position to canvass around the departments to get persons to attend his school where they are fitted for the Civil Service, and they never fail. I trust the gentleman will appreciate the ad. I am giving him here to-night. I submit that this is a state of affairs which justifies the hon. member for West Toronto in bringing the matter to the attention of the House. And once more I protest as a member of this House against the attitude of the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission in speaking as he did of the hon. member for West Toronto without any warrant for doing so. I want to express my disapproval of and resentment at the attitude of the Ottawa Journal in its editorial

columns, condemning every member of this House in regard to patronage, and particularly the hon. member for West Toronto, especially in view of the fact that the editor of the Journal was one of the men acting as a sub-committee in making these appointments of which we have just right to complain.

We have been told that old conditions have passed and that we enter now upon a new political era in the Dominion of Canada. I believe that to be true, and I believe that it is a good thing for Canada that it is true. Our politics, from Confederation down to the present time, have been largely a matter of man-worship. Canada had in its public life two of the most remarkable characters that ever graced the life of any country, Sir John Macdonald and Sir Wilfrid Laurier. These men by their personality added to their superior talents drew men to them; their word was law. I am free to confess that, as a life-long Tory, I used to think that when Sir John Macdonald expressed an opinion on any subject, that settled it—it was no use to debate it further. And I venture to say that there are men in this House to-day whose regard for the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier was so great that they paid equal deference to his judgment. This had the effect of suppressing individuality. One of the things that will come out of this war for Canada is that men who sit in this House, from now on, are going to express more their individual opinion than they ever did before. And it is a good thing for the Dominion of Canada that it should be so. I hope to goodness we shall never again have in this Dominion men who are possessed of the wonderful magnetism possessed by the two great leaders who occupied the political stage in this Dominion for so many years. Whether hon. gentlemen opposite believe me or not, I think they will find that men not only in this House but throughout this country are supporting Union Government not only because Union Government has justified its existence, and justified it amply, but because they recognize in this Union Government and this Union party a breaking away from those hard and fast political lines with which, in their soul, they did not agree.

Now, I wish to say a word in regard to the tariff. I doubt very much if this is an opportune time for a thorough revision of the tariff. I stated in this House last session that I did not believe there was in Canada at that time a man who could state what the fiscal policy of this Dominion should be after the war; that after the war we should have to arrange our fiscal policy to meet changed conditions. It seems to me that in the course of the next two or three months, or perhaps in less time than that, there will be such radical changes in transportation rates and in the prices of commodities that we shall be in a better position to form an opinion on tariff questions than we are now, when prices, transportation rates, and other elements in the problem are in a state of flux. Hon. gentlemen opposite seem to speak as if the one only thing upon which parties can be based in this House is the fiscal policy. I venture to suggest that there are problems facing this Dominion of far greater importance than the immediate arrangement of our fiscal policy. I have always been a strong protectionist. I have no apologies to make for that; whether I am right or whether I am wrong, I have been sincere and conscientious in my belief. But, speaking as an Ontario man and one who has been a strong protectionist, I am prepared to go a long way in revising my views on tariff matters if by so doing we can keep together the people of this country, who, it seems to me, have got to keep together if we are to solve the problems with which our country's future is bound up. If we can get together by a compromise on tariff matters, there are other matters, such as putting the foreigners of this country where they properly belong, which are more important, in my opinion, than the immediate fixing of the tariff and the settlement of the question whether the duty on a given article shall be fifteen per cent or seventeen and a half per cent.

Before taking my seat I want to say just a word in regard to defaulters and slackers, and the way they have been treated in this country. I have no sympathy to waste on the man who is behind prison bars to-day for being a deserter or defaulter under the Military Service Act. But, Mr. Speaker, I protest very strongly against an Ontario man who is charged with desertion, or being a defaulter under the Military Service Act, being condemned to imprisonment for one, two, three, four or five years, when a defaulter in Quebec gets off with a fine of $5, $25 or $50. In my judgment, the placing of these defaulters in the penitentiaries and jails of the country is a mistake. They should be punished, but it seems to me they should be placed in internment camps, and the form of punishment I would impose on them would be to take from them the franchise. If they have refused, as they have, to do their duty in the nation's crisis, they should not expect to exercise the

privilege of the franchise. I will tell you why I object to placing these men behind prison bars. They have been guilty of a breach of the Military Service Act. You take a man and place him in prison or in the penitentiary. Apart from the fact that he has not responded, as he should have responded, to the service of his country, he has shown no criminal instincts whatever. Is it a wise thing to take a man who has given no evidence of criminal instincts and put him in prison along with men steeped in crime? Is that wise from the national standpoint? What chance has that man to come out after two, or five years' incarceration alongside of the worst criminals the country may have produced and play the part of a man? For that reason, and not because I think they should be exempt from punishment, I believe it is a mistake to place these men behind prison bars in our penitentiaries and jails.

In conclusion, let me say that the men on this side of the House, whether Liberal or Conservative, in supporting Union Government, had to decide whether party or national interests should be paramount. There are plenty of big problems in this country to be solved. The motives that actuated the men on this side of the House in the last election should actuate them in the future, and their principal idea should be not the good of the party, whether Liberal, Unionist or whatever it may be, but the good of Canada. There should be sufficient independence and patriotism in every one of us to express his honest convictions on the various matters that come before us and do his utmost to solve them in the best interests of the country. That should be the aim of each and all of us, and I am sure that it is the aim of most of the members, at least, of this House.

Mr. LUCIEN CANNON (Dorchester): Mr. Speaker, nothing, I believe, can be added to the completeness, the nobleness or the unanimity of the tribute that has been rendered by the state, by the church, and by the people of this country to our revered leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. May I be permitted, nevertheless, to add a few words of loving admiration. It was my good fortune to know this great statesman in my boyhood days at Arthabaska. It was my good fortune to be brought up within the magnetic spell of his great personality. I have experienced the kindness of his heart, I have appreciated the loftiness of his mind, I have enjoyed the benefit of his paternal solicitude.

His life, Mr. Speaker, has been a striking example of disinterested patriotism. His career has been a continuous struggle towards national unity. His death is a great national loss and his memory will be, I am sure, a guidance and a comfort to all Canadians. May the people of this country never forget the ideals and the principles to which our great chieftain devoted the unceasing labour of his lifetime—liberty and freedom; respect for duly constituted authority; religious and racial tolerance among fellowmen; generous co-operation of effort towards the welfare of our common country. May the sons of Canada reap the bountiful crop which the gifted, the great Canadian has sown among difficulties, among troubles and, very often, among bitter fights. There is an inspired legend of the Middle Ages which tells us that when great men pass away God makes their souls stars in the heavens. If that be true, very soon a new constellation will arise in our northern sky shedding forth rays of golden hope on those whom the great Canadian that we loved so much has left behind to continue his noble work.

The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has made a speech which contains many good things and I wish particularly to congratulate him on the moderation of his feelings and sentiments to-night. The hon. gentleman has spoken of the Civil Service Commission. He has attacked the Government, he has attacked the commission, and he has complained of the secretary of the commission. I hold no brief to defend the Government or the commission, or the secretary.

I hope that some member of the Government will do that for me. The hon. member for Frontenac has spoken of defaulters, and according to him defaulters should not be sent to jail. I agree with this statement, and I think that any member in this House who wants to promote the welfare of this country, and to protect our young men, will also agree with the hon. gentleman. Mr. Speaker, in connection with this matter, the member for Frontenac went back to his old habits for a while, and complained that in the province of Quebec the defaulters were not dealt with as severely as they should be. Now, there occurred in the city of Quebec an incident in connection with trials of defaulters, and a long correspondence has appeared in the papers between Mr. Justice Langelier and the Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe. I wish to remind the House that in con-

nection with this incident and this correspondence it has been proven beyond a doubt that Judge Langelier acted according to the instructions he received from this Government. First, Mr. Speaker, the Deputy Minister of Justice attacked Mr. Justice Langelier and said that he had acted contrary to law, and, after an exchange of various telegrams and several letters, the former had to apologize to Judge Langelier. Therefore I wish to say to the hon. member for Frontenac that I do not wish to discuss whether a man should be fined $50, or $100, or $200. I wish to tell the hon. gentleman, who has more influence with the Government than I have: If you want to have justice given, as justice should be given, to the defaulters, do not have your Deputy Minister of Justice send down instructions, which afterwards have to be denied and annulled by Order in Council.

The hon. member for Frontenac made a comparison that he should not have made, if he is really animated by the sentiments that he expressed at the end of his speech, between the province of Quebec and the other provinces as to their contribution in men during the great war which has just ended. I do not know from where the hon. gentleman has taken his figures, I do not know if the figures which he quoted were given by the Bureau of Public Information, but if those figures are as reliable as the other information given by that bureau they certainly do not show exactly what the different provinces of this Dominion have done. But, Mr. Speaker, is it not time for the men of this country, when they consider the problems awaiting to be dealt with, to lay aside their provincial outlook, to lay aside their provincial prejudice and to look at these questions from a national viewpoint. We in our province have never asked if the province of Ontario has done its duty, we have never asked if the province of Prince Edward Island has supplied a hundred or a thousand men, we have never asked if the province of British Columbia has done more than the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta, but we do know that Canada has done nobly and we are proud of it. And moreover, Mr. Speaker, there are certain other things we do know in our province. We know that many homes are mourning for the loss of dear sons; we know that many women have become widows, and we know that many girls are mourning for boys to whom they were engaged. We know that many of our boys are maimed and crippled, and we know that our boys of the 22nd Battalion have done, if not better, at least as well as any other battalion in Canada. Mr. Speaker, in concluding these few remarks with reference to the speech of the hon. member for Frontenac, I wish to add this: Last year I expressed my opinion of discussions of that kind. I do not wish to reiterate what I then said, but may I ask that we once for all avoid these discussions that are of a nature calculated to lower the level of parliamentary debate and to shorten the radius of our political insight and perception. Let us be Canadians, let us according to the constitutional spirit of our institutions, represent not merely one county, not merely one province, but represent Canada from the Pacific to the Atlantic. Then on both sides of this House people will have understood their duty toward their common country. Ontario and Quebec will no more be separated, the provinces of Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia will no more be western and eastern provinces, but all the provinces will be component parts of a great whole, and Canada will have reached the stage which Sir Wilfrid Laurier worked to achieve and become a nation of free institutions and a nation proud of its Parliament.

Mr. Speaker, the speech from the Throne mentions different matters, and I think I can classify them under three heads: First, International; second, Imperial, and third, National. As regards International matters, my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) to-day laid down principles of international policy that ought to be carried out by any government that wishes the improvement of our international relations. I will not repeat what the hon. member said; but may I ask you, Mr. Speaker, if it is not time to-night for the members of this House to request the Government to state what our delegates and representatives at the Paris Conference are doing? What information have we got, what reliable information have we received, since the Peace Conference was opened? We see by the papers one day that Sir Robert Borden has claimed for Canada the status of full nationhood. We see another day that Sir Robert Borden, from his seat at the Peace Conference has suggested that the Allies should enter into negotiations with the various factions in Russia. We see again that Sir Robert Borden has been meeting the different trade commissions representing neutral and allied countries; but, Mr. Speaker, all the information we get is gathered from the newspapers, and I say that if this Par-

liament is a representative parliament, as it should be considered to be, we are entitled to be informed officially of what is transpiring, and not have to rely upon hearsay information taken from the press. The Acting Premier has mentioned that Canada should receive an indemnity. Well, that hon. gentleman is in a much better position than I am to deal with a question of such gravity and seriousness. But in view of what we hear and what we read, the Acting Prime Minister can hardly ask the people of this country to believe that an indemnity will be paid to Canada, for it seems to be settled that we are to receive no indemnity. Indemnity for what? Indemnity for the damage caused to our country by the war? That damage is very slight. Fortunately for us, the war has but slightly affected our country so far as material damage is concerned. Shall we be paid back every cent that we spent on this war? We do not know. The Government has not said anything in connection with it; our Prime Minister has made no official declaration; we are in utter darkness in this matter as we are in all other matters connected with these conferences. Is this the way to treat Parliament in regard to problems of that character? I say, Mr. Speaker, that in this respect the Government is not treating the representatives of the people as they should be treated.

I saw the other day in one of the newspapers that it was intended to destroy the German fleet which had surrendered. In this connection I would offer a suggestion. If we are not to have a money indemnity; if we are not to be paid back any of the money which has been disbursed by Canada in connection with the war, why should Canada not receive a number of those ships? It is proposed that those ships shall be sunk in mid-ocean. I do not see why such action should be taken. Are the shipbuilding interests behind this move and behind the articles which have appeared in the press in this connection? I do not know, but I do think that it would be most unreasonable to sink all those ships and thus render them absolutely worthless. Is the Government going to take a stand on this question? If they do not, what will the Liberals say who fought for the Canadian navy advocated by the Liberal party in 1911? What will the present ministers who supported Sir Wilfrid Laurier and his naval policy say when the question comes up before Council? Will the Prime Minister approve the sinking of the ships so that we shall not have a Canadian navy for the defence of our coasts? Because Sir Robert Borden was always opposed to such a navy; he thought it nobler for Canada to pay money than to build ships to defend her own coasts.

The member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) mentioned the proposed League of Nations. I do not wish to take up the time of the House in discussing that matter, but if Canada is to be a party to the League of Nations, Canada should enter that league as a nation. Can we be a party to the League of Nations; can we assume the obligations; can we bind ourselves to such a league, and yet not be absolutely free to decide our own policy in regard to international questions? Mr. Speaker, this is a very important matter, and I have no doubt that this Government has given to it the same consideration that it has given to all the matters connected with the Peace Conference at Paris.

As regards imperial matters, Sir Robert Borden left us last November. Last summer he went over to England, and the year previous he also went over. Since then we have been told that our status in the British Empire has undergone a considerable change. What that change is, what its nature or extent, we do not know. Again I say that this House is entitled to an explanation and to full information, and I hope that the Government will furnish it within a very short time. But I think that both sides of the House will agree on one point in connection with imperial relations, and it is this: the old colonial days are gone. We are no more a colony. We can now say that we are a nation and as such have a right to conduct our affairs on an equal footing with the Mother Country, England. Of course, what I am saying now may be qualified as disloyal. I will remind the members of this House of what happened in 1867 at the meetings of the Canadian representatives in London before the drafting of the British North America Act. At that meeting Sir John A. Macdonald, the leader of the Tory party in Canada at that time, whose memory is rightly dear to every true Conservative in the country, suggested that Canada be described not as the Dominion of Canada, but as the Kingdom of Canada. Mr. Speaker, if such was the opinion in 1867 of the man who was shortly to become Prime Minister of Canada, I think that all members of the House, especially the present Prime Minister, should hold the same opinion and see that we be no longer treated as an ordinary small colony and that we be given all the

rights and privileges of a nation. The British Empire, according to a happy expression that has been used of late, should be not only the Mother Country and her colonies, but a League of Nations in itself.

As regards our relation to England, I feel, representing a constituency in the province of Quebec, that it is good for the province of Quebec that Canada remain as it is to-day, a part of the British Empire, because the great protection that we have as a minority in this country is the protection of the British flag. If we cease to be a part of the British Empire, where shall we be? Shall we become independent? Independence is the dream of every young nation; but are we ready for independence? Could we carry the burdens of independence? Would our financial condition enable us to become an altogether free nation? I submit, Mr. Speaker, that Canada is not yet ripe for independence.

But another and much greater danger than any other that has been mentioned in the press or in this House, is the danger of annexation to the United States. I am against annexation to the United States, because I believe Canada should maintain her British institutions and also that the Canadian nation should remain a nation of itself. I call the attention of the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) to what I am now going to say. His press agents, his censors, have been very busy reporting what the President of the Council has done in Great Britain or elsewhere. The Bureau of Public Information has also been very busy in telling us of different things that have been done by the Government or of different other things that might have been done or will be done by the Government. But instead of having a subsidized press for self-glorification, the Govenrment of this country ought to have a stricter and closer control of the moving pictures shown in this country. If we go into moving picture theatres, we see nothing but American pictures, nothing but the glorification of the American flag. And if there is an American feeling in this country, if there is a sentiment favourable to annexation, the Government of this country is partly responsible for it, because proper control and supervision are not exercised by the Government. I remember, during the war, the censors had cut from the newspapers insignificant bits of news; but if we go into a theatre in Ottawa, or Montreal, or Quebec, we shall see there pictures of such a nature as to make the young men of this country believe that the United States is by far superior to Canada and a far greater country than England herself. The President of the Privy Council should be more loyal and patriotic and should attend to this.

I do not wish to detain the House very long; but, as a Liberal of old standing, I would like to say a few words in regard to the actual situation of affairs in Canada. When I arrived at the House of Commons last year, I was told by members sitting on the other side that we were not to discuss such and such a matter because the war was on. The boys were in the trenches, the country was in danger, and we had to keep silent and united. This year the war is over. This Government was made for the sole purpose of winning the war, and I remember declarations of Liberal-Unionist members of the Cabinet to the effect that the very moment peace was declared, they would walk out of the Cabinet presided over by a leader in whom they said they had no confidence. To-day the war is over; the armistice is signed; hostilities have ceased; but I see with great amazement and surprise, my good friend, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) still sitting in this House as a Cabinet minister. What is the reason? "Win the war" was the slogan last year. This year it is "Reconstruct Canada."

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: By doing nothing.

Mr. CANNON: There is plenty of reconstruction to be done in Canada, because I must admit that this Government has done plenty of destruction. But in my own modest and limited experience, the man who has done the damage is not as a rule the man to repair it. The argument brought forward this afternoon by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) would be good if the situation existing in the world to-day was new; but, there have been wars before, there have been reconstruction periods before, and history is there to show us what was done. The hon. ministers will be surprised to know that there was living in England a gentleman who was Prime Minister while England was fighting Napoleon. There was in those days no cry of win-the-war in order to form a Union Government and stifle freedom. Government was carried on according to the old constitution of England, according to the usual lines. The war was won; the reconstruction period ensued; party government was continued, and what happened? Was England ruined? No, England saw an era of development without any precedent. Not only that, but after those exhausting wars carried on by

England through a period of twenty-five years, party strife was kept up and political liberty flourished in England as never before. We saw, for instance, carried through the Houses of Parliament that great Bill of liberty and justice, the Bill of Catholic Emancipation. Later on—and this reminds me of what my hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said a few minutes ago, namely, that the tariff should be left alone—after those wars, wars that had been fought by England with the energy which always belongs to England, tariff questions were brought to the front. We saw the Manchester school preaching free trade. The Corn Laws were repealed Free trade was established in England. Moreover, the whole basis of representation in Parliament was changed. The Reform Bill was passed. It was in the periods immediately following great wars that England went through that political development to which Englishmen owe to-day their prosperity, their liberty and the stability of their institutions.

But a more recent example may be quoted. I draw the attention of hon. members of this House to the situation which existed in the United States after the Civil war. During the reconstruction period was there a cessation of political strife? No, government was carried on after the war as it had been carried on before and during the war. Party government was considered the best. In those days the man who had guided the neighbouring republic through the terrible war, was stricken down. Abraham Lincoln died when his talents were most needed, but his party remained, his party carried on the Government of the United States, and the trouble that was experienced in the United States at that time was trouble caused by politicians who went into the Southern States and tried to do what this Government did last year, namely, to take away the franchise from citizens who were entitled to it. It was only when that exceptional condition of things was removed and the normal state of affairs was re-established in the Southern States that the real peace existed and has existed in the United States ever since. If England after the great war against France and the United States after the great Civil War were able to carry on party government, and carry it on successfully, history disproves the argument brought forward by my hon. friends opposite to the effect that reconstruction necessarily means a period when political hostilities should cease; their argument is not sound at all.

The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), and other former Liberals now sitting on the other side of the House have told us they are still Liberals and we cannot put them out of the party. I would say to our friends opposite that I have not the authority or any intention of doing any such thing. Two years ago a great issue arose in this country. Many Liberals in all honesty left their old leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and supported the present Government. Some of them now sitting in the House often said last year: "We cannot vote against this Government. We have to support it because we want to win the war." That object has now been attained, and any Liberal on the other side of the House who wishes to remain a Liberal must now show that he is honestly supporting a Liberal policy and believes the policies he is supporting to be so.

I now come to the question, Is the present Government a Liberal Government? I answer without any hesitation whatsoever that not only is it not a Liberal Government, it is not even a Tory Government; it is worse than that; it is a mixture of both without being anything of either. The ministers call themselves members of a union or coalition Government. Coalition Government can only be had by compromise; it can only live by compromise, and it can only work through compromise. And what is compromise? Compromise is too often but the sickly offspring of ill-mated principles. That is the kind of government we have to-day, and I say to our Liberal friends on the other side: You may honestly and sincerely have supported that Government in order to win the war, but to-day, if you are Liberals, you cannot support it any longer.

This Government by its formation showed that it was a Tory Government, and a Tory of the worst kind. It was born of the union of three elements: first, materialism in its lowest form—Sir Joseph Flavelle, the bacon king; second, perverted spiritualism, professionalized religion, subsidized self-glorification, and, last, but believe me, Sir, not least, Sir Clifford Sifton, that brazen time-server, whose political ancestors can be retraced only to the darkest recesses of the history of England when jobbery was an art and treason a career. The present Union Government is the union of these three elements, and I appeal to any honest Liberal in this country: Can you look upon the

product of such a union without disgust and repulsion?

What kind of administration has this Government given? The President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), who formerly led the Liberal party in the province of Ontario,—successor to Sir Oliver Mowat and that line of great Liberals in the province of Ontario who thought that in Canada the ideals of Liberalism should be followed and fought for,—this man now sits on the treasury benches, and what administration does he support? How can he claim to be a Liberal when he supports a Government that has taken away the freedom of the Press? I speak to-night in this House, and representatives of the newspapers are in the Press gallery listening to me, but to-morrow I am sure that no part of my speech will appear in the newspapers they represent. Why? Because most of those men are paid not to inform their readers, but to misinform them, and they have been doing that for the last two years. They say that the President of the Privy Council looks after that, but I don't believe it. They have gone further, and taken away the freedom of the Bench. If there is one thing that the Liberal party have always fought for, it is honest justice, but this Government has tried to prostitute justice in this country. Courts have been given orders that if cases of such and such a nature come before them for decision, judgments are to be given in such and such a way, or else the judge was liable to fine or imprisonment. Are we living in Russia or in Prussia? The President of the Privy Council, a former leader of the Liberal party in Ontario, has travelled in Europe, so perhaps he will let me know. This Government have taken away the freedom of the Press, they have taken away the freedom of the Bench, but more than that, they have taken away the freedom of Parliament. The war is over now, and yet while this House is in session the Government is still taking advantage of the War Measures Act to pass Orders in Council against every principle of British justice.

I see the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) listening to my argument. He used to be a Liberal, and I hope he still is one. I am sure he was not present at the Council table when that Order in Council was passed, with retroactive effect, providing for the punishment of those who have already appeared before tribunals and been convicted or acquitted.

Do you know, Mr. Speaker, how far back we must go in the history of England to find an example of such behaviour? You have to go away back to the time of Charles I, when the Earl of Strafford was beheaded by virtue of a law having retroactive effect as regards criminal offences. This Government has gone back three hundred years for its precedent. But there are " Liberals " in that Government who have declared that we cannot put them out of the party. It is not very hard to put out of the Liberal party men who have acted as these people have acted for the last year and a half.

I submit to the Liberals on the other side of the House that legislation by Order in Council, freedom taken from the press and the bench, the oppressive acts of labour—these are not acts of Liberalism. When the labouring people of this country are told by the Minister of Public Works that they cannot claim their just rights, but must choose between jail and a military uniform, where are we living? Is it Canada?

If the Liberals on the other side, including those in the Cabinet, claim that this Government should be supported on its administration, what about the programme set forth in the speech from the Throne? All the great men who have been leaders of the Liberal party—Blake, Laurier and all the rest—have always fought for provincial rights. Liberalism has always respected the privileges and liberties of the provinces and insisted that they should be protected. But this Government, which has the support of some Liberals, is taking a position the very opposite to that supported by Liberals in the past. Education is a subject that is left to be managed by the provinces, but this Government announces Bills on the subject of technical education. As the ex-leader of the Liberals in the province of Ontario did not leave the Cabinet, I am not surprised that the speech from the Throne runs to war. Prohibition is another question on which the present Government is aiming at the destruction of provincial autonomy. My stand on this question is very simple. I say that this question should be settled by the provinces. But if the Federal Government wishes to pass legislation in connection with prohibition, let us have no hyprocrisy about it. In this country, in the province of Ontario, people now are not rated according to the money they have in the bank, but they say of a man, " He has so many cases of Scotch in his cellar." I tell the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) that this situation has to cease. If we are to have prohibition let us have a law of such a nature that every man must, within six months of the passing of the law, declare on oath what quantity of liquors he

may have in his house, so that we may know.

The speech from the Throne foreshadows another measure. Possibly we may find out once for all whether the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) is a Liberal or not, and whether the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) is a Liberal or not. The Speech announces a Franchise Bill. Two years ago the elections of this country were stolen by means of a Franchise Bill put through this Parliament by the Borden Government. Are we going to have another steal? Will the Liberals who sit on that side of the House protest against such a measure, or will they accept it? The hon. Minister (Mr. A. K. Maclean) who represents the city of Halifax, a few years ago said that the Franchise Bill was a "nameless monster." That "nameless monster" brought him into this House. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) said that it was "iniquitous legislation without precedent in any parliament." He was elected by acclamation. In this House what we want is justice. Let us have justice from the so-called Liberals if they are Liberals. If we are to have an election fight, let it be a real fight, and let not the Government steal the election as the last one was stolen. Speaking even more seriously let me say this: The Minister of Public Works grew very indignant about Bolshevism. As Macaulay put it the only cure for the evils of newly-acquired freedom is freedom. I go further and say that what creates revolution is the love of liberty in the hearts of people who want to live freely and are denied that right. We of the Liberal party on this side of the House represent the men who built up Canada. If in this country we had had only Tories, Canada, politically speaking, would have been in the same state in which it was when the Family Compact ruled. Our forefathers fought and died for our constitutional liberties, and they secured those liberties for the people. Will their children to-day, through want of Liberalism, through want of courage, through want of national pride, cast off our common heritage?

Our boys fought at the front. They have written in the history of Canada the proudest pages that we can read. The name of Canada is known all over Europe, and when a battle had to be fought and the best soldiers were to be brought forward, the British command always thought that the honour of the Empire was in safe hands when entrusted to our soldiers. Will these soldiers who have fought on the other side, soldiers who have shed their blood, soldiers who have sacrificed everything that was dearest to them, come back to this country to find that Canada is deprived of the freedom that they have given to Europe? Let Canadians be true to the great leaders of the past, William Lyon Mackenzie, Papineau, Macdonald, Mowat, Laurier; let their spirit prevail in our council and then the living will be worthy of the illustrious dead.

[Mr. Cannon.]

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Maclean, the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Maclean, the House adjourned at 10.55.

Friday, March 7, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the work of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment (Invalided Soldiers Commission) to March 31, 1918, with appendix to June 22, 1918.—Mr. Hugh Clark.

Orders in Council with reference to the work of the Department of Agriculture since the last session of Parliament.—Hon. Mr. Crerar.

THE CASE OF J. H. LEWIS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I served notice upon the Acting Minister of Justice (Hon. Arthur Meighen) that I wished to bring a matter to his notice to-day. I shall read the following letter dated at Winnipeg on March 4th, 1919, a copy of which, I understand, has been sent to the Acting Prime Minister:

To Organized Labour, Greetings:

At the regular meeting of the party in session February 26th, the question of forbidden literature and the case of J. H. Lewis, in particular, under sentence at Prince Albert, was taken up and dealt with and the executive instructed to take immediate action and use every effort to bring about the release of all citizens sentenced, and prevent any further prosecutions under this Order in Council.

The following resolution has been wired to acting Premier Sir Thomas White:

Be it resolved that the Winnipeg and District Branch of the Dominion Labour Party unreservedly condemns the savage sentence imposed at Prince Albert on J. H. Lewis for having forbidden literature, and demands immediate abolition of laws and Orders in Council which make possible such outrages on personal freedom; demands release of all citizens sentenced thereunder, and warns the Government that the persistence of such violations of democratic principles in face of repeated protests is provocative of violence. A prompt and specific statement of Government's intention in the matter is requested.

Be it resolved that a copy of this resolution be sent to all branches of the party, also to the Winnipeg Trades and Labour Council with a request for co-operative action. That copies also be sent to the Minister of Justice and the Hon. D. D. McKenzie, leader of the Opposition; to the Saskatoon Trades and Labour Council, and to the three local daily newspapers and the Western Labour News.

That failing a satisfactory reply within seven days from the above date, the executive committee be called at once to take such steps as may appear necessary to carry out the instructions of the party as contained in the resolution passed at the last general meeting of the party.

Trusting this will meet with your immediate attention, on behalf of the party.

From Yours fraternally,

G. Barlow, Secretary.

A telegram to the same effect was also received to-day. This appears to be a serious matter, and I should like to know whether there is to be any immediate relief of the situation.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): About a week ago J. H. Lewis,—of Saskatoon, I think, not Prince Albert,—was found guilty before Magistrates Smith and Elliot, of that city, of having in his possession banned literature, to wit, "War—What For," and "The Melting Pot," both of which publications are, under censorship regulations, prohibited. Lewis was, I am informed,—of this I am not sure, but I am tolerably certain,—at the time an employee of the Post Office Department. He pleaded guilty before those magistrates and, upon his own admission of guilt, was sentenced to a fine of $2,000, I think, and to three years' imprisonment, so the reports that reach us say. Application by telegram was sent on behalf of Lewis for clemency and new trial. Many telegrams have been received, some simply demanding a new trial, and only two, I think, asking for clemency. The powers of the Crown in this regard are, of course, ample so far as clemency is concerned, but as to a new trial, which is the chief demand, our powers are confined to the provisions of section 1022 of the Criminal Code, and may only under that section be exercised—when on a perusal of the case the Minister of Justice believes that the person should not have been convicted. In view of the fact that he pleaded guilty there would seem to be little prospect that that power could be exercised at law in this case. In so far as it is an application for clemency, it is at present under the consideration of the Solicitor General, who has charge of such matters. I believe at the moment that further particulars have been requested from the solicitors acting for Lewis, and also fuller reports from the magistrates.

FURLOUGHS IN FRANCE FOR CANADIAN SOLDIERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. T. LEGER (Kent, N.B.): I desire to direct the attention of the Government to a matter of importance as set forth in a letter written by a Canadian soldier in England and published in L'Acadien, a French paper published in Moncton, N.B. I have translated the letter into English in order that it may be better understood, and I will read the translation.

Mr. SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. member desires information from the Government on a matter of importance?

Mr. LEGER: I desire to put a question to the Government on a matter of importance. The letter is as follows:

Knotz, Ash., Eng.,
February 15th, 1919.

Mr. the Editor of L'Acadien:—I do not believe I am a grumbler, but when it comes to injustice committed towards the French Canadian soldier, I cannot do otherwise than indicate the facts to L'Acadien which is ever ready to defend our rights. Perhaps I will be able to call the attention of some members of Parliament to the injustices which are done to us in the Canadian Army, and have them claim from the authorities the justice and British fair play for their fellow-countrymen.

I understand, by the English papers, that the Canadian troops in France have crossed to England where they will have a leave of eight days to visit their relatives and friends, before coming to Canada. But the French Canadian soldier who asks for transportation to see the land of his ancestors in France, to spend a few days with some friends he has known in his mother country, or even the Canadian soldier who has chosen a lifetime companion amongst the good girls of France, sees himself refused the privilege of going once more into the country for the defence of which he has sacrificed everything. It is said that the transportation is difficult.

Is that fair play, especially when a great number offer to pay their expenses? There is an order according to the Canadian soldiers who have relatives in England, wives, mothers, daughters, the privilege of bringing to Canada the said relatives at the expense of the Canadian Government, the soldier having only to notify the military authorities of the fact. That is also very well. But why is it that the same privileges are being refused to the French Canadian soldiers who have relatives in France?

I know that my assertions are true, such privilege having been refused to a soldier.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I am unable to follow the reading of the letter as carefully as I would wish, but I have followed it suf-

ficiently to be able to say that if any meaning is to be taken from it, it involves an attack on the Government for its policy in respect to the treatment of soldiers. In no case would that be permissible on the Orders of the Day. There is some question as to how far an hon. member should go in laying the ground for a question, but certainly the hon. member is not in order in reading a letter of that character which involves practically an attack upon the policy of the Government. If he wishes to direct a question to the Government, it seems to me he ought to be able to summarize the complaint or to put it in the form of a question.

Mr. LEGER: My question is whether the Canadian soldier, before returning to Canada from England, has the privilege to go back to France on a visit.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): I think I can answer the question of the hon. gentleman, and I wish to thank him for his courtesy in sending me a copy of the letter he has just read, which I got only a few moments ago. It appears to be a complaint from a young French-Canadian soldier who was in England, and I may say that I have every sympathy with this young man when he says in his letter that he desires to revisit France for the purpose of visiting the girl who is his choice amongst the good girls of France as his life-time companion.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Send him back at once.

Major-General MEWBURN: In that letter he says that he understands the Canadian troops have returned to England. That is not quite correct. The Third Division has returned to England and part of it is on the ocean now homeward bound. In the first instance, it was expected that the Canadian Corps would embark from a French port direct to Canada. That was found impossible for various reasons which I shall be glad to explain to the House later on. Since the armistice, I understand that as regards the troops in England, before embarkation, the men on application have been given a short furlough or leave. I know that the difficulties of transportation across the channel are very acute owing to demobilization and every discouragement is given to men wishing to return to France. This man does not say which unit he is with. If he was with the celebrated 22nd in France, as I presume he was, I understand certain leave was given to that unit in France, and I understand the 22nd Battalion is still in France. I have no personal knowledge of men who have made application being refused permission to return to France on furlough; but if the hon. member so desires, I shall be very glad, if he will give us fuller particulars in regard to this young man and the unit he is with, to pass the information to the Overseas Minister.

[Mr. Speaker.]

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East), for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Thursday, March 6.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Speaker, I intervene in this debate primarily for the purpose of making some observations in respect of the statements made a few days ago by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) in reference to the Civil Service Commission and its work. This debate has been a very long and interesting one, interesting because of the many subjects dealt with by the various speakers and also because of the unfettered expression of the individual views of members of Parliament. As was suggested by an hon. member who spoke last night, I have no doubt that the war will affect our parliamentary institutions just as it affects many other things which concern us. As I listened to the concluding remarks of the hon. member from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) last night, as he championed the cause of free speech, a free Parliament and an uncontrolled press, I could not but reflect upon the last ten days proceedings in the House and come to the conclusion that he was endeavouring to champion a cause whose victories were won many years ago and that all these matters are more strongly entrenched and rest upon stronger foundations to-day than ever before in the history of British representative institutions.

Before addressing myself to the subject of the Civil Service Commission and its operations, I wish to refer very briefly to one or two other matters. I would gather from the concluding remarks of the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) which I chanced to hear the other day, and from the remarks made yesterday by the hon. member from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), that some hon. member had entered a protest against the visit of the Prime Minister and his colleagues to the Peace Conference at Paris. Protests of

this nature have, from time to time, appeared in the Canadian press. I am unable to understand how any Canadian could object to Canadian representation at the Peace Conference now sitting at Paris. Further, I do not believe such protests reflect in the slightest degree Canadian opinion. Every Allied nation is represented there; every portion of the British Empire is there represented. Upon what basis or reasoning it can be argued that Canada should not be there represented is something absolutely beyond my comprehension. This is the judgment day in the history of nations and institutions. The Peace Conference now sitting at Paris marks, probably, the greatest event in human history, and it would be a strange thing, indeed, if we, as a nation, were not permitted to participate in those proceedings.

Can it be rationally contended that Canada, which fought in this war to the end that some day a peace conference would be convened, shall be written down in history as an absentee from the conference? When we entered the war we had in mind that some day victory would be achieved and that a conference would be held in some part of the world to settle the terms of peace, and to provide, if possible, appropriate means to prevent the recurrence of such another war. That day has come, and it is suggested that Canada should not be represented at the conference. I must express my surprise that such a view should be taken by any hon. member or by anybody in Canada.

If Canada should not be represented, why should the United States? Our effort in man-power, in money, and in everything else, relatively equalled their effort, and I am unable to comprehend the process of reasoning which would lead anybody to the conclusion that the great nation to the south of us can with propriety be represented at that conference, but that Canada should not be represented. We fought as a nation. Our political sovereignty is almost as complete as that of any other nation which fought in this war. We are not a subject power. Our political status is not that of a colony or dependency, and I submit that it would be a great offence to the spirit and pride of the people of this country if for a single moment it were seriously urged that we should not be represented at the Peace Conference as we are to-day. Speaking for myself, I should be ashamed of my country if at this period in her history and that of the British Empire our political status were such that we could not with perfect propriety and as a matter of right sit side by side with every other nation which fought in the allied forces, in settling the terms of peace and the other questions arising out of the war.

It must be a matter of pride to us that we are able to take part in this great world constructive and reconstructive programme. A new map of the world, and particularly of Europe, is being made to-day. New nationalities are being established, on the principles of self-determination or otherwise. New political systems are being framed and the old systems are being destroyed. The terms of peace with the enemy are being settled, and there is being organized a League of Nations which we trust will maintain the peace of the world for many, many years to come.

Furthermore, many material problems of interest to Canada and all parts of the world will be the subject of discussion at the conference. For instance, efforts are being made to solve labour problems upon an international basis. The conference is also considering questions affecting the distribution of shipping, of food supplies, of raw materials, as well as economic and financial questions of vital interest to every nation of the world. I cannot take the time to enumerate the different matters which will very naturally and very properly be the subject of consideration by the conference. In view of the world-wide importance of the questions that will be considered by the conference, I say that it is hardly proper to suggest that Canada should not be represented there. And if we are to be represented, what more appropriate than that the Prime Minister of this country and some of his colleagues should represent Canada? How else could we be represented? If anybody had a right to enter a protest, surely it would be the colleagues of the Prime Minister remaining here, upon whose shoulders further responsibilities have been cast in consequence of the absence of their colleagues.

The hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) argued last night that Canada is no longer in a position of political dependency, that it is not a colony in the sense in which it was some years ago. I thought he approached that question cautiously and with some reserve. He took a view which was quite correct and I thought he might have shown a little more confidence in his position. To suggest that the political status of this country to-day, politically or otherwise, is comparable to our position

fifty years ago would be to interpret wrongly the organization and constitution of the British Empire and of the several Dominions and to disregard recent political developments. I do not think it is worth my while to pursue the matter further. I merely wish to enter my solemn and emphatic protest against the proposition which has been made by some hon. members to the effect that the Prime Minister of Canada and his colleagues should be in Canada to-day, instead of representing Canada at the Peace Conference.

I wish to refer very briefly to a matter which was discussed on Tuesday last by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) in his remarks upon the Address. In discussing financial matters he particularly referred to the flotation cost of three different Canadian loans. The figures which he gave are so palpably in error and do so manifest an injustice to the Department of Finance and the Government that I think a few words should be said upon that point. I shall not, however, refer to any other portion of his remarks. I have not the slightest doubt that the hon. member himself is anxious to have the exact facts.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did the hon. member say that my figures were in error?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: My figures were correct according to the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think I shall be able to show that the hon. gentleman was in error in the statements which he made. He referred to the flotation costs of three public loans. First, in respect of the 5 per cent Public Service Loan in New York, in 1916, for $75,000,000, he stated that the cost of flotation was $4,098,580, or $5.46 per $100.

The fact is that the cost of that loan was $2.70 per $100, and not $5.46 as the hon. gentleman states. In calculating the cost of this loan, he permitted to enter into his calculation the discount of the bonds, amounting to $2,022,927, so that his calculations are obviously wrong by that very substantial amount.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will Canada have to pay that amount of over $2,000.000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Upon the maturity of the bonds they must be retired at cost. That is quite correct. But the hon. gentleman was discussing the cost actually paid for the flotation, and obviously and beyond dispute, the discount upon the bonds should not be taken into account in calculating the expenses of the flotation itself. If the bonds were sold at a premium, my hon. friend, according to his method of calculating. would be driven to the conclusion that the loan had cost nothing—even less than nothing. That, certainly, would be a strange conclusion to reach.

Sir SAM HUGHES: You must balance one account against another.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, because the hon. gentleman was discussing the cost of flotation. Of course, the discount on the bonds must be taken into consideration in the bookkeeping, and it of course represents the difference, between the par value of the bond and the issue price, but it has no reference whatever, I submit, to the cost or charges of the flotation. Again, the hon. gentlemen referring to the cost of the "Dominion of Canada war loan, 1915," states that the cost was $3,408,358, or almost $3.41 per $100. The fact is the loan was issued in Canada at the price of 97½. The total cash expenditure for remuneration of bankers and brokers, printing, advertising, salaries, contingencies was $425,677, so that the percentage of cost was 42½ cents per $100, considerably less than one-half of one per cent. Now, my hon. friend, I know, will be one of the first to admit that there is a very substantial difference between a flotation cost of 42½ cents per $100 and $3.41 per $100. Again the hon. gentleman referred to the "5 per cent Dominion of Canada War Loan" of October, 1916, a loan of $100,000,000. He stated that the cost was $3,539,410, or $3.54 per $100. The fact is that this loan was issued in Canada at a price of 97½, and the total cash expenditure for remuneration of bankers and brokers, printing and other expenses was $797,468.27, a percentage cost $0.792 slightly over 79 cents per $100—less than four-fifths of one per cent.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the hon. gentleman be good enough to read from the Auditor General's Report which he has before him the figures given for this loan?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend made the mistake, quite unintentionally, of taking the statement as it appears in the Auditor General's Report without discriminating between the actual expenses in connection with the flotation of the loan and the discount upon the bonds. If he had merely subtracted from his figures the discount, he would have reached the cost of floating the loan. His remarks the other evening made it appear that the discount

upon the bonds was an actual expenditure of money.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I be pardoned another question? I am very dull witted, no doubt. Do I understand that we are not to pay these discounts?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The 5-year term bonds of the 5 per cent Public Service Loan, 1915, were sold at 99.56, which represents the amount investors were willing to pay. The discount merely expresses the fact that investors wished a higher rate of interest than that offered for the bond at par. If the bonds are issued at five per cent and the investing public desire a higher yield of interest than that, they must offer a price below par. The hon. gentleman is perfectly right in saying that ultimately the bonds must be redeemed at par but that is another matter. At the same time I would impress upon him the fact that in his speech he was clearly discussing the cost of floating the loan and he calculated the discount upon the bonds as an expenditure in connection with the floating of the issue. It went into Hansard and to the press in that form, and I merely wish to make the correction so that there may be no misunderstanding on the part of the public as to the actual cost of floating these loans. When securities are offered the seller must accept the price offered by the market, or not dispose of the securities If less than par is offered and it is accepted, it means that par was not obtained for the bonds, but the difference between that and the issue price is not a charge or disbursements in connection with the flotation of the loan.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, as I am drawn into this through no action on my own part, I ask permission to submit a question to the hon. gentleman. How can he get round the statement made in the Auditor General's Report, and also in the Public Accounts, where the figures are to be found exactly as I gave them and include all these items as part of the cost? He will surely admit that I am correct—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is going beyond his privilege under the rule.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think I have fully answered the question of my hon. friend. Upon reference to the Auditor General's Report it will be seen that the discount at which the bonds were sold is treated as discount, and not as a flotation charge or expense, whereas my hon. friend was confusing the discount with the costs of flotation. That is the point I wish to make.

My hon. friend referred also to the fact that the 15-year bonds of the "Public Service Loan," which sold at the figure of 94.94, shortly after the issue went above par, and he infers that the bonds were sold at too low a rate. I would point out certain facts with reference to the money market at that time. The Government were unable to make this loan in Canada, at least it was not thought that a market existed here, and the Finance Minister was obliged to go to the only market then available in the world, New York. In that market Canada had no preference over any other country, and other countries were selling securities there at that time. Canada had to accept the best market price offered or not sell at all. The Anglo-French 5 per cent 5-year bonds had been marketed there about six months earlier. That was a five per cent bond and was offered to the public at 98, or to yield 5·45 per cent to the investor. The underwriting price was 96. This loan was not successful and had an adverse effect upon the market. When the Canadian loan was offered to the public it was selling at 95, yielding over 6¼ per cent. This, of course, affected the market for this particular Canadian issue.

My hon. friend thinks that because the 15-year bond of this issue afterwards reached par and over, therefore, somebody made a great deal of money to the loss of the Canadian treasury. It is true that these bonds did reach par and over, but only for a short period. It is also true that very shortly afterwards they fell to 97. It is also true that in 1917 they were selling as low as 87½ and my hon. friend might as well be solicitous about the people who lost when they fell to 87 as of those who profited when the price went above par.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If the hon. gentleman wishes I can give him the explanation of that although I do not want to interrupt him.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not wish to engage in any very lengthy discussion about this particular matter. It was perhaps peculiar that a 15-year bond should sell at a lesser rate than a five or ten-year bond. The fact is that at this period the short-term securities were more in demand by the investing public than the long-term bonds. Short term securities were at that time more popular with investors. But it appeared later, that the long-term bond

was more in favour and had a wider market than the short-term securities. But that was a condition which nobody could foresee at that particular time in the United States.

The Public Service loan of 1915 was sold at what was then regarded as very favourable terms. The results were highly spoken of by the financial journals in the United States, Canada and Great Britain and I do not think there is anything in connection with it that is open to criticism. The only reason I entered upon this subject was to emphasize the fact that my hon. friend the other evening, in stating the expense of floating these loans, was very grievously in error and represented it at a figure very much above, and in excess of the actual amount.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of privilege. In regard to the statement that I have been grievously in error, I would refer the hon. gentleman to page F-16 of the Auditor General's Report for 1917, Volume 1, where he will find "Charges of Management, Loan Account." The identical figures that I gave are given on that page.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am contending that my hon. friend is wrong in his method of calculation and that he has improperly taken into his calculation the discount of the bonds in reaching the actual cost of floating the issue. He has treated the discount as an expenditure or outlay of money, and in doing so I say he was in error.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not know about discount ——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Now, I approach the subject for which I rose, namely, the statements made by the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) in respect to the Civil Service Commission and its work. The statements made by the hon. member for West Toronto on Tuesday last involved very serious charges against the Civil Service Commission and the gentlemen constituting that commission. I do not know that any more serious charges were ever levelled against any Government, any branch of the Government, or any individual connected with the public service of the country. His charges involve the perpetration practically of crimes. If they are true it is serious; if they are true they are worthy of further investigation; if they are true the hon. gentleman should repeat his statement formally and ask for an investigation. It is hardly fair to the public service that charges of this nature and character should be made unless the hon. gentleman making them is prepared to substantiate them. I want to say to him that if he believes in the statements he has made, if he thinks that they are well founded and can be proven and if he desires a parliamentary, or any other form of investigation the Government will gladly accede to his request if he formally makes the application.

I regret, however, to say that I have come to the conclusion that his statements are not well founded, and that in not one single instance can they be established or proven. I regret that my hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) should have undertaken to make the statements he did concerning one of the important branches of the public service without first informing himself as to the facts. I do not question my hon. friend's motives. I know he is too honourable a gentleman to make these statements without believing that they could be supported by the facts but still I wish to say that in my judgment, after an investigation of them severally, they cannot be supported by the facts, that they are not well founded, and my hon. friend has done a grave injustice to the public service, to that important body the Civil Service Commission, to the members of that commission and particularly to the secretary of the Commission.

I wish to take these charges practically as they were made in the House the other evening, and I shall comment upon them as I go along. The first matter to which he refers is the appointment of the deputy postmaster in the city of Toronto, and I want to read to the House—and I would ask the House to carefully observe my reading of the statements made—so that my answer to those statements to-day will appear quite clear to hon. gentlemen. They will remember that the hon. member for West Toronto stated that the appointment of the present postmaster of the city of Toronto, in succession to his predecessor who had died early in the last year, was very properly made, and he commended the promotion of the then assistant to the position of chief postmaster of the city. He commended it further upon the ground that the appointee was the senior officer and was entitled to promotion under the principles of the Civil Service Act. He then proceeded to discuss the appointment made to the position of assistant postmaster which was rendered vacant by reason of the promotion of the then assistant to the position of postmaster. He made this statement:

My hon. friend from South Toronto (Mr. Sheard), in his speech the other day, approved of the appointments to the Toronto post office. I want to associate myself with him so far as the choice of postmaster is concerned; the appointment was made promptly with the best man available. But when it came to the position of deputy postmaster, what happened? The postmaster, who had worked with the present deputy for twenty-five years, sent the recommendation to Ottawa for his appointment. That appointment was held up in this city for months. It was held up until I instituted inquiries to ascertain the reason for the delay, when I was told that it was due to the Civil Service Commission endeavouring to ascertain whether the official recommended was the senior man. It was none of their business, Mr. Speaker, whether he was a senior man or not—he was the one best qualified for the position. As it happened he was the senior official, but the commission refused to accept the recommendation of the postmaster, who knew all the men that were available for the position, and spent some time before consenting to make the appointment. Why? Because the next man in seniority was a friend of a friend of the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission.

That is the statement of the member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). Now, what are the facts? They are as follows: That the appointment was not held up by the Civil Service Commission; that the man who eventually was appointed was not the next senior in the Toronto Post Office; that the Civil Service Commission did not refuse to accept the recommendation of anybody; that the Civil Service Commission does not know to-day, collectively or individually—or did not know until Wednesday last—the name of the man who was appointed. These are the facts and I propose to establish them. My. hon. friend says that the Civil Service Commission refused to make the appointment. Well, I will give him the reason why there was a delay in the appointment. He says that the Toronto Postmaster recommended, I think, Mr. Westman. The truth is that the Toronto Postmaster did not recommend Mr. Westman until months after the vacancy occurred. He recommended a man in Winnipeg whom he wanted transferred to Toronto. Now if the Postmaster in Toronto had his way, an official in Winnipeg would be the Assistant Postmaster in the former city instead of the one who was appointed, and my hon. friend might then have protested perhaps with some justice and some vehemence. I want to give the facts which relate to the delay in filling this position, and which are contained in a memorandum which I have received from the Deputy Postmaster General. Possibly I had better read from the memorandum itself as it will present the circumstances to the House clearly and in order:

As regards the delay in the appointment of the Assistant Postmaster, Toronto, the following facts are submitted. The Postmaster of Toronto died on the 17th May, 1918, and the new Postmaster was appointed on the 15th June of the same year. As the Department expected the Postmaster to make a recommendation as to who his successor as Assistant Postmaster should be, no action was taken until the 3rd July, when the Postmaster was written to, asking for a recommendation in this respect. He replied on the 16th July recommending that Mr. Thomas T. Bower, Assistant Postmaster, Winnipeg, be appointed to the position of Assistant Postmaster, Toronto. Nothing further was done until the return of the Chief Post Office Superintendent, Mr. George Ross, who was absent overseas looking after the Postal Corps of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, and inquiring into grievances complained of in that Force, as it was considered necessary to have Mr. Ross' advice in regard to whether Mr. Bower should be removed from Winnipeg. Mr. Ross recommended strongly against the removal of Mr. Bower, in the interests of the Winnipeg Post Office, and on the 5th November, the Postmaster, Toronto, was written to, that the Department could not see its way to approve of his recommendation to remove such an important officer from his position at that time, particularly in view of the disturbed condition of the West. The Postmaster was then asked for a further recommendation, and replied on the 18th November, recommending Mr. Eldon Westman. This recommendation was forwarded to the Commission on the 26th November, and on the 30th November the Commission wrote the Department asking to be furnished with a complete statement of the clerks senior to Mr. Westman, also the date of examination, date of entering the service, present salary, and any other information the Department might think justified, ignoring seniority. This information had to be obtained from the Postmaster, Toronto, and the reply was given to the Commission on the 21st December, approved on the 28th December, and the certificate of promotion issued on the 16th January, 1919—the promotion to take effect from the 18th May, 1918, the date the vacancy occurred.

My hon. friend charged the Civil Service Commission with delay in the making of the appointment to the assistant postmastership of Toronto for many months. The fact is that the commission was not responsible for the delay. The hon. gentleman also stated that Mr. Westman was the senior in that post office. As a matter of fact he was not the senior. The Civil Service Commission was justified in inquiring whether Mr. Westman was the senior officer before making his promotion. The Commission was well within the law, and well within good practice in making the inquiry it did. Every single statement which my hon. friend made in reference to this appointment are not founded upon fact, and they are unfair and unjust to the com-

mission in every single particular. Now eventually the appointment was made. The senior officer was not appointed, but I believe the best man was chosen, and in that belief the hon. member and myself are in agreement. That was the view of the Civil Service Commission, but the Commission was not responsible for the delay. The delay was due to the postmaster of Toronto, who wanted to transfer from Winnipeg to Toronto the assistant postmaster of the former city. Why blame the Civil Service Commission then for anything in connection with this particular appointment? The Commission is as innocent of any wrongdoing in connection with this matter as are the mummies in the tombs of the Pharaohs. I repeat, that not in one single particular can my hon. friend justify the statements he has made, and there is not the shadow of a shade of a reason for the complaints which he brought against the Commission in respect of this particular appointment.

Now everybody does not think that the Civil Service Commission did right in appointing Mr. Westman to the office of assistant postmaster, and a protest has been made by the Postal Service Association, I think, against that appointment on the ground that the official in question was not the senior, and that statement is quite correct. There was at least one other official in the Toronto post office who was entitled to that position ahead of Mr. Westman upon the ground of seniority, but upon the grounds of capacity, ability and fitness for the position he was selected.

My hon. friend next referred to an appointment made to the Custom House in Toronto, and this is what he said in relation to that particular matter:

> The same thing happened in regard to filling a position in the Custom House at Toronto. A hardware appraiser was needed there, and the collector of the port forwarded three names from which to make a selection. But, Sir, these three names were taken by an official in this city, and cast into the wastepaper basket, and the Civil Service Commission appointed a man in the city of Victoria, B.C., to come to Toronto to take the position of hardware appraiser.

That is the charge, but the fact is that the Civil Service Commission did not make the appointment at all; they were no more responsible for the transfer of that man from Victoria to Toronto than I was, or than was the member for West Toronto. Yet my hon. friend accuses the Commission of wrong-doing in connection with this particular appointment. I say with confidence that this accusation is not founded upon fact. Indeed, it is not founded upon anything; it is a dream, a vision, on the part of somebody—I am sure not on the part of my hon. friend. The matter never came before the Civil Service Commission; I am sure that not one member of the Commission could give the name of the man who was transferred from Victoria to Toronto. What more can I say about that charge?

Mr. CURRIE: Why, then, was this man appointed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Well, I am going to tell you. The transfer was made by the Customs Department, and its authority for so doing was Section 17 of the Act, which reads, in part, as follows:

> Subject to the provisions aforesaid and to the provisions of section 15, nothing in this section or in this Act shall prevent the deputy head from transferring any officer, clerk or employee from one part of his department to another.

It was under the authority of that section of the Civil Service Act that the Customs Department, not the Civil Service Commission, made the transfer in question.

Mr. CURRIE: Was it the deputy in that case?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know, it does not matter what he was. The official in question occupied the position of appraiser or valuator in the Customs Department at Victoria, and the Customs Department transferred him from Victoria to Toronto. It is a serious thing to charge the Civil Service Commission with the transfer of this man when they had nothing to do with it, never heard of it, and could not even give the name of the man who was so transferred. It is not humanly possible that they could know the name of that man, unless by virtue of the publicity which has been given to these matters during the past few days they had occasion to refer to some documents or were enabled to secure the information from some other source.

Now, if my hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) had attacked the practice of transferring officials he would have been upon safe ground, and he might have been justified in attacking that practice. Speaking for myself, I do think that the Customs Department were hardly justified in making that transfer. I do not think they were justified. They should have known that the doing of that thing would prejudice the Civil Service Act just at this particular stage when it is being tried and when it has many critics and few friends. I think that they are deserving of some castigation

on the part of members of Parliament for doing that. True, they were well within their powers, but I think they did not exercise a sound discretion.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who is "they?"

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Customs Department. I do not say that there are not occasions when it is good business and good practice in certain departments to transfer persons from one place to another. I have particularly in my mind at the moment the Customs Inspection Service. I think it would be perfectly justifiable practice to keep the Customs inspectors moving from one province to another. I believe that a Customs inspector should not long remain in one province. But that is a matter worthy of the consideration of hon. gentlemen. The practice I refer to might very well be attacked, but if it is wrong, if it is open to criticism, surely Parliament itself, not the Civil Service Commission, is to be blamed for it. But it is within our power and our jurisdiction to amend the Act so as to prevent transfers by any one department from one point to another, if we think that the practice is wrong. I do protest, however, against such a body as the Civil Service Commission being blamed for something for which they should not be blamed.

My hon. friend next referred to the matter of advertising for applicants for certain positions and the making of temporary appointments in the meanwhile; and he drew the conclusion that invariably the temporary appointee would secure the permanent appointment by virtue of the prestige given to him through his selection by the department. Again I say that this is a fair matter for discussion, but I protest against charging the Civil Service Commission with the building up of this practice. They are in no way responsible for it; it is unfair to accuse them of it. I myself think that the several heads of the departments should resort to temporary appointments as little as they possibly can. Every minister and every deputy minister should anticipate his departmental needs in respect to the appointment of officials, and only under circumstances of urgency and grave necessity should he recommend a temporary appointment to the Civil Service Commission and subsequently ask the Commission to advertise for applications to fill the vacancy. I say this because such a practice lays the whole Civil Service Act and the Civil Service Commission open to suspicion. In that connection I am not disposed to be too censorious or too critical of the remarks of my hon. friend, because I can quite understand that in the multiplicity of temporary appointments followed by advertising, my hon. friend or any other hon. gentleman in the House might well become suspicious of the practice and might well conclude that improper influences were operating somewhere and at some times.

Now, what occurs? Why are temporary appointments made preceding the publication of advertisements calling for applications? It is invariably due to the fact that a department often requires men possessing special qualifications to discharge special departmental duties. Moreover, the Civil Service Commission has been in operation for such a short time that they have not been able as yet to build up an eligible list from which it can select temporary appointees to meet the needs of the several departments of Government. Therefore, when a vacancy occurs or a new office is to be created and the needs of the department are urgent and cannot wait, the practice is for the deputy minister to make a recommendation to the commission for a temporary appointment, and to ask them to approve temporarily of that appointment. The Commission is not to blame; it is unfair to cast that burden upon the Commission. If anybody is open to criticism, it is the minister or the deputy minister or some departmental head, and I repeat that my hon. friend, in his criticism in this connection against the Civil Service Commission and the Secretary of the Commission, was unfair and unjust to them.

Yesterday evening the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) referred to the appointment of a publicity agent required by the Department of Immigration and Colonization. He stated that Mr. Donald Tuck was an applicant for this position. In his application, Mr. Tuck set forth his qualifications and the hon. member thought that he was entitled to the office. Mr. Tuck's letter is used to support the complaint that the Civil Service Commission should not delegate its powers of appointment to a Board of Examiners. Mr. Tuck, however, was himself a beneficiary of this, because not very long ago he was an applicant for the position of head of the Publicity of the Vocational Branch of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, and his name went before a board of examiners and he was selected. He was, therefore, a beneficiary of the prevailing system, and if he

is to-day complaining of that system, I say that he cannot do so fairly. A publicity agent was required by the Department of Immigration and Colonization and the qualifications necessary were set forth in the remarks of my hon. friend (Mr. Edwards) last night, and I might read them:

A Publicity Agent to take charge of the Publicity work of the Department of Immigration and Colonization at a salary of $4,000 per annum. Candidates should possess the following qualifications:—Ability to prepare and direct newspaper, magazine and farm journal advertising campaigns, both in Canada and elsewhere, in setting forth the settlement opportunities in Canada; knowledge and experience with (a) follow-up systems, (b) the production and circulation of motion pictures, and (c) the natural resources of Canada; ability to direct lecture campaigns; a personal acquaintance with writers, publicists and organizations now dealing with the opportunities and land settlement problems of Canada.

There were, I believe, some seventy-nine applicants for this position. The Civil Service Commission felt that they were hardly capable of deciding, amongst the seventy-nine applicants, who was the man most capable of doing the work. Accordingly they called to their assistance a board of examiners composed of Sir John Willison, of Toronto, Mr. P. D. Ross, of Ottawa and Mr. A. D. DeCelles, Librarian of Parliament. These gentlemen were called together and the applications were put before them. In the end they decided that a Mr. R. J. E. Stead, of Calgary, Alta., was the best qualified amongst the applicants. Will hon. gentlemen be disposed to say that the board of examiners selected were not honourable and capable men? Were they not just as capable of making the best selection as would be the Commissioners themselves if they undertook to make it? Further, the Civil Service Commission is not a board of examiners. Examinations are held on behalf of the Commission throughout Canada from coast to coast. They do not attend those examinations in the capacity of examiners, but examiners especially for that purpose are selected and appointed, and they take charge of the examinations. This was an examination. The statute permitted it. It need not necessarily have been a written or an oral examination; it might be a competitive examination, if in the judgment of the Commission that was desirable. The board of examiners selected Mr. Stead. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) referred to the case of Mr. Tuck, a returned soldier, and he read his qualifications which are very good. I think my hon. friend thought they were so good that he concluded that Mr. Tuck should have received the appointment. I do not say that Mr. Stead deserved the appointment, nor that Mr. Tuck did not deserve it. All I mean to say is this, that when you have seventy or eighty applications for a position, it is humanly impossible to determine with absolute accuracy that one man is much better than another, or that the man who eventually receives the appointment is actually stronger in his qualifications than the man who did not get it. It is difficult to determine matters of this kind to a nicety, and if in the end the Board of Examiners have made a wise and sound selection and have given to the public service a man who will discharge in a competent manner the duties and responsibilities attaching to that office then public interests have been fully met and no one having the public interest at heart can very well complain.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Was Mr. Stead a returned soldier?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think not. Mr. Tuck was.

Mr. McKENZIE: How does this committee proceed in order to reach a conclusion? Did these men appear before the Board of Examiners?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand they usually take the applications made by the several applicants and get from them the qualifications as told by each applicant. They also take all such other means as they consider wise and necessary to afford them information as to the qualifications of the several applicants. They can, if they see fit, bring before them such of the applicants as they think might be best fitted for the position.

Mr. NICKLE: What is the alleged justification for overlooking the returned soldier if he possessed the minimum of requirements for the office?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not say that the returned soldier should not, in this case, have received the appointment. I am not undertaking to say that Mr. Stead should have received the appointment as he did. I am arguing to-day on behalf of the Commission and I am attempting to relieve them of the innuendoes and charges made against them the other day. I am more concerned about that than I am about the defence of the Government, of the departments, or of any system that has grown up or that prevails in the administration of the Civil Service Act. The question,

therefore, which my hon. friend raises, is hardly the one I am endeavouring to answer. But when the public service requires a man for a special duty, the Civil Service Commission is bound to secure for the public service the best man available. If that man can be found amongst returned soldiers, then he should have the preference.

Mr. STEVENS: Did we not, in passing the Act last session, adopt the principle that where a returned soldier had reasonably good qualifications, that is, where he could qualify, it was not necessary for him to have the highest qualifications of all the applicants, and where he had those qualifications, he should get the appointment?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Substantially that is quite true. I agree with my hon. friend. That is the principle set forth in the Civil Service Act as enacted at the last session of Parliament, and I am not disputing that proposition at all. However, there must, in practice, be some qualification to that very general proposition. The Department of Immigration and Colonization required a man for the position which I have already mentioned, and, as I have said, Mr. Tuck was an applicant. He appears to have had considerable experience in advertising campaigns. In the second paragraph of his letter he says:

"I am at present in charge of the Publicity of the Vocational Branch of this department which involves considerable research work and feel that I have qualifications and experience which would fit me eminently for the vacant position.

In my late appointment (prior to the war) as manager of the Copy and Art Department of The Norris-Patterson Advertising Agency I was brought in touch with many of the leading Canadian advertisers, the preparation of whose copy was in my hands, and the continued success of these advertising campaigns is evidence of the quality of this copy. In many cases it has been my duty to advise on and instal follow-up systems, and especially in the preparation of catalogues and booklets, my experience has been very varied, embodying, as it does, a knowledge of the technicalities of the printing and engraving industries."

Let hon. gentlemen remember that the Department of Immigration and Colonization wanted a publicity man in connection with immigration and colonization work. Let us now look at the qualifications of Mr. Stead. Remember, I am not arguing in defence of the appointment of Mr. Stead or attempting to detract in the slightest degree from the qualifications of Mr. Tuck. I simply want to place the facts before hon. members, and they can make their own deductions. I want to place the facts before them in such a clear way that they will be able to visualize the difficulties of the commission in selecting a man of the qualifications required by the Department of Immigration and Colonization. I repeat that I am only interested in making what I think is a deserved defence of the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. HOCKEN: Was Mr. Stead holding this position when the applications were considered?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think so. In fact, my hon. friend stated so the other evening. Upon the recommendation of the Department of Immigration and Colonization Mr. Stead was appointed temporarily early in January, and for that, of course, the Civil Service Commission is not responsible. I shall now read the qualifications of Mr. Stead:—

"Grew up on a homestead 120 miles from a railway, where he obtained first-hand knowledge and experience of the problems of pioneer life on the prairies, and personal knowledge of the practice of agriculture."

May I remark just here that a publicity man for the Department of Immigration and Colonization would naturally be expected to have a knowledge of the western country, where colonization is alone possible. To continue:—

"Was for 11 years a newspaper editor in Manitoba, developing during that time a wide acquaintance with the problems of the West, and also with newspaper writers and editors. Experience includes the management of the advertising department of a paper, as well as its mechanical production, and the superintendence of a job printing department.

Was business manager of The Alberta Automobile Co., Ltd., from February, 1910, to November, 1912. During this period travelled many thousands of miles over the prairies increasing his knowledge of the Country's agricultural resources and business conditions.

In March, 1913, was appointed Assistant Publicity Agent of the C.P.R. Department of Natural Resources, and early in 1916 was placed in charge of all the advertising and publicity work of the C.P.R. relating to the colonization of its lands. Occupied this position until January 1, 1919, when he was appointed temporarily to position of Publicity Agent for Department of Immigration and Colonization. During employment with C.P.R., his duties included the preparation and direction of newspaper, magazine and farm journal advertising campaigns, both in Canada and elsewhere, setting forth the settlement opportunities in Canada; and the installation and direction of a follow-up system dealing with inquiries from prospective settlers."

The duties of the publicity agent required by the Department of Immigration and Colonization naturally had relation to the colonization of our western lands, and the

experience of Mr. Stead with the Canadian Pacific Railway was clearly in line with the duties of this new position. I repeat that the Civil Service Commission was in no way responsible for the temporary appointment of Mr. Stead. There was nothing else for them to do but issue a temporary certificate to him, as a request had been made by the department. Therefore, I say they are not chargeable with any recommendation. There were some seventy odd applicants for this position and the Civil Service Commission chose to establish a board of examiners composed of the persons I have named. The judgment of this Board was that Mr. Stead should be appointed. I have read both the qualifications of Mr. Tuck and the qualifications of Mr. Stead, and I leave it to hon. gentlemen to decide whether or not the Board of Examiners made a mistake. Perhaps they selected the very best man among the applicants; perhaps they did not. At all events, the qualifications of both Mr. Tuck and Mr. Stead were excellent, and I can quite understand how both would appeal to the board of examiners, and I think hon. gentlemen might very well forgive the board if they had selected either. However, they chose to select Mr. Stead, who had been in charge of the immigration and colonization work of the Canadian Pacific Railway—a man who was born and bred in the western country and who knew its needs and might, therefore, naturally be expected to make a very competent official in connection with the matters of immigration and colonization in the Prairie Provinces. That is all I have to say of that particular case.

As I said a moment ago, the establishment of a board of examiners may be open to criticism. But that system is used in Great Britain to-day and was frequently resorted to in the United States some years ago, although I understand they are gradually departing from this practice. I have discussed this matter in the last few days with the Civil Service Commission and they inform me that once they have perfected their organization and have a competent staff they hope, in cases of this kind, requiring technical qualifications, to be able to make the appointments themselves. I appeal to hon. gentlemen to extend to the Civil Service Commission an opportunity to build up an organization, and if this is extended to them I am sure the time is not far distant when they will be able to discharge their duties without deserving criticism on the part of the public. In the meantime, I do not know what else they can do. If the system is wrong, Parliacan easily cure it by amending the Act.

Let me give another case. A few days ago, the Department of Public Works required a solicitor. Seventy-nine applications for this position were received from all over Canada and a committee of lawyers was appointed composed of Judge Audette, of the Exchequer Court, J. F. Orde and W. D. Hogg, of Ottawa, to consider the applications. These three men were all practicing barristers. Will any hon. gentlemen say that if he had been a member of the commission he might not possibly have resorted to the same method as the Commissioners adopted? No member of the Civil Service Commission is a lawyer and, therefore, they could not very well render sound judgment as to the ability of the several applicants for this position.

Mr. COPP: Was the solicitor for the Public Works Department appointed temporarily?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, in that case no temporary appointment was made by the minister, and in that respect the case is different from some of the others we have been discussing. I ask the hon. gentleman (Mr. Hocken) how he can reasonably criticise the action of the Commission in creating a board of examiners to select from the applicants one to be appointed as solicitor for the Public Works Department? Were not those examiners better fitted to make a selection than the members of the Commission? What better method of selection could one suggest?

The hon. gentleman then referred to the appointment of a fruit inspector for western Ontario, and he made very serious statements in connection with his appointment. He said:

> **The man chosen had been an American citizen before the last election in Canada and could not vote in that election. True, he was Canadian-born but he went across the line and was naturalized there.**

This was really irrelevant matter, and many inferences may be based upon what my hon. friend said, none of which, I am sure, he intended.

> **He returned to Canada, and was not entitled, as I say, to vote at the last election, but he happened to become naturalized here since. Then he takes precedence of men who have lived here and have been serving the country, men who never ran away and were naturalized in a foreign country. This person is placed over qualified men because he is a friend of the officials.**

A friend of somebody in the Civil Service, I suppose he means.

The understanding is that the late Mr. Johnson desired this man to be appointed. That is the way the Civil Service is operated.

The hon. gentleman says further:

His name is Mr. J. R. Hastings. We have over the signature of Mr. William Foran, the chief guide of the Civil Service Commission, the statement that when the limit for receiving applications has expired the applications will be submitted to a competent board of judges who will select a man who is in their opinion best qualified for appointment. Is that the way, Mr. Speaker, we understood that this thing was to be worked out. Are these commissioners Civil Service Commissioners, or are they not?

Now, what are the facts in this case? Mr. Hastings was born in Scotland, fifty-four years ago, and came to Canada in 1882. Later, he went to the United States, as have many other Canadians from every province of the Dominion. He returned to Canada thirteen years ago and purchased an orchard at Winona where he has since been engaged in fruit growing. Nine years ago he became associated with the Winona Fruit Growers, Limited, and during the past seven years has acted as secretary and managing director of that organization. In 1917 he became a member of the Fruit and Vegetable Committee in the Food Controller's office, and later, at the request of the Fruit Inspector of the Department of Agriculture was temporarily appointed by the Civil Service Commission. Again, the Civil Service Commission were not responsible for the temporary appointment, and it is unfair and unjust to attempt to use it against them. If the temporary appointment should not have been made, the Department of Agriculture is to blame, and if accusations are to be made they should be made against that department. I understand that Mr. Hastings is a very capable man and well qualified for the position. There are members of this Parliament who say that he is better qualified for the position than any other man in Canada. Certain persons in Ontario sent petitions addressed to the Civil Service Commission recommending another person, whose name I cannot recall at the moment, for the position; but when they learned that Mr. Hastings was an applicant, they wrote to the Civil Service Commission explaining that they did not know that Mr. Hastings was an applicant and withdrawing their support from the man they had recommended. Mr. Hastings was appointed temporarily for six months, and at the end of that time the appointment was enlarged for another period of six months. Before that time ends applications will be received, and I understand it to be the intention of the Civil Service Commission to appoint a board of examiners made up of three of the leading fruit growers of the province of Ontario, and with them will rest the recommending of an appointee to the Commission.

Mr. CURRIE: Will this board be responsible to Parliament? If not, to whom will it be responsible?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The board of examiners will make the selection from among the applicants and will recommend one person to the Civil Service Commission. The Commission will act upon that recommendation, or not, as they see fit.

Mr. CURRIE: To whom will they be responsible for the appointment?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The board of examiners will be responsible to the Civil Service Commission to whom they act in an advisory capacity. The Civil Service Commission will be responsible to Parliament and to the country for the appointment they make. I may state that when the Department of Agriculture required the services of Mr. Hastings they thought they had the right under section 15 of the Civil Service Act to take him into the service and made the endeavour to do so. But the Civil Service Commission intervened and said: You must not do that; we will appoint Mr. Hastings temporarily, and we will issue a certificate to that effect; but applicants must be publicly called for, and from among the applicants we will make the appointment. That is a small circumstance, but I merely mention it to show my hon. friend (Mr. Hocken) that he is not right in criticising on this ground the Civil Service Commission or its secretary. If anybody is open to criticism it is the Department of Agriculture. I do not say this department is open to criticism, but I do say, and with emphasis, that the Civil Service Commission are not in this regard subject to criticism.

The hon. gentleman next referred to a case which, I understand, has been the subject of a great deal of discussion outside; the appointment to the position of Superintendent of Penitentiaries. There has been a good deal of publicity about this matter, largely because one of the applicants, who was one of the Inspectors of Canadian Penitentiaries, belongs to a very distinguished family in this country; in fact he is a brother of the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), and as gallant a soldier as is that hon. gentleman. My hon. friend from

West Toronto, in discussing this particular matter, said:

> And this is the very principle that was adopted when a Superintendent of Penitentiaries was to be appointed. The Civil Service Commission had not the knowledge or the intelligence or the courage to make an appointment, and they selected three men to deal with it, at least one of whom was known to be hostile to the best qualified man in Canada for the position of Superintendent of Penitentiaries. What chance did he have? Among one hundred applicants his qualifications were the best; but this committee says: None of these candidates are quite satisfactory; we throw them all out and we will advertise afresh. You see how they double-cross the soldier; how they whip-sawed a qualified man who is a returned soldier, who fought with the Canadian army at Courcellette, who was promoted on the field of battle to the rank of Brigadier-General and who had had twenty-six years of experience in the very work for which applications were being sought.

I would like to point out that my hon. friend has brought into the argument a great deal of irrelevant matter but which at the same time is calculated to prejudice many members of Parliament and a great number of people outside. If this evidence had been given in a court of law, I am afraid the court would have ruled that my hon. friend's testimony was not relevant and could not be accepted. But, anyway, it has been read into the record and you must deal with it as it is. At the last session of Parliament a statute was passed changing somewhat the administration of the penitentiaries of Canada. This was Chapter 36 of the Acts of the Parliament of Canada for the year 1918. Section 3 of the Act is as follows:

> Sections fourteen to twenty-three both inclusive, are repealed and the following are substituted therefor:—
>
> "14. (1) The Governor in Council may appoint a Superintendent of Penitentiaries, who shall be an officer of the Department of Justice, who shall, under the Minister, direct and superintend the administration and business of the penitentiaries, and perform such other duties as may from time to time be assigned to him by the Minister."

Then it is provided that:

> "The Governor in Council may appoint not more than three inspectors of penitentiaries, who shall perform such of the duties by this Act required to be performed by an inspector as the Minister may assign to them respectively."

It is also to be observed that:

> "(f) 'Penitentiaries' includes not only the penitentiaries hereinafter mentioned or described, but also such other prisons and public institutions as are from time to time designated for that purpose by the Governor in Council by proclamation in the Canada Gazette."

In due course that Act was assented to by His Excellency the Governor General and became law. Later the Department of Justice were required to fill the position and they thought they should promote somebody in that department. The Civil Service Commission took the ground that there was nobody in the department who should be promoted as there was nobody engaged in that particular line of work, or in work which bore any resemblance to institutional work and they said that this position must be advertised. My hon. friends should not and, I believe, would not object to the course taken by the Commission. I am speaking on behalf of the Commisison this afternoon. The Commission are not open to criticism in reference to anything in connection with this particular matter at all. They deserve commendation for every step they have taken in the matter from beginning to end. In the end, an advertisement appeared in the public press asking for applicants for the position of Superintendent of Penitentiaries; a great many applications were received and later a committee was appointed to consider the applications. The members of the committee were as follows: Dr. C. K. Clarke of Toronto, late superintendent of Rockwood Asylum, Kingston, later superintendent of the Toronto General Hospital and, I am told, one of the best recognized authorities in Canada on institutional work; Mr. C. A. Magrath, of Ottawa; Mr. F. H. Chrysler, K.C., of Ottawa; General Fotheringham, of the Department of Militia and Defence, and Dr. Paget, of the Dominion Immigration service. This committee sat to consider the applications received. They concluded that the advertisement calling for applications stressed too much the business qualifications and did not give sufficient prominence to the technical qualifications. They were of the opinion that anybody responsible for the administration of the penitentiaries in Canada, and for any other institutional work that might later be placed under him, required certain technical qualifications. That was their view. It impressed the Commission and the Commission decided to readvertise, setting forth more clearly the technical requirements for the position.

It is a fact that the man who is in charge of penitentiaries, or who is responsible for the superintendence of penitentiaries in Canada, does require special technical

knowledge. The science of criminology in modern times is based upon the theory that all, or most, criminals are insane and that they require special treatment. The modern theory as to the care of these people is entirely different from what it was thirty, forty or fifty years ago. A new conception has arisen regarding the administration of institutions for the care of these unfortunate inmates. I am not going to decide whether the committee or the board of examiners were wrong in recommending that other applicants be advertised for and I am not going to decide whether General Hughes, as the hon. member for West Toronto says, is the best qualified man in all Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There are three of that brand; would you kindly be specific.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I can only refer to the one who is the applicant for this position; I think he is William J. Hughes—

Sir SAM HUGHES: No.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: William S. Hughes. It is not my intention to decide whether or not he is the best qualified man in Canada, as my hon. friend says. He may be—I do not know—but I do say that, taking the course of action pursued by the Commission from beginning to end, it is hardly open to the very harsh criticism which it has been subjected to by the hon. member for West Toronto. I think the Commission were to be commended because they were perfectly right in saying that the position should be open to public competition and, in insisting upon that, they were perfectly right. There will be always be some doubt really as to who is the best man for this position. But the friends of General Hughes are not the only people in Canada who say that somebody is being railroaded into this position and that some improper influences are operating in this matter. I have a letter which was addressed to me the other day by a man whose name I cannot give, but I propose reading to you just a little portion of the letter.

Sir SAM HUGHES: We will have to get the whole of it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I will give it to my hon. friend privately.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not want to see it. I am not interested in the matter particularly. The only reason I asked for it was that I got into trouble by saying "Mr. Gundy" the other day. Every Gundy in Canada but the right fellow has protested.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This letter was addressed to me the other day from Montreal and attached to the letter was a little leaflet issued from the Grand Army Headquarters of Canada. I see on the first page of the leaflet, underscored in blue pencil: "We ask no favours from politicians; they need not expect any from us." That, however is by the way.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does that refer to any particular politician?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know to whom it refers, and I am not going to give the name of the writer. I am reading this letter in order to indicate to the House that when these positions are thrown open to public competition every candidate thinks he is qualified, and his coterie of friends think his qualifications are the best. I do this merely to point out to hon. gentlemen the difficulties confronting the Civil Service Commission in filling appointments which are thrown open to public competition. This letter is addressed to me, but personally I do not know the writer, and it is in part as follows:

> Hon. and Dear Sir,—With reference to the appointment of Superintendent of Penitentiaries, which, originally, was advertised on November 14th, 1918, and for which appointment I am led to believe my application is still under consideration.
>
> I beg to invite your attention to the following facts:—facts, concerning this appointment which you must admit has been kept open for the appointment of Brig.-General Wm. St. Pierre Hughes, following the resolution adopted by the G.W.V.A. Cornwall Branch.

This applicant is of the view that the Civil Service Commission is improperly manoeuvering in this matter so as to secure ultimately the appointment of Mr. Hughes. On the other hand, my hon. friend the member for West Toronto accuses the Civil Service Commission of attempting to relegate Mr. Hughes into the background. The letter proceeds:

> The publicity given to this resolution is clearly a forerunner of coming events and an announcement to other applicants that the appointment has been now filled.
>
> I do not dispute the right of any man, be he a private or a brigadier-general, to make application for any appointment if he is qualified to hold that appointment, but, as a returned soldier and also a member of the Great War Veterans' Association and the Grand Army of Canada, I do dispute the right of any association or society endeavouring to force the Government to place any of its members when the appointment is open to competition throughout the Dominion, and especially when the appointment is likely to be given to a returned soldier who has every qualification for the position.
>
> My original application was submitted on November 18th, 1918, and my references were taken up by the Civil Service Commission, and I know for a fact that these references could not

be anything other than satisfactory as I am fully qualified to hold such an appointment and am without prejudice.

Mr. CURRIE: Will the hon. minister be good enough to state the name of the writer?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I am not going to disclose who the letter is from.

Mr. CURRIE: It is the custom of the House to give that information when it is asked for.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It is not the custom of the House when, as in this case, the document is not a public one, and furthermore it is not of very great interest.

Mr. CURRIE: I want to know to what Orange Lodge the writer belongs?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not know that he belongs to any Orange Lodge.

Mr. McMASTER: May I direct the attention of the hon. minister to the fact that it is with difficulty members on this side of the House are able to follow the interesting family quarrel going on on the other side.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There is no quarrel on this side of the House with reference to this matter and so my hon. friend opposite need not worry.

Mr. McMASTER: At all events we should like to hear what is being said.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I read that letter just to indicate to hon. gentlemen the difficulty which confronts the commission in making appointments of this kind, and in the circumstances I say it may well be justified in calling together a board of competent men and asking that board to recommend to them whom, in their judgment, among the seventy or eighty applicants is best qualified for the position. Whatever may be the merits or demerits of the system now prevailing in making appointments to the Civil Service, whatever may be wrong in the practice of the Civil Service Commission, I want to again say that in so far as this case is concerned the Commission has acted, in my opinion, with perfect propriety, and in an absolutely honourable manner from beginning to end, and in no respect do I think the Commission's conduct is open to adverse criticism.

Again, my hon. friend referred to the appointment of a Chief Clerk of Files. The Soldiers' Settlement Board required a Chief Clerk of Files, and in the advertisement calling for applications it was stated that candidates must have five or six years' experience with files and records in a Government department, and must be thoroughly familiar with such a system. The member for West Toronto in this connection spoke as follows:

> I am informed, and I believe, that a man can begin and complete his studies in medicine in five years; that a man can begin and complete his studies for the Bar in four years; but to be an efficient and capable filing clerk, a man apparently requires five or six years' experience. Is there any intelligent man in this House who will say that that length of experience is requisite for that kind of position?

He proceeds to say there are young officers coming back so broken that it would be impossible for them to take up their former avocations, and that it is the business of the Government to see that they are offered opportunities of this kind. He goes on to say:

> My deduction is, I think, reasonable, namely, that a man who is now in the Government service has been picked out for that position. The job is practically filled before the advertisement is put into the newspaper.

Later he states:

> If we have a Civil Service Commission that is going to cut men out of all opportunity of obtaining such positions, what is the use of putting in the Act the statement that the returned soldiers shall be given a preference?

Such is the hon. gentleman's statement. What are the facts? The Soldiers' Settlement Board, which is administered by the Minister of the Interior, recently required a filing clerk and they were obliged to ask the Civil Service Commission to advertise for one. An experienced man was required, I am informed, for the reason that the Soldiers' Settlement Board is a new branch of the public service. In the meantime, pending the receipt of applications in response to the advertisement, the Soldiers' Settlement Board recommended the appointment of a man temporarily.

5 p.m.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did the advertisement call for five years' experience?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, and the advertisement was prepared by the Soldiers' Settlement Board, not by the Commission. Again I say it was unfair to blame the Civil Service Commission for this advertisement. If there is any criticism to be made it should be directed against the proper body. I complain therefore of the generality, the vagueness, and the unfairness of the charges made by my hon. friend from West Toronto. Now, five or six years' experience as Chief Filing Clerk does seem a rather extended period of service to me. I would

be rather disposed to agree with the criticism of my hon. friend from West Toronto, but I do not know whether I would be right in so thinking. For the time being I would rather take the judgment of the Minister of the Interior and his officials who must have believed that they required a filing clerk of certain experience and ability, or else they would not have asked for a person possessing such qualifications and experience.

Mr. NICKLE: Does not that blow the whole thing sky-high?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think so. Now, what happened? As a matter of fact the person filling the position temporarily is a returned soldier who served three years overseas as a private, and who has had a son a prisoner in Germany since the beginning of the war.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: At one time he was in the public service, and had experience as a filing clerk, for I do not know how many years.

Mr. DEVLIN: He will have to get out then according to the advertisement?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I do not think he will have to get out if he is competent, even though he did not have the five years' experience. I wish to impress upon hon. gentlemen that I am not taking the responsibility of saying it was proper to insist upon five years' experience.

I merely wish to insist that the Civil Service Commission be not held responsible for that portion of the advertisement, and that criticism, if any may justly be made, should be directed against the department responsible for the issuance of the advertisement. However, no injustice has been done to any one. In the meanwhile, the department have a man whom they consider quite capable of discharging the duties attaching to that particular office. Fortunately, it happens that he is a returned man. In due course his application, with many others, will be considered, and in any event the department is assured of having a competent man and one who is a returned soldier. Consequently, so far as this charge is concerned, every criticism which my hon. friend made falls to the ground.

Then, my hon. friend made reference to the appointment of a man named Michael Dryden to one of the employment bureaus at Halifax, stating that on February 3rd Mr. Dryden was advised by a telegram from one W. B. McCoy, of Halifax, who is in the employ of the Industries Department of the Government of Nova Scotia, that he, Dryden, had been appointed to the office, whereas advertisements calling for applications had been inserted in the public press only on February 18th. I have made some inquiry into this matter, and again I find that in not a single particular is the statement of my hon. friend correct. Mr. Dryden was selected by a committee appointed as a Board of Examiners after advertisement. The names of the members of the board of examiners are: Mr. Bryce M. Stewart, editor of the Labour Gazette; Mr. G. C. McNeill, representative of the Great War Veterans' Association, and Mr. R. H. Coats, Dominion Statistician. After considering fully the applications, this Board of Examiners selected Mr. Dryden of Halifax.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Who appointed the board?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They were selected by the Civil Service Commission. I find also on inquiry that Mr. McCoy did not, on the 3rd day of February, wire Mr. Dryden that he had been appointed, but that he did, on the 23rd day of February, wire Mr. Dryden that he had been appointed, after he, Mr. McCoy, had been so advised by a representative of the Labour Department. The purpose of Mr. McCoy's telegram was to inquire when Mr. Dryden would report at Halifax to engage upon the duties of his office.

Mr. P. F. MARTIN: What had McCoy to do with those duties at Halifax?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not carry my investigation very far, but I understand that the provincial governments and the Labour Department are co-operating in the matter of the Labour Employment Bureaus which are being established throughout Canada and that Mr. McCoy is in the employ of the Industries Department of the government of Nova Scotia, and, I imagine, was being interviewed by the representatives of the Labour Department who were sent down there from Ottawa. Therefore I say that so far as this particular charge is concerned, the statement of my hon. friend falls absolutely to the ground.

Mr. McCURDY: May I ask the hon. gentleman a question? I am prompted to do so because I have received a letter from Nova Scotia stating that a roster of names was prepared by Mr. McCoy in January; that this list was forwarded by Mr. McCoy

for the guidance of the Civil Service Commission, and that Mr. McCoy's recommendations were approved by the commission and his nominees appointed. Has my hon. friend any information on that point?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have absolutely no information on that point. Again I say that the only thing I am interested in this afternoon is that of making a proper defence of the Civil Service Commission in respect of the charges made against it the other day. The Civil Service Commission made a selection from among all the applicants who responded to the advertisement. Evidently representatives of the Labour Department were in the Maritime Provinces prior to the making of the selection by the board of examiners. What they did or what they said I know not and I care not.

My hon. friend made some reference to schools which, he supposed, were specially created for the coaching of candidates for the Civil Service examinations. He said:

> I am credibly informed that in this city of Ottawa there is a certain school. Nobody knows where this school is unless he is directed to it. It does not advertise; the name is not on the door, but candidates who are fortunate enough to be directed to this school are always able to pass with the highest marks. The system has been explained by one of the pupils, a young lady, in this way.

Then he proceeds further, but I shall not quote his remarks at greater length. The innuendo of that statement is that somewhere in this city, in some dark, hidden recess, there is, to the knowledge of the Civil Service Commission or its secretary, a school to which favoured and selected candidates are directed and at which they can be specially coached for approaching examinations. A species of nepotism and favouritism is suggested in this connection on the part of the commission.

Mr. HOCKEN: Is that in my statement?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is not in my hon. friend's statement, but one cannot refrain from drawing inferences. I do not want to interpret wrongly my hon. friend's remarks; I do not want to read into them innuendos which he never intended. But, the effect of that statement upon the public is to give them the impression that in this city there are schools for the coaching of candidates for examinations, schools which are specially favoured by the Civil Service Commission, the students at which receive an advantage in one way or the other over other applicants for admission to the Civil Service. Now, I hope that I do not wrongly interpret my hon. friend's remarks. That is a serious accusation to make against the Civil Service Commission or against anybody connected with it. If it is not true, it should not have been made; if it is true, my hon. friend should go further, should give to the House further facts and ask for a searching and thorough inquiry into the matter. Everybody knows that there are in Ottawa, and have been for years, schools specially organized for the instruction of candidates for Civil Service positions. I remember that six or seven years ago somebody in the Customs Department was dismissed from the service because he was conducting at night a Civil Service school, or a school for the preparation of candidates for Civil Service examinations. I should be surprised if there were not half a dozen such schools in Ottawa. Such schools are to be found in Cornwall, Brockville and Toronto; if they are not to be found in every city in Canada, they will inside of twelve months. There are scores of them in the United States. My hon. friend seems to think that in this particular school somebody knows the particular questions that are to be put to the candidates and the particular subjects upon which they are to be examined. Well, everybody in Canada knows the subjects upon which the candidates are to be examined. The curriculum is published and made known to the public; the subjects are set forth on the notices which are sent to the candidates giving the date of examination. The subjects are also mentioned in the regulations of the Commission.

Any one conducting a Civil Service school could go over the examination papers of the last ten years, and I suppose he could approximate any possible question which could be put by the examiners. Again I say, that was an unfair imputation to make against the Civil Service Commission. They are not responsible for Civil Service schools in Ottawa. Such schools may be here by the dozen. I have no doubt there is more than one here. They will grow up in every city and town in Canada from now on, just because there is a wide open opportunity to every boy and girl in Canada to enter as a competitor in the Civil Service examinations and aspire to an appointment in the Civil Service of this country. The Civil Service Commission are not responsible for such schools; they know nothing about them. No information reaches the persons who conduct these

schools as to the subjects. Such information is of a public nature. The subjects upon which candidates are to be examined are very few and everybody who wants to know the subjects, may know them. Therefore I say the accusation made in this respect against the Civil Service Commission is unjustified and unfair.

The last case to which I desire to refer is that in the concluding remarks of my honourable friend's speech, when he referred to the unfortunate theft of examination papers by some means or another. My hon. friend almost directly accuses the secretary of the Civil Service Commission for the fact that in some way or another these examination papers reached the hands of two or three candidates at an approaching examination. Why is the secretary of the Civil Service Commission blamed? Will any hon. gentleman answer that question? Why not blame any hon. gentleman in this House? Why not anybody else in the world? Perhaps it is a fair presumption to suspect some person connected with the Civil Service Commission rather than somebody unconnected with the Commission and whose work has no relation whatever to the work of the Commission. The secretary of the Commission never sees the examination papers. They are prepared by certain persons appointed by the Commission, and are educationists of some standing and repute.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the Minister name them?

A. K. MACLEAN: I am sorry I cannot. Their names were given to me but I have not now their names before me. When the questions are set, the papers are put into the hands of the confidential printer of the Commission and they remain in his possession. My hon. friend says: Where are you going to place the responsibility for this? Surely it must be upon the secretary. Under the Statute and under the regulations the secretary is not charged with this responsibility. If he should be charged with the responsibility, then let us make him directly responsible by passing an amendment to the Act or by suggesting an amendment to the regulations; but do not let us make him responsible for this particular offence when he was not responsible. He is the chief executive officer of the Commission and not the custodian of the examination papers. Perhaps he should be. Perhaps the practice of making the confidential printer of the Commission responsible is wrong. I am prepared to hear an argument in support of that contention. Perhaps it is too great a responsibility to leave upon one man, and I am inclined to think so. The member for West Toronto in this connection stated: " If there are clerks under him who are handing out these papers for consideration and they would hardly do it if there were no consideration—he is the man who must be held responsible. If in your business, Sir, you had a man whom you had placed in a chief position of responsibility with regard to a thing of this kind, would you go on down the line and pick out the office boy for dismissal, or would you pick out the man who is primarily responsible?" If my hon. friend's argument is sound he would act as follows: If an employee in the post office committed theft he would say: dismiss the postmaster. If the teller in the bank stole money he would say: Let the bank manager be charged with the crime and dismissed from office. If a deacon of the church committed a sin he would banish the minister from the precincts of the congregation and rob him of his pulpit. Surely there is a great fallacy in the argument which my hon. friend makes in this connection. I am not going to say much about this particular incident. It was unfortunate, but, perhaps, it is fortunate in the sense that it will cause the Commission to take greater precautions in the future in the care of examination papers. These things have occurred in other countries, in connection with examinations of the Civil Service. The same thing occurred in Ottawa years ago, when examination papers were printed at the public Printing Bureau. Personations at Civil Service examinations occurred at Toronto some years ago, and this has also occurred at Montreal and other places in Canada. In connection with Civil Service examinations, it must be remembered that there will always be some persons doing their very best to obtain information about forthcoming examination papers, and personation will be frequently attempted, but, of course, it will be the duty of the Commission to prevent this as far as possible. In this particular case the Commission are doing everything they can to bring the culprits to justice. Already one man has been arrested and his trial is now in progress. The case is in the hands of the secret service and is under the control of the Department of Justice. Everything that should be done is being done, and I do not think any hon. gentleman could suggest that anything be done which is not being done in the case. My personal judgment is that these papers

were not stolen from the premises of the Civil Service Commission. The evidence indicates that they were abstracted from a postage parcel en route from the city of Ottawa to another place in Canada. I would like to give my hon. friend my personal view and judgment in this matter, namely, that no person in the Civil Service Commission is responsible for this, and much less is the secretary responsible. I am very sorry that my hon. friend attempted to leave upon the House the impression which he did, particularly in reference to the secretary of the Civil Service Commission.

Just a few words of a general nature and I have done, and I am sorry to have detained the House so long.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask the minister a question?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Certainly, but I do not want to discuss discounts.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not want to raise a question of privilege. The point is that I do not want to stand before this House and the country as having attempted to mislead the people, and I am not going to.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say you did.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I want to ask a question. If not, I will take the matter up with the question of privilege. It is to be found on page F-16 of the Charges of Management Loan Account, New York Loan, $4,098,580, but I want to know from my hon. friend if the Minister of Finance returned to Canada with the $75,000,000, less the Morgan's commission, or did he return with the $65,000,000, less the discount and the commission? Did we get $70,901,420 out of it, or did we get the $75,000,000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: We received the latter amount.

Sir SAM HUGHES: He came back with $70,901,420.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The difference represents the discount and all charges of selling the issue.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I want to know how much money went into the Treasury of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: $75,000,000, less the cost of charges, less whatever the discount on the bonds was.

Sir SAM HUGHES: $70,901,420. Then I was right.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: It would have been easy to receive $75,000,000 if the rate of interest had been about 6 per cent.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The point I make is that I was charged with making a misstatement.

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is not in order in entering into a discussion or argument. He would not be in order in rising to a question of privilege even if he had one, because the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. Maclean) has the floor. The hon. member's speech is on record and it is not competent for him to interrupt.

Sir SAM HUGHES: It is competent for me to ask a question if the hon. member is willing.

Mr. SPEAKER: With the consent of the hon. member.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How much did the Dominion of Canada get from that loan? Was it $70,000,000 or $75,000,000?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Even if I answer that question it would not follow that my hon. friend's statement was correct.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I got my figures from the Auditor General's Report.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understood my hon. friend to say that the loan cost a certain rate per $100 and I think I have demonstrated that his statement was not correct. My hon. friend does not desire to misrepresent the facts. I know he would like to have the figures correct, just as I would myself, and having that high regard for him I ventured to correct his statement.

Sir SAM HUGHES: How much money did we get?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. NICKLE: Paragraph (2) of section 39 of chapter 12 of the statutes of last year reads as follows:

> Immediately after each examination, a list of the successful competitors in the case of a competitive examination, and of the successful candidates in order of merit in other examinations shall be made out, and the list of successful competitors and candidates shall be published in the Canada Gazette.
>
> (a) Provided, however, that in all examinations persons who have been on active service overseas on the military or naval forces of His Majesty or of any of the Allies of His Majesty during the present war, who have left such service with an honourable record or who have been honourably discharged, and who obtained sufficient marks to pass such examination shall irrespective of the marks they have obtained be placed in the order of merit on the list of successful candidates above all other candidates.

What construction does the minister put upon that section?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think the proper construction is the obvious one, namely, that a preference is to be given to returned men, and I think that the Civil Service Commission are following out that policy. I have not followed the work of the Civil Service Commission very closely and am not in a position to discuss individual cases with my hon. friend. But if the Civil Service Commission are not observing this section of the Act they would of course be open to criticism.

Mr. NICKLE: I understood my hon. friend in answering my previous question to say that the returned soldier got no preference.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Oh! No. I did not mean to say that. What I meant to say was that in the case of a position where technical qualifications were absolutely necessary the Civil Service Commission might select a man who was not a returned soldier if he alone possessed the proper qualifications. Reverting to my subject, the hon. member for West Toronto made very, very serious accusations against the Civil Service Commission. I do not believe that ever in the history of this Parliament has any man made more grave accusations against any Government bureau or government service than he made, and I doubt if ever in the history of the Canadian Parliament such serious charges were made against any one man as my hon. friend made against the Secretary of the Civil Service Commission. I have dealt with the cases specifically, and think I have demonstrated beyond controversy that the statements of my hon. friend were absolutely unfounded in every case and cannot be supported by the facts. In concluding his remarks my hon. friend from West Toronto said:

> I have just one suggestion in closing, and that is that the Civil Service Act should be amended at a vital point. I would have every position in the Outside Service filled upon the recommendation of the man who sits for the constituency in which the appointment is to be made.

Mr. Speaker, I quite understand the opposition that exists on the part of some hon. members to the Civil Service Act. It was inevitable that there should be opposition, and I am not surprised in the slightest degree. There have been similar complaints in all countries which have taken the step that this Parliament decided to take at its last session. If the objection to the Act is that the recommending power has been taken away from members of Parliament and the appointive power placed in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, all right. That is a fair matter for debate in this Parliament, and if Parliament wishes to reverse the position it took last session, well and good. Nobody could complain about that because it would be the will of the people, as expressed through its representatives in Parliament, which must ultimately prevail. But if that be the objection I do not think an hon. member should attack the Act through the Civil Service Commission. I think he should attack the Act itself, and on the floor of Parliament, and not make such serious charges as he has made against the commission and its secretary. Last session Parliament unanimously supported the principle of appointment by competition, and promotion by merit. I know the Act is unpopular in many parts of Canada. I have heard many of my political friends on the other side of the House say: This is not a Civil Service Act at all, because no Liberal ever gets a position. The only thing that will satisfy them, I assume, will be the filling of every office by a Liberal. On the other hand I have heard the same complaints from members of the Unionist party, some of whom are not satisfied unless every appointment goes to friends of the Government or of Government supporters. It might be well for us to appreciate that members of both political parties will not all be satisfied with the present system, and if this Act was accepted by Parliament upon the theory that the old conditions would still prevail, it might be well for us to consider at the earliest possible date the propriety of continuing this Act; but so long as it remains on the statute books I say it must be observed. The old conditions will not prevail so long as this Act remains in force. I can quite understand how representatives of Parliament find pressure from their constituents and political friends very embarrassing indeed with the present Civil Service Act in operation. I have sympathy for them. I have been embarrassed on that account myself. But the question is: Are we to have a different system from that which has prevailed in the past in making appointments to public office? Is it desirable in the interest of the public service that appointments to office be made on the recommendation of members of Parliament, or shall they be made by an independent tribunal such as the Civil Service Commission? I am very glad to

find so many members on both sides of this House approving, after all, of the principle and expressing their sympathy with the Act and their desire to see it continued. I believe it will only be a short time before every member of this Parliament, or of future Parliaments, will say that the present system is better than that which obtained in the past, and when every member, regardless of the name of the party with which he is affiliated or the constituency which he represents, will be anxious to preserve the principle of the Civil Service Act which leaves appointments in the Civil Service with an independent commission.

My own opinion is that it is by far the better system; fairer, more just, more democratic. It is hardly worth while to boast of democratic institutions unless you follow out the principles of democracy; and it is nothing but tyranny which gives to any party or to any member of Parliament the right to make recommendations to office which are virtually conclusive. I have made many recommendations to office myself during the many years in which I have been in public life, and I have seen the present Civil Service Act in operation; and I have no hesitation in saying that it is in the interest of the public service, it is in the interest of Canada, that the method of appointment which now prevails shall continue.

I trust this Parliament will never again revert to the old method of making appointments. I had intended to refer to the many anomalies and injustices which issue from the past system, but I shall not take up the time necessary to refer to these matters. I trust, however, that Parliament will continue to support, as sympathetically as it did last session, the principle of appointment to the public service by an independent commission.

Now, just a word or two as to the Commission. I have already said more than once that the criticism of the hon. member for West Toronto may have a very disastrous effect upon the work of the Commission and upon the progress and development of our public service under provisions of the Civil Service Act. I know that he did not intend to do injury to so important an institution as our Civil Service Commission, and it became necessary, therefore, for some member of the Government to speak in answer to the accusations he made and in defence of the work of the Commission. He has referred to the fact that the chairman of the Commission, Hon. Dr. Roche, is not a very strong man and has been more or less ill, and consequently has been unable to devote the time to the work that the work deserved. As a matter of fact, Dr. Roche has enjoyed better health during the last year than during many years previous. It is unfortunately true that Mr. Jameson has been seriously ill during the past few months. He became an influenza victim, in the month of November, I think, and has been obliged to spend the winter in the southern states. But, after all, the criticism which is made of the Commission was not directed, in the main, against the capacity, integrity and character of the Commissioners but rather against the work done by them as a body, and the suggestion was, not of incapacity or inability, but of something worse—a desire not to observe the provisions of the law or to carry out the Act honestly. I do not suggest that the Civil Service Commission must be free from criticism; but, I do state frankly that I think the work imposed upon the Commission is excessive, and that Parliament should consider the question of increasing the Commission during this Parliament. I know that the duties of the Commission are so onerous that much of their work must be neglected. They have not devoted sufficient time to the proper organization of the Commission as they should have done. But there was a reason for that. The statute passed last session imposed upon the Commission the duty of reclassifying all the Inside and Outside Service. In conjunction with a body of experts whom they brought to Ottawa they have been engaged in that work of reclassification ever since Parliament rose last year. I say on their behalf—for it should be said of them—that it has been impossible for them to discharge the duties pertaining to their office in the manner and with a despatch, which, I know, they would have desired. I am not pleading for mercy for the Commission, and I would be the last person to say that they should not be criticised. All I ask of Parliament is that fair play and ordinary justice be extended to the Commission and its members. I do not ask more on their behalf; they would not have me do it; they would not do it themselves.

I wish to say a word particularly as to the secretary of the Commission, because I feel that my hon. friend for West Toronto has done that gentleman a great injustice, unintentionally, I believe. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) speaking last evening objected to some statement made by Mr. Foran in commenting on the

statement made in Parliament by the hon. member for West Toronto. It is to be remembered that the accusation made against the Secretary of the Commission was a very, very serious one indeed—one who reads the hon. gentleman's speech carefully must be seized of the seriousness of his statements. Accusations made against any man, if the person accused believes them to be unfair, naturally provoke recrimination. In this particular case the recrimination has brought forth a reference to matters of religion and creed, which have nothing to do with the question of Civil Service—and I doubt if they have anything to do with Christianity. Perhaps the statement made by the secretary was unfortunate. I think the statement made by the hon. member for West Toronto will, some day, be regarded by himself as unfortunate. I think the secretary of the commission and the member for West Toronto will, some time, come to understand one another better with respect to these matters, and that each of them will forget some of the remarks that have been made.

My personal acquaintance with Mr. Foran is very limited indeed; in fact, I have never had the opportunity of meeting him in my life until the Civil Service Act was under consideration at the last session of Parliament. But, I do know that he is a strong friend of Civil Service reform and of an efficient public service. I do not believe there is a man in Canada who is so strong a friend of Civil Service reform, and of an efficient, capable public service, as Mr. Foran. He is so regarded by Civil Service reformers in the United States as well as by those in Canada who know him in connection with his work.

I must speak of him as I know him with my very limited experience. I have no hesitancy whatever in expressing to the House my own view, and that is, that he is a capable public official interested in building up a strong and efficient public service. I do not believe for one single moment that the secretary of the commission would be guilty of doing any of the acts which were charged, or suggested, against him in the remarks made a few days ago by the hon. member for West Toronto.

Mr. Foran has been in the public service for thirty years. He has been connected with the Civil Service Commission since 1908 and he was secretary of the Board of Civil Service Examiners from 1895 to 1908. Therefore, he has been intimately connected with, and has intimate knowledge of, everything that relates to the Civil Service of Canada. I think he is trusted by all who know him. I believe his services to the public are appreciated by all who have had an opportunity of knowing him and I think I can safely commend him to Parliament, as a capable and trustworthy secretary of the Civil Service Commission.

I feel called upon in justice to say these few words for the secretary of the commission, and I do trust that the member for West Toronto will be able to revise his opinion of that gentleman and of the work of the commission, and that before this session closes we will have from him an admission that in regard to all, or practically all, of the statements which he made against the commission and its work the other evening, he, unfortunately, was misinformed. Having said these few words on behalf of the commission, the members of the commission, and its secretary, I finish.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. ARTHUR TRAHAN (Nicolet): Mr. Speaker, I trust that you and the House will pardon me if, in the course of my remarks, I frequently refer to my notes. Wishing to be understood, and desiring to make a modest but active contribution to national harmony, I address the House in English, which is not my maternal tongue. For this reason I ask your indulgence.

I will make only a very brief answer to the speech which was delivered by the hon. minister representing the city of Halifax. First of all, I wish to assure the hon. gentleman that nobody on this side objects to Canada being represented at the Peace Conference. On the contrary, we say that Canada should be represented at the Paris Conference, but surely my hon. friend from Halifax will not support the idea that nearly one-third of the Cabinet should be overseas while there is so much to be done in Canada, and when ministers remaining here follow, according to the Globe, a policy of " putting off " concerning all important matters.

As to questions relating to the cost of war loans, and the conduct of the Civil Service Commission, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the debate, and I do not wish for the present to interfere in this family quarrel. I have only one word to say about the Civil Service Commission: I hope that the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) will take advantage of

the opportunity which has been given to him by the Government, and ask for an investigation in order to prove the charges which he brought to the attention of the House the other day. Speaking for myself, having heard from the gentlemen opposite contradictory statements on the matter, I shall reserve my judgment until this investigation has taken place.

Mr. Speaker, it is stated in the speech from the Throne that " important measures, designed to promote the welfare and prosperity of the people in the new era of reconstruction, social as well as material, upon which the world has entered, will be recommended for our consideration." This paragraph is very general, indeed, and enunciates a very large programme of action. For my part, I would have preferred to the word " reconstruction " the words " readjustment," or " co-operation," which seem to be more applicable to our country. However it may be, the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) the other day exemplified this programme in a very magnificent, descriptive definition. He summed it all up in this telling sentence:—

Reconstruction means a going forward, not a standing still; it means progress, not stagnation.

Let us see, Sir, if the Government has realized such a definition. Is it true that by their actions they have justified the laudatory speech of the hon. minister? In answering this question I wish to be fair, and I will give the opinions of friends of the Government itself. The fact that the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy), who was Parliamentary Under-Secretary for the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, has resigned that position is very significant. Why did he resign? His motives were explained in a statement issued to the press and which has been already read to this House. It is a clear statement, and coming from such an authoritative source it proves conclusively that in matters of reconstruction the Government, completely and absolutely, lacked initiative, method and courage. Moreover, another good friend of the Government, Senator Nicholls, in a letter published by the Globe of December 4, 1918, said the following:—

The Government has been repeatedly warned to prepare for after-war conditions, but the war is over and little or nothing has been done, although every other civilized nation has been mobilized for trade purposes long since. Better late than never is an old proverb, but "a stitch in time saves nine," is a much better one.

[Mr. Trahan.]

These opinions are confirmed by the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization himself, who said the other day that " there was not very much talk at that time—that is to say, last July—about the preparations for after the war, and we must not be very much surprised in this country if in that respect the full duty of the Government was not completely performed." Then a little further on the hon. minister went on to say:—

We always understood that the war was going to end, that it would not last forever.

Again he said:—

We were not all adrift.

How can the hon. minister reconcile this last statement with the first one? I do not know, but what I do know and say is that the Government has failed in its duty regarding reconstruction.

They were repeatedly warned to prepare for after-the-war conditions, but when the armistice was signed, according to the Minister of Immigration (Hon. J. A. Calder) himself, little had been done. Surely this is not a progressive policy; it is rather stagnation. Read carefully, Sir, the entire speech of the minister and you will see that while set phrases were coming forth fluently and eloquently, actual facts were standing still.

I will deal in the course of my remarks with three subjects: the returned soldiers, the labour question, and the tariff and agriculture.

As to the returned soldiers, many say to them that they are heroes. That is perfectly true. Many tell them also: we owe everything to you. Perhaps the desire is all right, but they speak from the generosity of their hearts, not with due regard to the financial possibilities of the country. Too many transient favours can only make sufferings more acute. Everything which is promised to our returned soldiers and not given to them will be considered by them as a robbery. The Government must take care not to make of each of those whom they help a kind of perpetual pensioner who may become all too easily a rebel or a beggar. On the contrary, it is our imperative duty to afford to these veterans an opportunity at the earliest possible moment and in the most extended manner of resuming their pre-war activities and acquiring, as a consequence, a greater dignity and the right to greater independence. To give to disabled soldiers artificial limbs is good, because you release their bodies of many hardships. But that is not enough. We must secure for them also calmness of heart and soul

and inspire in them a high idea of their dignity. Has the Government succeeded in this noble work of raising the morale of our returned soldiers? As you read the newspapers, Sir, you are obliged to confess that the numerous troubles caused by some returned soldiers in Toronto and in other western places seem to suggest a negative answer. This is a great source of regret to every law-abiding citizen, and I earnestly request the Government to adopt proper measures not only to assure material help to our heroes, but also to provide for their intellectual and moral welfare.

I truly believe, Sir, that the principle of granting pensions to returned soldiers according to their rank in the army and proportionately to the pay they were receiving as such is not just and fair. I do not advocate uniformity in the rate of pensions; I only submit that you must not create distinctions and privileged classes among the veterans. Moreover, the Pensions Board should not consider only the gravity of the injury, because the injury may not of necessity bring about a change in the earning power of the man. For instance, an accountant with a leg taken off at the thigh will be able, without suffering any decrease in his salary, to continue to do his book-keeping, while a pianist, deprived of the use of only one finger necessary to the exercise of his profession, may fall into poverty. Consequently, it is the relation between his infirmity and his ability to carry on the work or practise his profession which is the essential factor to be considered in determining the pension of the returned man. Each case, therefore, should be dealt with individually, separately, according to the particular circumstances, on its own merits, and not according to specific rules, rigid regulations, or the rank held by the man in the army.

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization told us the other day that we have, scattered throughout every province of Canada, something like 150 institutions for disabled soldiers. This is very well, but if these institutions are managed according to "the arrogant and insolent system" described by the Globe, "which regards the continued interest and concern of civilians in their sons and brothers after they have become part of the military forces as presumptuous and calling for reprimand and punishment;" if the Administration maintains the conditions that—and here again I quote the Globe—"permitted Ottawa—behind the anonymity of which guilty officialdom now seeks to hide—to utilize a building"—the Base Hospital at Toronto—"which the Medical Officer of Health testified was in a disgraceful and unsafe condition, to house more than double the number of patients it was properly capable of accommodating in a sound and safe condition;" if there is no better accommodation for soldiers in these institutions than in the Toronto, Montreal and other military hospitals; if, as asserts the Globe, of October 30th, 1918, Canada, in its fifth year of war has yet made no attempt "to provide adequate modern hospital accommodation and equipment for the men of Ontario's biggest military district;" and if these conditions prevailed all over the country, well, Sir, to use the expression of the Minister of Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder), we are nearly all adrift. I am afraid that our returned soldiers will not be cared for as they deserve, and the Government will be held responsible for this bad treatment.

We Liberals are true and sincere democrats, and as such are supporters of responsible government. We desire that the people should govern themselves in accordance with the Constitution, through the intermediary of their representatives. But a reasonable use of political rights demands a political formation, a political organization. How is it that to-day in our country a large number of citizens are sick of politics and apathetic to it? Evidently there is a close connection between this condition and Government by Orders in Council. It is not sufficient to say to the people: You are free according to the law; you are, by the universal franchise, the leading authority; by your vote you are the masters of the country. How can the people be sovereign when we are not permitted, in a meeting of free citizens, to speak freely on matters concerning the interests of the country? Do we sincerely desire to be a nation politically free? Do we sincerely desire that all classes of society, with diligence, energy and thoroughness, should take an active part in active political fights for the defence of their most sacred rights? We must immediately abrogate the Orders in Council repressing the freedom of speech and freedom of the press. These are political liberties for which our forefathers have fought, and I feel it is my imperative duty earnestly to urge the Government to repeal without delay all regulations encroaching upon that liberty, regulations which entail autocratic Prussianism in this Dominion. It is time,

Sir, to practise in our political life the democratic ideals which have triumphed on the battlefield.

There is now in our Dominion a general industrial unrest. Its principal sources are: the abuse of Orders in Council, the high cost of living, the scandalous war profits and the social strife between the different classes of the community. During the last four years and a half we have been the sorrowing witnesses of the most bloody war in the history of the world. In our country we have also had our internal difficulties. There has been a general struggle between manufacturers and labourers, between producers and consumers. The result has been the triumph of the powerful over the weak, of the unscrupulous man over the honest man. The rich have become richer and the poor poorer. What has the Government done to help the Canadian people to recover all the rights of which they have been deprived by capitalism under an economic sphere? Has the Government proved to the working people that not only do the labouring men work for a salary, but they perform in our community functions of general interest for the accomplishment of which they have a right to gratitude? Has the Government been progressive in this matter? The strike of the postmen last July, the difficulties of the Government with the Civil Service, the strike of the employees of the Public Printing Bureau which began to-day, are good answers to this question. They prove conclusively that as regards labour the Government has been inconsistent, autocratic and stagnant.

Ministers of the Crown were responsible for this strike and postponed a decision until they were forced by public opinion to make one. Let me quote an article from the Globe under date of July 25, 1918, which explains the situation very well:

> It is impossible to avoid accepting the verdict of the man on the street that responsibility for this dislocation of business rests primarily with the Government at Ottawa. The bonus passed to the letter carriers by Parliament has never been paid. The Government either neglected the repeated petitions of the men or refused to take them seriously. The Premier, the Postmaster General, and several members of the Cabinet were overseas. Those remaining at Ottawa followed a policy of "putting off." The result is the strike, the tying up of much important business, and general public inconvenience and loss.
>
> The plain truth of the matter is that the Post Office Department has been practically neglected for months, while the Labour Department, which should have properly also interested itself in the situation as it concerned the carriers, is headed with such hopeless inefficiency that nothing effective or business-like can be hoped for under existing conditions.

If the Government acted in the same manner towards the Printing Bureau employees, they must bear their responsibility before public opinion. For this reason, I blame the Government for its prolonged delay in performing one of its principal duties, that is, to guarantee and favour the development of professional organizations. The ministers who occupy the Treasury benches must remember the very object of the State, namely, that its principal mission is to protect all rights without exception.

If common law justly prevents the abuses of the less disputed power, the paternal one, much more should it do so when it is a question of labour contracts. A minimum must be guaranteed to the weakest contracting party. Liberty alone is not sufficient to solve the serious social problems.

As part of its so called progressive policy, the Government intends to confer upon women the privilege of sitting in Parliament. This reform is not asked for by women, and in my opinion is mere camouflage. Women will not avail themselves of this privilege. In Great Britain at the last election there were only a few women candidates and only one was elected. Does the Government really believe that it will be otherwise in Canada? If not, this proposed legislation is useless. Moreover, it is not demanded by the women, who in general have never claimed political rights, but have always firmly demanded laws which would enable them to be victorious in their struggle for life. In our modern society, working women have been exploited by the manufacturers. They receive no protection and work hard till they are exhausted, and it is well known that they are not sufficiently paid. What they demand in the name of justice and humanity is a minimum wage and the Government would serve the interests of women better by passing a law fixing a minimum salary for working women throughout this Dominion, than by giving to women the privilege of sitting in Parliament. Legislation such as I have suggested has already been proposed by the Government of the province of Quebec, and I urge this Government to follow along the same lines.

Inasmuch as the labour programme claims the possession by labourers, including farmers, of their essential rights, the legal, proportional and professional representation of their interests, the protection of their homes, a sufficient salary to insure a decent standard of living for themselves and their families, guarantees by way of state insurance against accidents, illness and unemployment, old age pensions, the privilege of participating in profits and

even, by means of co-operation, in the capital of the enterprises to whose success they contribute by their work, to that extent I approve of it. Why? Because the labouring men constitute an essential part of the community and because the Government must solve the problems of our social life. The question is, not merely to provide against poverty, but to guarantee social rights; it is not a question of charity, but a matter of justice. It is important to limit as much as possible that unhappy class of our people earning a precarious wage. Having first admitted that the labourer is entitled to a just salary in proportion to the efficiency of his work we must then grant to him additional remuneration by means of sharing in the profits of the enterprise in which he is engaged. This is the future form of salary and perhaps it will take a long time before the rights of the labourer in this respect is recognized. There will undoubtedly be much objection to it but we know that the principal has been already applied in some measure and with good results in the form of co-operative farming, in the form of distribution of dividends or bonuses and of pensions proportionate to the size of the family. Remedies must be applied if we are to check effectively the industrial unrest which at present makes our national outlook very gloomy. What remedies have the Government proposed? The Minister of Public Works made two suggestions. By the first he declined all responsibility on the part of the Government, and wanted the capitalists to spend their money in industrial enterprises regardless of consequences. To my mind that suggestion is impracticable, because in financial matters there is no sentiment. Secondly, he intimates that the Government will spend enormous sums of money on highways, railways, shipping, etc., but that in consequence we shall face a yearly deficit of from one hundred to one hundred and fifty millions of dollars. This second suggestion is not the proper remedy, and if it constitutes progress at all, it is an uninterrupted progress towards bankruptcy.

What else is the Government doing? We have ministers giving interviews—talking always talking, but doing nothing in the matter of social reform. If this Government progresses at all it progresses in stagnation.

Speaking on the Budget in the session of 1916, the Acting Prime Minister said:

> "The future of Canada rests with the development of its great resources, of which the greatest and most fundamental is agriculture, and this development is in turn bound up with the question of increase in population of the productive sort and the facilities afforded it for the application of its intelligence and industry. It is probable that in the straightened financial conditions which may prevail for some years forward, the question of capital for the development of agriculture may be of paramount importance, and it is our intention to inquire carefully during the coming recess into this most important subject. . . . .

It is always the same song, Sir; it was repeated the other day by the hon. Minister of Immigration, when he said:

> "A good deal of thought and study has been given to many of the problems that would naturally come up when the war would close."

But where are the results? Has the Government created a system of rural credits as requested by the farmers for many years? Not yet, why? Because the Government always studies but never acts. Since 1913 they have had before them a Bill regarding rural credits, and after six years of study and thought, they have not yet adopted it. They are not following on this great question, the bold example of France, of Great Britain, and of the United States, all of which countries have passed, even during war, progressive legislation to efficiently promote rural credits. I hope, Sir, that there will be no more standing still on this question, but that in the interests of the farmer the Government will establish rural credits in Canada, so that the farmer may not be at the mercy of accumulated capital in merged banks, but may be able, by means of co-operation, to finance and develop their own industry, the basic industry of our Dominion. I make this suggestion, not only for the good of farmers, but in the interest of the whole country; because, if agriculture progresses, there will be a decrease in the cost of living, and with such a decrease industrial unrest will soon come to an end.

Is the Government more active and determined as regards free agricultural implements, free food stuffs, reciprocity with the United States, and tariff questions in general? The Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) has admitted that " the Tariff forms a very essential part of the work of reconstruction." This opinion is general among the people; manufacturers await a decision on that important question, and are postponing improvements to their factories pending announcement by the Government of its policy. On this point I have only to read the circular of the Canadian Manufacturers Association, dated at Toronto, February 19, 1919, and numbered 174. It is entitled " New Factories and Additions," and says in part:

> There is no doubt that a considerable amount of factory extension construction is held up

owing to the uncertainty prevailing in regard to what the Government may do with the tariff at the approaching session,—as a result of the demands of the Western Grain Growers and other farmers' organizations.

The demand for a decision by the Government on the tariff question comes not alone from the manufacturers of this country, but the Grain Growers, the United Farmers, the local legislatures of Manitoba and Saskatchewan, and the rural population all over Canada, are unanimous in favour of an immediate and substantial reduction of the tariff. On the 4th of this month, Premier Norris, of Manitoba, according to a Canadian Press despatch published in the Citizen, expressed a strong opinion that never in the history of Canada was the time so opportune as now for a revision of the tariff on the lines of a substantial reduction. "The Government at Ottawa," said Premier Norris, "is not supposed to be a party Government, and should be in favour of dealing independently with the question."

Facing such a general demand for decision and action on the tariff question, what is the Government doing? Have they, as the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization said, "A true conception of what the people of this country demand in the way of progressive legislation?" No, Sir, they progress only in stagnation. They "wait and see." They should remember that this policy was disastrous in England, and that such standing still is against the public welfare and cannot be rightly supported. Allow me to quote on this subject the conclusion of a letter, dated Langvale, Manitoba, February 10, 1919, and published by the Financial Times, Montreal, of first March inst.

They argue for a "wait and see" policy and for us to let this sacred national policy alone until they have had time to adjust themselves to peace conditions. What about time for us to adjust ourselves? Our point is that if the burden is not removed we farmers, on this drifting policy, will be, if not ruined, brought dangerously near that point. As I said before when wheat was too cheap years ago we were very near to a catastrophe. The life of Canada depends mainly on the basic industry of farming. Let them beware that they do not kill the goose that lays the golden egg. The manufacturers seem to see blue ruin ahead for them if Free Trade is adopted. This I do not credit, but I do know after thirty years' experience farming in Manitoba that if the burden is not eased the farm will be more and more forsaken, and I fail to see how we can possibly build up Canada fit for all classes without a prosperous farming community.

This statement is very accurate and I entirely concur in it. I said, last year, that I was in favour of free agricultural implements and free foodstuffs. May I add, Sir, that, following Liberal principles, I am a staunch supporter of the 1911 Reciprocity Agreement with the United States, of an increased British preference and of the immediate withdrawal of the war supertax. I greatly doubt that such an expression of opinion on my part can induce the Government to reach a conclusion on this question. They are too much inclined to stand still and stagnate in matters of progressive legislation.

We are jubilant, Sir, because the war ended with the triumph of liberty and civilization; but we have another important duty to perform. Our delegates attend the Peace Conference. Let us pray the Almighty that their decisions be always and only guided by the eternal principles of justice and charity which have enlightened the world and which alone can ensure a lasting and profound peace for the universe. Let us learn the moral lessons of the war. Our gallant Canadian soldiers of all races and creeds have united their energies and thoughts, their experience and hearts, for the defence of a sacred cause. Let us imitate them and heartily practice for the progress and welfare of our beloved Canada the beautiful virtue of mutual toleration and the duty of national unity; let us be animated and inspired by the spirit of that illustrious and much regretted statesman, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who during his lifetime always had an undivided affection for Canada and liberty, a profound respect for human beings and who always advocated "welfare in harmony."

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON (Yukon): Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a few observations in connection with the debate on the Address as the representative of the most northerly and most westerly territory of this great Dominion. The hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. Trahan) has paid some attention to some incidents that have occurred in the present session and, before addressing myself to the subject matters of the speech from the Throne, perhaps you will permit me, Mr. Speaker, to make a few references to some of the things that he has said. He refers to what he is pleased to call the family quarrel and I presume he has reference to what took place in the House this afternoon when the hon. the Minister (Mr. A. K. Maclean) referred to the hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken). One of the hopeful things about this Union party to me is, Mr. Speaker, that when a man who sits on your right

has anything to say in regard to the conduct of affairs by the men who sit on the Treasury Benches, he is not afraid to get up and say it in Parliament, or in public, and to have it carried on the wings of the telegraph to the uttermost parts of this Dominion. That is, I consider, good policy. Publicity is one of the great safeguards of democracy and I think it is just as well that members should express themselves here where they can express themselves.

My hon. friend referred to the speech made by the hon. Minister of Colonization and Immigration (Mr. Calder) and particularly to his remark regarding reconstruction that not all had been done that he wished they could do. Is that not all right? I do not suppose there is any minister of the Crown sitting here who is able to do what he would like to do, but it is at least a confession of interest for a minister to get up and say that he has done certain things but there are other things that he has not found himself in a position to do. He shows the right spirit at least when he takes that position rather than attempting to defend what it is impossible to defend. The world is in a very chaotic condition and great changes have taken place all over.

My hon. friend also paid his respects to the method of governing which this Government used to a large extent during the war and when resort was had to Orders in Council. I have heard other hon. gentlemen speaking from the other side of the House and criticising the Orders in Council as well. They have found fault with the Government for using that method of giving effect to the will of the people in carrying on the war. I do not think that criticism is well founded. In my judgment, Orders in Council are an indication of the flexibility of our constitution rather than a symptom of the autocratic methods which governments use in times of stress. Orders in Council have been used by the British Government for more than one century at least. They were in existence at the time of the Napoleonic wars, having been used by the British Government of that day. I do not remember what their origin was, but I know they existed then. They are not used, generally speaking, except in times of stress. Where did the Government get its authority to issue these Orders in Council? Perhaps the hon. gentleman who has just preceded me will be surprised when I point out to him that the authority which is carried by these Orders in Council is derived from the War Measures Act, an Act which was consented to unanimously by the members of this Parliament, and an Act which was supported by the distinguished gentleman whose spirit has passed beyond and who led the party of which my hon. friend is a member. Sir Wilfrid Laurier himself supported that measure. I wondered when I heard of these hon. gentlemen referring to these Orders in Council if they had just thought back far enough to realize where those Orders in Council had their source. In my hand is the Hansard for the special session of Parliament in those fateful days of August, 1914. Sir Wilfrid Laurier is speaking——

9 p.m.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Order.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: What does my hon. friend say?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I do not believe my hon. friend can read from Hansard.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is perfectly in order for an hon. member to read from the debates in Hansard provided they are not the debates of the present session.

Mr. ALFRED THOMPSON: Is my hon. friend satisfied? In that case I may be permitted to read the quotation:

> The gravity of the occasion which has called us together makes it incumbent upon us even to disregard the formalities and conventionalities which in ordinary times the rules of the House, written and unwritten, enjoin as a wise safeguard against precipitate action, but which, on such an occasion as this, might impede us in dealing with the momentous question before us. This session has been called for the purpose of giving the authority of Parliament and the sanction of the law to such measures as have already been taken by the Government, and any further measures that may be needed, to insure the defence of Canada and to give what aid may be in our power to the mother country in the stupendous struggle which now confronts her.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier quoted the War Measures Act from which these Orders in Council spring. The Government is not attempting to get from under any responsibility that they have in this matter. In the final analysis they have to depend on the War Measures Act, and we are told that only those Orders in Council which are necessary to be retained will be submitted to Parliament. They will be brought down and Parliament will be asked to approve or disapprove of them. I do not see why it is necessary to criticise the Government for using an Order in Council as a method of representing the people during the stress of war.

My hon. friend referred to the extension of the franchise to women and criticised that act of the Government. Sir, it is too late to criticise the giving of votes to women. If there was one thing which impressed itself upon my mind during the war, so far as the Canadian people are concerned, it was the degree of organizing ability which the women of this country displayed, to say nothing of their heroism and patriotism during the great struggle. For my part, Sir, I welcome the giving of votes to women, for I feel sure they have well deserved it, and if they are not as thoroughly versed in the arts of government as the male members of our population they will very quickly learn.

I would like, Sir, to offer my felicitations to the distinguished gentleman who now leads the Opposition, and upon whose shoulders the mantle of the late distinguished leader of the Liberal party has fallen. He is an old parliamentarian, and I am glad indeed to find that he was selected as the leader of his party.

I am pleased to find that the speech from the Throne promises constructive legislation which will require constructive statesmanship to carry into effect. Perhaps never in the history of our country do we need more than now such statesmanship and such legislation. Some of the hon. members of this House in their conversations with me rather indicate that they almost fear the return of our men to this country after the cessation of the war. What were we fighting for four years in the great war for? Was it not for a victorious peace, and have we not achieved that triumphant result? Why then should we fear the return of our men from the front, or fear lest a chaotic condition of mind ensue when they do come back? Are these men strangers to this country? Are we bringing back from Europe four or five hundred thousands of aliens? No, Sir, they are our own people who understand the meaning of representative government and what the possibilities of Canada are. They are coming back to their own people, coming back to their own homes, and I have no fear at all as to what their attitude will be. I welcome them back because they have a tremendous flood of energy which, if properly directed, will result in great good to this country of ours. They are coming back to take part in the political life of Canada, and unless my judgment is altogether wrong the men who will govern this country, provincially and federally for the next decade or two are in the Canadian Army. I have no doubt that the Prime Ministers of Canada even will be recruited from that source if history repeats itself in our country, as it did in the United States. In the course of the next ten or fifteen, or perhaps twenty years I have no doubt that the men who fill these positions in front of me in this House, the men who represent the Crown in this country, will be chosen, to a very large extent, from the Canadian Army which has brought such glory to our common country. There is no fear in my mind about the ideas these gallant gentlemen will bring home with them, because they have fought the fight, they have kept the faith, and they are coming back to the country which they love and which they may call their own.

Amongst the constructive legislation promised in the speech from the Throne is a measure to assist in settling the soldiers on the land. I am a great believer, Sir, in having among our population people who have a stake in the soil. Canada is an agricultural country, but we have different resources from which we derive our national life. They are four in number, the farms, the fisheries, the mines, and the forests, but of these four the greatest of all is the farm. It employs the greatest number of our people, it furnishes the largest number of tons of freight to our railroads—in a word, farming is the backbone of Canada. But you cannot convert four or five hundred thousand soldiers immediately into farmers. There are certain things which must be done, and done in unison, before a soldier can be made into a successful farmer. These things are three in number. First, you must have land for the soldiers, and I am glad to find that the Government has undertaken to provide land for our soldiers when they return. But that is not enough. We must also provide the soldier with a certain amount of capital—not very much, but a certain amount—so that he will be able to make a proper start. But there is another thing that is almost equally as essential as land and capital, and that is some experience or some knowledge of agriculture. These are the three things that are necessary, in my judgment, to start a soldier who wants to go on the land and become a producer, as we all want him to do. To give him land and money without knowledge or experience is not of much use, failure is almost sure to result. But if you give him a certain amount of training, which can be done by putting him through a course in our agricultural institutions, then I think the chances of his success are very greatly enhanced.

Another matter referred to is the permitting of desirable immigration. If there is

one thing that we have learned in the recent war, it is to be careful about the character of the people we permit to come into this country, and I hope the Government will see to it that the immigrants permitted to enter Canada will be men upon whom we shall be able to rely in any great national crisis in future. If there is one important thing we have learned from the experience of the past it is the necessity of having in this country men who will defend it if necessary with their lives, and that democracy which we all stand for, and which we all believe in, and I hope we all practice. To bring men to this country who have lived their lives under institutions foreign to our own, would be a very doubtful asset in time of peace, and a heavy liability in time of war, as we have already found out. So I hope that the Government will be most careful to see that any men they bring into this country will be such as our free institutions will appeal to, and such as will defend democracy with their lives. The assimilative power of the Anglo-Saxon race has been one of the wonders to men who have studied the question of the assimilative power of races, but even that great and inherent quality of our race has been over-taxed in this country. Therefore, I repeat, let us be careful in the future, and see that we get the right kind of immigration into Canada.

Another matter the Government has taken up, I am glad to say, is the matter of public health. Mr. Speaker, the greatest asset any state can have is the people that compose that state, and the stronger those people are in body and mind the more valuable that asset is. A health department is capable of doing wonders in strengthening our state. In the matter of tuberculosis alone a department of public health, with headquarters in Ottawa, and ramifications throughout the country, can assist in saving—and I speak from knowledge, for I have had some experience in this particular matter—seventy-five per cent of those people in this country who to-day are suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis, called consumption. Such a department can do more than that; it can convert those people into active citizens, who will be a great asset to the country. There is another way in which the Department of Public Health can help our country—I mean in the matter of sanitation, providing a pure water supply for our cities and seeing that our streets are kept clean. In a word a department of public health can do an infinite amount of good.

A Department of Public Health can carry on and develop methods of decreasing the number of typhoid cases. Typhoid, so recently as the South African War, killed more soldiers than did the bullets of the Boers, though in this greatest war of all times typhoid has been practically wiped out. A good, active Department of Public Health at Ottawa can do a great deal towards reducing the mortality from typhoid in this country. The same is true of smallpox. The same is true of venereal diseases, always following in the wake of the armies. A Department of Health at Ottawa can do a great deal towards reducing that danger to a minimum. Take the great influenza epidemic which is sweeping over the world at the present time and which caused the death of thousands of Canadian people within the few months that it scourged and ravaged this country. We do not know yet what the cause of it is. The greatest bacteriologists in the world have devoted their best efforts to the solution of that problem, but the medical profession is not united as to what the cause of this disease is. There is a field for a Department of Health; there is an opportunity for scientists to investigate and inquire into the cause of that fatal scourge and try to secure a remedy. So it is with cholera, that seaborne disease; so it is with bubonic plague. Because of the situation of our country in relation to the ocean highways of the world, these diseases may invade us at any time. They have invaded us in the past. Bubonic plague has been in Canada; cholera has been in Canada; smallpox has been in Canada; typhoid has been in Canada. I think, therefore, we should have a Department of Health, and I should welcome it now.

The speech from the Throne referred to the export trade of Canada. For fifty years we have been devoting our energies to spending money in the development of interprovincial trade, in creating manufacturing industries, in building up our educational and commercial institutions, in constructing our transcontinental railways, in digging our canals, in lighting our coasts, in providing means of transport for this sparsely populated country stretching from ocean to ocean. We have built up in Canada a very considerable manufacturing business, but we have never had our fair share of export trade. During all these years we have been creating, creating, creating. Now is the time, when our statesmen are at the Peace Conference, when commercial treaties are being revised, when the name of Canada stands

higher than it ever did in all the Allied countries and Canadian products will be well received—now is the time for us to develop our export trade. I believe that if the energies of the Government are properly directed there may be brought back to Canada an enormous portion of the export trade of the world in the commodities which Canada can export.

We have the greatest possible asset in the Canadian artisan. Did any one believe, Sir, when the war broke out that we could create from the ground up a new industry which would bring into this country $1,200,000,000 from outside of Canada? That is what we did, and we did it with our own people, with our own artisans. We showed that we have in Canada artisans second to none in the world. Having regard to the manufacturing industries that we have here, to our means of transport on the two oceans, to the opening up to us of trade with the Orient, to the fact that South America, Mexico and Central America are at our door and that the European countries which were our Allies are favourable to us, now is the time of all times for us to get after this export trade. Time, tide and fortune await us. Let us assist our Government in any way that we can to get our share of it.

I am glad that the Government is going to expend money for the construction of highways. Canada, like every other pioneer country has gone through the various stages of transportation. First was the method of transport by waterways, then by connecting the waterways with trails, then building roads, then building the great state road, then using the stage coach, then building railroads on a large scale and using the rails which have done so much to develop Canada. Money expended on the construction of highways serves a double purpose; it gives employment to our men and it increases our capital account.

A new system of transportation has been developed in this world since the war began, and it is about that particularly that I wish to speak to-night with reference to its application to the great hinterland of Canada, part of which I have the honour to represent in this Parliament. I refer to the highways of the air. This war has practically created aerial navigation. Three types of airships are used, first, the lighter-than-air machine; second, the land plane, and third, the seaplane. By means of this method of transportation I believe we can give safe and rapid transport to an enormous section of our country which lies undeveloped. We have a tract of virgin soil sixteen hundred miles long and a thousand miles deep reaching from the Hudson bay to the Alaskan boundary, 141st meridian west. In that vast tract I do not believe that there are many more than a thousand souls; certainly there are not more than ten thousand. It is an empire itself, with great possibilities; a vast tract owned and controlled not by any of the provinces, but by the Federal Government. In that tract there may be minerals enough to pay our national debt a dozen times. Some hon. gentleman behind me says that he would like to live there. I will show him how he can go and live there, and live in comfort. I have in my hand an article written for the Geological Survey of Canada by Charles Camsell. He refers to this vast hinterland of Canada in which, he says, there are 900,000 square miles that have never been explored. Most of that is underlain by what the geologists call the pre-Cambrian rocks, in which occur the copper, nickel, iron, silver and gold of northern Ontario. He says:

> Signs are not wanting that deposits of similar minerals of perhaps equal richness occur in various parts of the unexplored north, such, for example, as the copper deposits of the Coppermine River.

I am speaking of land away north of Alberta, away north of Saskatchewan and away north of Manitoba, land which does not belong to any of these provinces. The writer goes on to say:

> It is estimated that the rocks which are the source of this oil, namely, the Devonian strata, are the surface rocks of about 150,000 square miles of the lower Mackenzie Basin, while in the southern part they extend under a larger area of younger rocks, so that their total area covers not less than 300,000 square miles. The future as regards oil, therefore, is full of promise and cannot easily be estimated at its full value. The region is believed to be one of the largest areas of possible oil-bearing country yet unexplored on the face of the earth, and it is to the exploitation of the oil resources that we look for the greatest development in the basin of Mackenzie River. This must come within comparatively few years; for the oil reserves of the United States are estimated by the United States Geological Survey to be sufficient at the present rate of output for only about thirty years.

There, he says, is the largest undeveloped oil field in the world, right in our own country, in a district where there is no population. The climate is salubrious. Men can live and are living out in the valleys of that country the year round. It is a country well watered with plenty of rivers and lakes. How can we reach it? We can reach it by means of the aeroplane. Before I touch on that, let me say that

in that vast northern country there are two of the largest rivers in Canada, the Mackenzie river and the Yukon. What I would ask the Government to do is this, namely, to purchase or have the British Government give them an airship. I am not speaking now of the aeroplane, I am speaking of the lighter-than-air machine, known as the dirigible. In this northern country there are the vast valleys, the Yukon and the Mackenzie, sparsely populated, capable of being highly developed, but they lack transportation for about seven months in the year. I would suggest that the Government get an airship, base it on Edmonton, sail it down the Mackenzie river valley to the Arctic ocean, across to Dawson, up the Yukon valley to White Horse, across the northern part of British Columbia and back to Edmonton. Perhaps you, Sir, and the hon. members here think that is a chimerical dream. Well, if you do, you are just about four laps behind the times, and I do not think you are. Has this been done? Are other people using airships and aeroplanes? The Prime Minister of Great Britain regularly goes to and returns from the Peace Conference in Paris in an aeroplane. So does Mr. Bonar Law, the Chancellor of the Exchequer. So do several of the other British statesmen who are attending that conference. I hold in my hands an extract from the New York Times of February 20, referring to an airship which the British people made, known as the R-33. If you will give me your attention, Sir, I will just quote very briefly:

> The R-33 will be fitted with five engines of 1250 horse power in combination, and she will have a carrying capacity of from 27 to 30 tons, which would allow accommodations for a crew of twenty or more men.
>
> Additional safety has been assured to the lighter-than-air ship by the development of a non-inflammable gas (helium) of which the United States possesses almost limitless natural resources.
>
> Under way the R-33 will have a displacement of 2,750,000 cubic feet, a speed of about seventy knots, and a range of well over 200 hours, or safely across the Atlantic and return in any weather except the worst storms.

Could the R-33 navigate the Yukon and the Mackenzie valley? Let us see. From Edmonton to Herschell island at the mouth of the Mackenzie, is 1,300 miles. The R-33 could do it in fifteen hours. She could make Dawson from there in about six hours, and from Dawson to Edmonton she would come back in about eighteen hours.

In 1897, when the Edmonton route to the Klondike was boomed throughout the length and breadth of this country, scores of people left the old route and went by that route to Klondike. How long, Sir, do you suppose it took to go from Edmonton to Dawson by that route? Just eighteen months. The R-33 will do it in eighteen hours. There are on the Mackenzie river Hudson Bay forts which have been operating for over a hundred years, perhaps a hundred and fifty years, forts that are to-day far removed from civilization except for a very short time in the summer. There are: Fort Chippewyan which this airship could make from Edmonton in six hours; Fort Reliance, five hundred miles down the Mackenzie, which she could make in eight hours; Fort Simpson, where the Liard river joins the Mackenzie, seven hundred miles, which she could make in ten hours; Fort Norman, on the Mackenzie, 900 miles, which she could make in thirteen hours; Fort Goodhope, 1,100 miles, which she could make in sixteen hours, and Fort McPherson, 1,300 miles, which she could make in nineteen hours. What a blessing it would be for these people who are struggling in their cabins along the banks of the Mackenzie river, trying to uphold our methods of civilization, having to transport their supplies for long distances over snow and ice through many months in the year. This ship could operate the year round. There are few storms in that country and it is not very cold. It would be an enormous blessing to that country and to the country which I have the honour to represent, namely, the Yukon. This would not be a costly experiment compared with the building of a railway, and we have more than once mortgaged the future of Canada to give our country transportation. I commend this proposition to the Government and I hope they will favourably consider it.

There is, however, another means by which we can develop the other part of this section of the country that is between Hudson bay and the Mackenzie river valley. In that country, if the geologists are right, it is more than probable that there are other Cobalts and other Porcupines and other Klondikes. What does that mean? It means that if we can find another Cobalt in that country, we can enhance the value of the world's metal by just $200,000,000. If we can find another Klondike in that vast country, it will enhance the world's wealth by $200,000,000 more. These are not dreams at all. I am speaking of absolute facts. The Cobalt district has produced about $200,000,000 in silver. Klondike, I know, has produced about $200,000,000 in gold, and Porcupine is

producing a very large amount of money every year. Camsell, in his report, speaks of the difficulty of getting into this vast country, how it is almost impossible to get into it in the summer and get out again and do any work. One can easily understand how that is the case. Can we assist in developing that country by giving transportation? I believe we can. How? By using the aeroplane. I do not need to argue here, I take it that the aeroplane has been demonstrated as being a method of transportation. Aeroplanes travel to-day from London, Great Britain, to Calcutta, in India. They have made the trip more than once. Aeroplanes are used in Europe in very many ways. They are being improved all the time. And when I tell the House that the Prime Minister of Great Britain uses this method of transportation to go to the Peace Conference at Paris, it may be taken as being a fairly safe method of transporting the people from one point to another. What can we do? We have here in Ottawa a number of trained, scientific men whose business it is to make a geological examination of the hinterland of Canada. My suggestion to the Government is this—and when I make this suggestion I am not suggesting something that is impracticable. I do not believe that our men who are coming back will require or expect any coddling. What I believe they have a right to expect is an opportunity to develop the individual initiative which has made this Empire great and which is one of the best assets we have. If we can open up new avenues of employment, new countries to exploit and develop, we can help our men better than by doing anything else. I would suggest that the Government should get some aeroplanes. We are already getting them; we are getting them from the British Government. I saw a report stating that fifteen aeroplanes had been given the other day by the British Government to Sir George Perley. Have we men to operate these aeroplanes? What did our Canadian boys do in this war? They developed the highest type of air men that the world has so far seen. Our own boys who flew those air machines and did such magnificent work with our army in France and Flanders, are coming home and being demobilized. Is there any work in this country for them to do? Is it possible to have some air work for them to do? It is; at least a few of them might be employed in this work. We have the airplanes, the trained airmen and the trained miners, who could go into this land and find out whether these minerals are there or not. It would not require a large expenditure of money. But if these geologists and scientists will go into that country and tell us that it has possibilities of silver, cobalt, copper or gold, then we have the adventurous population who will follow. The scientists could by airplanes be taken from almost any part of the northland into the very heart of this country in a few hours, and they could stay there through the summer and come out in the fall. There need be no fear of a lack of landing places. The country abounds in lakes and rivers and an airplane could land on a river or lake almost anywhere. I have talked with men who have been over this country and I know that it would be possible to go in there in the spring before the ice had melted, and if the airplane was provided with skids a landing place could be made on the lakes. The machines could have both wheels and skids, to be used as occasion required. Canada was a pioneer in the business of airplanes. You will recall, Sir, that long before the air machine was brought to perfection, in the country from which the hon. leader of the Opposition comes, two men were flying their machines over Baddeck county—Graham Bell and Baldwin. It seems to me too bad to allow an opportunity such as this to go by without making the best possible use of it. The geologists could survey this vast tract of land and examine the rocks, the oil experts could find out whether there was any oil there or not, and there should also accompany them naturalists to examine the flora and fauna of the country. Immense herds of caribou roam over that northland. I have seen caribou by the hundreds of thousands up there. Only last year a herd of caribou crossed the Yukon river and took three days to pass a given point. Hon. gentlemen within sound of my voice to-night would hardly credit the size of the vast herds that roam over those regions. It is possible that there is a source of food which could be tapped; the food could be transported and conserved. I am not advocating that as a positive proposal, but I do know that we have men in our employ who could go in and look over these herds of caribou and report to us on the possibility of using them as a food supply. One of our explorers who recently returned from the north reports having seen enormous numbers of musk-oxen. The flesh of the mush-ox is almost equal to that of a cow, and the milk of the musk-cow is almost equal to goat's milk. If that is so, there is

a source of food supply which we have not yet tapped.

The science of airplane photography has been enormously developed during the past few years so that now an airplane can fly over a city and mark off every street and avenue so that it could be identified, just as was done during the war in France. It is no trick at all to take aerial photographs of this vast area up north and have maps made, so that there would be no difficulty in knowing just where the lakes and rivers were. There are no mountains there, it being practically a level country.

There is another matter. I have here a dispatch from Winnipeg, under yesterday's date, published in the Montreal Gazette, to the effect that the Legislature of Manitoba has passed a unanimous resolution asking this Parliament to finish the Hudson Bay railway. Premier Norris takes some pride in pointing out that from now on Manitoba will be a maritime province, having in mind Hudson bay, which is in the province of Manitoba. Explorers who have been up north report tremendous ice floes in the Hudson strait. We have spent millions of dollars to build the road to Hudson bay, and for what purpose? So that we can get our wheat out by that route into the North Atlantic and across to Liverpool. Why not have some of our trained airmen patrol the Hudson bay and report on ice and weather conditions in the straits for the benefit of steamers using that route? An air station should be established on the Hudson bay and the airplanes could communicate by wireless with the station. This is not an impracticable proposition; it is just applied common sense. I submit these suggestions to the Government, because they are ways in which we can help our returned soldiers to help themselves, and that is what I believe in. Some may object that the weather conditions would be too severe, that the cold would be too intense. I have not the facts, but I have not the slightest doubt that the airman who could stand the cold at an altitude of from twenty-five to thirty thousand feet, as they did in Europe, would find that temperature colder than anything to be found in the Klondyke, or anything found by Nansen on his trip to the North Pole.

We have the machines, we have the men, and more than that, we have a police force in this country that can help put this scheme into operation—the Royal Northwest Mounted Police, in whose ranks are many flyers. If the Government will not consider my proposal with regard to that north country favourably I urge them to use airplanes in connection with the Royal Northwest Mounted Police. I have figures here showing how much it costs for transport from Vancouver through Behring strait into the Arctic ocean for the police force at Herschell island. Another station is shortly to be established at Bathurst inlet. This force polices the whole of that vast territory. There are few stations at present, but the number is gradually increasing. We could carry the men to their posts and back, and their supplies, at a very small cost, and give them regular and continuous means of communication. The men who are up around the Behring sea and strait discovered such a rich store of copper at Coronation gulf that when they reported the find to the Government that district was retired from entry. It is a vast empire in itself and contains tons of copper ore, which I am told is similar to the ore found in the great copper fields of Michigan. I am quoting absolute facts. I have seen the ore and have talked with the men who have been up there. Surely it is not good business or good government to leave that ore undeveloped up there. We could send scientists in there by airplane to explore that vast territory.

I do not doubt that we are now within a few months, perhaps within a few weeks—yes, it may be, even within a few days—of the accomplishment of a trans-Atlantic flight by airship. The Daily Mail of London has put up a prize of £10,000 for the first man who makes a trans-Atlantic flight. There is a Swede in Bayonne, N.J., who is practising now with an airship with which he expects to make the flight by way of Newfoundland and across the Atlantic. The American Government have made an appropriation to provide the materials and build a ship for trans-Atlantic flight. There is not a doubt in my mind that this year, and perhaps within a few weeks, we shall have airships crossing the Atlantic. And they will not stop at that, they will fly across Canada, to Siberia, to China, to Japan. Now, Canada is on this great highway of aerial commerce which is about to be made, because Canada is nearer to Europe than the United States or any other country south to Patagonia, and nearer also to Asia than any other American country. I firmly believe that air routes will be outlined and that airships will fly across the North Atlantic, across the North American continent, across the North Pacific, and that the route they will take to Siberia, China and Japan will be practically the same route—but a little

further north—that ships are taking to-day. And why? Because the northern route is the shorter route. Why did the old Spanish merchant ships going to Manilla sight the Aleutian islands? Because that was the shortest route. These airships will cross the very section of country to which I am asking the Government to afford transport facilities. They will seek the line of the mountain range where the winds are not great; they will cross the great section of this country between the Alleghenies and the Rockies, this great central plain, they will sail across to the Rockies, north along that great chain and down the Yukon valley and across over the Aleutian islands and thence by way of Siberia and China to Japan. And on this route from the mainland of America to Yokohama, there is not a section of more than 150 miles, perhaps not more than 100 miles, over which they will have to fly over water.

Why should we do all this that I am asking? Because, Mr. Speaker, we are a progressive people who have led the world in great enterprises. The first ship that crossed the North Atlantic was built by Samuel Cunard, of Halifax, Nova Scotia after whom the great Cunard line was named and through whose genius that great transportation system was developed. In the old House of Commons you will still find the brass plate near the Library which gives the history of the first ship that crossed the Atlantic under her own steam —a Canadian ship. When my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) was Minister of Finance he did a notable thing. Senor Marconi came to America and tried to get the Newfoundland Government to assist him in erecting a wireless station. But the Newfoundland Government could not do as he requested because of a contract which had been made by them with a cable company, the name of which I have for the moment forgotten. Marconi came to Cape Breton. An officer of the Canadian Government, a member of the staff of the Post Office Department, Mr. William Smith, happened to be in St. John's, Newfoundland. He heard of Marconi's invention and of the difficulty that existed because of the contract with the cable company. He was enterprising and far-seeing enough to write to a gentleman here who told the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens about the matter. That hon. gentleman himself wrote and told Mr. Smith that the Government of Canada would be willing to assist Marconi. Marconi came to Ottawa. the Government did assist him with a grant, with conditions attached that the Canadian people should be given low wireless rates for a certain length of time. The result was that Marconi towers were erected at Glace Bay and the wireless system became a fact—and perhaps there are few greater boons to the human race. To-day Canada has perhaps the finest wireless system in the world. And that reminds me that, under the scheme I am advocating, we could take the wireless plants that are being dismantled because of the cessation of war and place them at Hudson's Bay ports and other places in the north for the assistance of the enterprise.

Is there any other great enterprise in which we led the world? We built the first transcontinental road on this continent. Yes, Mr. Speaker, the first railway which connected tide-water on the Atlantic with tide-water on the Pacific, the first which ran from coast to coast, was built by the Canadian people, by the Canadian Government, namely the Canadian Pacific. There was no complete transcontinental road in the United States at that time—I do not know even that there is one to-day, and we have three of them.

We have never yet gone into any of these far-reaching enterprises without our action being justified by the result. You are aware, Mr. Speaker, that the great nickel and copper deposits of the Sudbury region were discovered by the engineers and contractors who built the Canadian Pacific railway. It was the building of the Temiskaming and Northern Ontario railway which made known the great mineral deposits of Cobalt and that whole region. That road was not built with a view to opening up a mineral country, but was built to reach farm land in the northern portion of the Lake Temiskaming country. The same is true of the Porcupine and other great mineral fields opened in Northern Ontario. The sending of a squadron of Northwest Mounted Police to the Klondike, before it was discovered or heard of, helped very largely in the discovery of the Klondike which resulted in giving $200,000,000 of wealth to the world.

Is there anything else in which we led the world? Yes, we were the first people in the British Empire to federate great states, when we created the Dominion of Canada and thus established the model upon which every federation in the Empire has been moulded. Seeing, then, that we have the genius, that we have the country, that we have the people, I trust that this Government, in its wisdom, will see fit to consider some of the suggestions I have made. If they do, I promise you, Mr. Speaker, I promise the Government and the people of Canada, that it will be the sowing

of fruitful seed which will yield a hundredfold.

Mr. ONESIPHORE TURGEON (Gloucester): Mr. Speaker, on rising to address the House for the first time during the present session, my first word must be of deep regret at the loss of our great and beloved leader. And I cannot resist the impulse to extend my thanks, as one of the humble followers of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, to the many hon. members on both sides of this House who have spoken in terms of eulogy of the life, character and achievements of that great Canadian. I must mention first, and with special appreciation the remarks of the acting leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) on the second day of the present session.

I also express thanks to two other hon. members on this side of the House. I must more particularly express my sincere thanks and appreciation for the eulogy pronounced yesterday by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in the speech delivered by him and in which the expressions of admiration and esteem for our revered leader reached a higher plane than has ever been attained in this House before. These remarks came from one who had been educated in the school of that great British statesman, Gladstone, who had dwelt with him in the city of London, who had heard him on many occasions and whose privilege it had been to listen to speeches delivered by him which had not only astounded his auditors but the whole world. I esteem particularly his likening of that great British statesman to Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I have always believed that it was the ambition of our Canadian statesman to follow in the steps of such a great British statesman as Gladstone. On many occasions when I desired to impress upon my people in New Brunswick the talents and position of our great leader I have deemed it appropriate to compare him to some of the great British statesmen and I have often designated him the Gladstone of Canada.

Being left in bereavement and without a leader at the opening of this House, the first duty of the Opposition was to look for another leader, either permanent or temporary. It having been decided by the Liberal party in this House that the choice of a permanent leader should be left to the consideration of a Liberal Convention to be held as soon as possible, the choice has been made, I believe, for the time being, of a member of this House and of the Liberal party well known to every hon. member on both sides and well known not only in his native province of Nova Scotia but throughout the other provinces of Canada. He is known as a result of the long years which he has given to his people in this Parliament, by his standing as a lawyer, by the ability with which he discharged the duties that devolved upon him while occupying a seat on the Bench and many other admirable qualities which make him most acceptable not only to the Liberal party in this House but, I am sure, to the Liberal party throughout Canada. He also possesses qualities, combined with his experience, which may be of great benefit to the Liberal party, and to Canada at any moment. The hon. the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) comes from a district where miners and steel workers are employed by the thousands in the great industries to be found in Cape Breton. His experience, as well as the place which he occupies in the confidence of those who know him best, give him the necessary qualifications to play an effective and useful part in the settlement of labour problems which this Parliament may have to solve before its prorogation. Therefore, he is well qualified for the position of leader of the Opposition in this House. The will of his people has guided every step of his career. He is an inhabitant of the ancient province of Nova Scotia where the spirit of justice, liberty and harmony still prevails as it did in the days of Haliburton and Joseph Howe. He is imbued with that sense of British fair play and justice which he has displayed on every occasion in this Parliament.

10 p.m.

Coming back to the debate on the Address, I cannot help but extend my sincere congratulations to the hon. the mover (Mr. Redman) and the hon. the seconder (Mr. Manion) of the Address. They are not in the House at this moment but I would point out that they have followed a direction new in this Parliament. They have not confined themselves to the old system by which it was considered the duty of the mover and seconder of the Address to speak to the House merely as supporters of the Government of the day. They have in noble language spoken to us of the war and of the heroism, energy and valour of our Canadian soldiers. They have told us of the duty we owe to the returned soldier not only in the matter of increased pensions but in many other respects. I acknowledge the indebtedness of the House to them for the very admirable addresses with which they favoured the House in moving and seconding the motion.

Speaking of the valour of the Canadian soldier, I may say that he has not only done his duty but he has shown a spirit which elicited the admiration of every nation engaged in the war. He has won the respect and esteem not only of Canada but of the British Empire and the Allies by his valour and courage. At the very first of the war, on that great and critical occasion at the battle of Langemarck the Canadian soldiers displayed a superhuman courage and valour but for which the day would have been lost. With the knowledge that there was no possibility of reinforcements reaching them, rather than retreat they fought with splendid courage, the bodies of their dead comrades were used as a rampart against the enemy and whilst the souls of those who had fallen rose to heaven their surviving comrades rallied nobly, stopped the advance of the Hun to Calais and thus saved the Empire. In a great many other hard fought battles they distinguished themselves and brought glory to their native land. At St. Julien, St. Eloi and elsewhere their gallantry and courage brought victory to the Allies and on every occasion the Canadian soldier acquitted himself in such a way as to win the admiration of the civilized world. It remains for the Canadian people to show their gratitude to every one of those returned soldiers who fought for liberty, right and justice, for democracy and against autocracy.

Sir, I wish to be brief in my remarks with respect to the matters referred to in the speech from the Throne. The representatives of the allied nations, including the representatives of the British Dominions, are to-day assembled endeavouring to frame a treaty which we hope will ensure permanent peace to the world. Not only will that congress determine the amount of damages to be paid to the allied countries, but it will be its duty also to endeavour to see that we shall have peace for all time. Not only will that congress fix the indemnities to be paid, but it will endeavour to see that the German people shall divert the trend of the education of its youth from the muddied channel of arrogance, autocracy and Prussianism, to the limpid stream of fraternity and democracy, in the hope that that nation, after sincere repentance and enlightenment, will be able ultimately to join in the League of Nations and help to make the world immune from future wars. So long as Germany educates its youth along the lines which it has followed during so many years, so long will it remain a menace to the world, and the rest of the nations would have to continue the maintenance of armaments, a thing which we would all deplore, and which it is certainly one of the chief aims of the League of Nations to put an end to.

I desire now to discuss more particularly the tariff question, and I am glad to see the Minister of Immigration and Colonization in his seat. That hon. gentleman the other day delivered a very remarkable speech, marked by some brilliant and patriotic features in discussing the intentions of the Government with respect to the returned soldier. But when my hon. friend came to consider the tariff question, he dropped to a lower level. In his opinion at the present time, when demobilization, reconstruction and re-establishment policies call for attention, we ought not to discuss the tariff question, but leave it in abeyance for some future time. Sir, in my humble judgment, the Government should have dealt with the tariff question from the very first; but instead of that it pursued a policy of delay, and now calls upon us to wait a while longer. In my opinion, the very moment the armistice was signed the Government should have called Parliament together with a view to taking some action on this important question, which is the very foundation of our national prosperity, and yet even to-day we are not to see any action taken because of peace time conditions. My hon. friend declared the other day that he was now, and intended to remain, a Liberal. I believe I know my hon. friend as well as any member in this House, and I can bear testimony to his strong Liberal beliefs. I think he is still a Liberal, and I hope he will remain in that frame of mind, not so much from motives of expediency, but with a view to the application of Liberal principles in this great Canada of ours. Let me tell my hon. friend that the question of the tariff is the great overpowering question that a true Liberal of the English school should bear in mind, and therefore we cannot leave unconsidered the matter of tariff legislation, more particularly as we are in the transitionary period between war conditions and peace conditions. In my opinion, no reconstruction policy can bring this country safely from war conditions to peace conditions unless it is based on the economic principles held by the Liberal party. My hon. friend's uncertainty of mind on this subject is perhaps due to his failure up to now to convince his supporters on the Government side, and he, therefore, wishes more time to convince them. I maintain, Sir, that we cannot wait any longer. The people expected the Gov-

ernment to take action three or four years since, and not wait as it has done, and yet in the matter of the tariff it to-day appeals for further delay. My hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) yesterday gave the Government credit for having given a certain degree of reciprocity in the shape of free wheat and free potatoes. For six years my hon. friend had been lamenting the defeat of reciprocity and the loss of the advantage that would have resulted to the country had that policy been carried out. The same eloquent gentleman spoke of the efforts which he had been making for three years or so to induce the Government to have recourse to an income tax, and yet, after it has been so long urged when it comes to be introduced it is made as light as possible. But why stop there? My hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization always advocated Liberal principles until the day he joined the Union Government. I presume he entered the Cabinet from motives of conscience, and as to that I have nothing to say, but we on this side of the House also have a conscience which would not honestly permit us to cast in our lot with them. Instead of that we have remained true to our principles, to our policy, and to our revered leader. My hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, in giving a reason for postponing the consideration of the tariff question, said, in eloquent terms: "There is a cleavage between the East and the West'.'

I think I can convince my hon. friends that there is no cleavage between the East and the West; that the policy of the West is the policy of the East; that the people of the Maritime Provinces are in harmony with the people of the West in demanding that the principles embodied in the reciprocity pact of 1911 be re-affirmed by this Parliament. The whole population of the Maritime Provinces is in favour of that pact to-day, as it was in 1911. The province of Quebec also is in favour of the reciprocity pact now, as it was at that time. If there is a cleavage it is between the people of Canada and a few financiers of Ontario and Toronto. To prove that the people of the East are in harmony with the people of the West in this matter, I have only to direct attention to a number of resolutions which have been adopted in the Legislature of Saskatchewan, a body which only a few months ago the Minister of Immigration and Colonization adorned with his talent and his ability, as he had done for twelve or fifteen years. There he made fame for himself, and was often justly extolled by the people of his province for his advocacy of the true principles of Liberalism. I will read that portion of these resolutions which relates to the general interests of the country, leaving aside that which is of particular interest only to the province. These resolutions are in the form of a petition to the Dominion Government and were adopted unanimously in the Legislature of Saskatchewan, being supported alike by Liberals and Conservatives. The resolutions read:—

The immediate adoption by the Federal Government of an efficient policy of soldiers' settlement which will ensure the immediate settlement of as great a number as possible of our returned soldiers upon lands in Saskatchewan within reasonable proximity of railway facilities and community centres.

An immediate and substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff.

The reduction of the customs duty on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual uniform reductions be made of the remaining tariffs on British imports that will ensure complete free trade between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

The acceptance by the Parliament of Canada of the reciprocity agreement of 1911, which still remains on the United States statute books.

The placing upon the free list of all foodstuffs not included in the reciprocity agreement.

The placing upon the free list of all agricultural implements, farm machinery, vehicles, fertilizers, coal, lumber, cement, illuminating fuel and lubricating oils and all raw materials and machinery used in their manufacture.

The immediate extension to Great Britain of all tariff concessions granted to other countries.

This is the view of the Legislature of Saskatchewan; indeed, of the whole of the people of that province. Only last Tuesday the sentiments expressed in these resolutions were adopted in almost the same words by the Legislature of Manitoba, where they were approved by every Conservative as well as every Liberal member of the legislature. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization knows that at many conventions of farmers and grain growers in Alberta the same sentiments have been expressed. The people of the three prairie provinces are one in their demand for the restoration of the reciprocity treaty. Had not the American Congress and Senate given Canada free lumber in 1913 the lumber industry in New Brunswick would have become bankrupt at that time and would have remained so ever since. In expressing these views I am sure that I voice the sentiment of the people of the Maritime Provinces, including members representing those provinces in this House. I know that these views are shared by the leader of the Opposition as well as by every

other member from the Maritime Provinces and Quebec. I need not say that they are entertained by my most esteemed friend the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Hon. Mr. Fielding), who was a minister of the Crown at the time this reciprocity agreement was entered into in 1911. Fortunately, the motto "No truck or trade with the Yankees" was not adopted by the Mother Country. If the Mother Country had taken the same position as that adopted by the Conservatives in 1911 and lacked consideration for the great nation to the south of us, where would we have been in this war?

Of course, these resolutions of the Legislature of Saskatchewan at once attracted the attention of the manufacturers of Ontario, and immediately, through the organ of the President of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, they issued a statement of their position with regard to the matters dealt with in the resolutions. In their judgment the time had not come to consider the question of the tariff; it should be left over to the future. Here is what, on January 28, through their president, they say of these resolutions:—

> Therefore, the Canadian Manufacturers' Association believes that the country should concentrate on the one main problem, with its attendant questions, and leave the highly controversial problem of tariff revision to a time when it can be given the undivided attention it demands.

Of course, it demands attention. They give this reason why it demands attention:

> It is a general and familiar law, that in any country, when fundamental tariff changes are anticipated, trade depression follows. During such periods of uncertainty, investment is curtailed, enterprise is limited, commerce lives from hand to mouth, consumers buy sparingly, and building languishes.

If it is a general and familiar law that when tariff changes are anticipated, trade depression follows, we should make haste and have the tariff revision made at once before trade depression takes place in this country. Now is the time to act. If we put the agricultural industry on a good footing, we shall be able to look after the returned soldiers. Agriculture is the basic industry of Canada. We want to send the returned soldiers to the land. One hundred and fifty thousand of them have expressed their willingness and their intention to go onto the land on their return. The Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) will, perhaps, tell me that the Government are going to be very generous to the returned soldier; that they will advance him a certain amount of money to pay for the land he needs and also money to buy the implements he requires. At the same time, the soldier who wants to go onto the land, wants to see ahead of him a future livelihood. If the Government advance him money, he will have to make good every year the interest on that amount together with the annual instalment he will be called upon to pay. If he is discouraged and cannot meet his interest and instalments, his loan is bound to be forfeited. Unless he sees that he is really encouraged and gets everything he needs at the lowest possible price, he will certainly not go on to the land; or if he does, and is not able to get on, his land will be forfeited and will not be handed over to any returned soldier, but will likely go to some speculator in the West who is waiting for such opportunities. The time is most opportune for immediate revision of the tariff. The manufacturers of this country have, during the four years of this war, accumulated immense wealth through the tremendous profits on their operations. They are to-day in a better position than they have ever been before. They have to-day millions of dollars in the banks awaiting investment. They have millions of dollars worth of Victory Bonds at five and a half per cent interest, free of taxation. They are, therefore, in a position to face the situation to-day. They are in a position, not only to accept the situation, but to help the people of Canada and also to help the farmer to get what he wants so that he may increase the quantity of land under cultivation in this great country of ours. To-day, when I say that the East is in harmony with the West in their claim for reciprocity with the United States, for free agricultural implements, and for having other articles put on the free list, it is because in the Maritime Provinces, as well as in Quebec, a new impetus has been given by the war to the industry of agriculture. Agriculture has doubled its production during the last four and a half years, and everyone of our farmers, with his son coming back from the war, is looking for the moment when he will again be able to increase his production. But to be able to do so he must be given every one of his implements at the lowest possible cost.

We have been informed by the acting leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) that the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) contemplates spending during the coming year $35,000,000 on railway rolling stock and steel rails; $20,000,000 on

railway extensions, and $10,000,000 on betterments. We have also been told that $25,000,000 are to be spent on housing. This makes a total of over $80,000,000 which will be spent on railroads and housing in Canada and which will give a new impetus to the industries which our manufacturers are well prepared to take in hand. Now is the time for the Government to act. The problem of the returned soldier must be solved. In my county there are several soldiers waiting to get land somewhere in the county or in the province to which they belong. Owing to the still indefinite state of affairs, we have not been able to locate any of them and they are still waiting. After a few months it will be too late; a year will be again lost for the farmers in the West as well as for the farmers in the East. Therefore, I repeat that now is the time for the Government to take the matter into consideration.

It is true that a compromise is asked for by the manufacturers. They are willing to compromise and they will, perhaps, be satisfied with the elimination of the war surtax imposed by the Government at the beginning of the war on all importations including raw material. It was my lot at the time, amongst other members of the Opposition, to oppose as strongly as possible the imposition of a surtax of 5 per cent against products coming from Great Britian and 7½ per cent on products coming from other countries. The manufacturers will accept the elimination of that war surtax which will give them the raw material. I see in that no great advantage to the producer or the farmer, for I was opposed at the time to the taxation of raw material just because it was hampering external trade, which was of first necessity, more particularly in war time and just now, and because it would also have the effect, with the maintenance of the tariff, of permitting the manufacturer to have the advantage of the elimination of the tax on raw material without giving the Canadian consumer the benefit of it. As long as there is a duty on goods manufactured from imported raw material such as woollen, or linen, or leather goods, the manufacturer will raise his price in accordance with the duty. There would, therefore, be no benefit to the consumer.

There was an offer of compromise with respect to another matter by an hon. member to whose speech I listened with great attention. He suggested that we should have a tariff commission, and I was amazed at his suggestion. Surely, we have had commissions enough during the war. For the last four years we have been governed by Orders in Council and by commissions. The Government would take away from Parliament all of its responsibility. A tariff commission would take a year or two to take evidence from the friends of the manufacturers and the protectionists before it would make a report. During all that time the consumers of the country would have to wait. If there is one thing which should be left to Parliament, according to all British traditions, it is the tariff, which has a bearing on the happiness or otherwise of all the people. I certainly hope the Government will not entertain the suggestion for a Tariff Commission. I would urge my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) to take the tariff question in hand at once, and if he can possibly succeed in bringing his supporters round to the Liberal policy on that question I shall give him great credit for it. I would also ask the Minister of Immigration and Colonization to take up with his colleagues another matter of vital interest to this country—the War-Time Elections Act. To my mind that Act should be wiped off the Statute Books at once and if there is one member of the Government who should initiate a movement in that direction among his colleagues it is the Minister of Immigration. He comes from a province where for long years he has enjoyed the confidence of the people who have come to this country at his own invitation and enjoyed the freedom of Canadian citizenship, who, according to his own testimony, have been loyal citizens of Canada and have voted for him every time he offered himself for election in the province of Saskatchewan. Will he go back to those people and tell them that he is going to keep on the Statute Book the War-Time Elections Act which disfranchises good, honest citizens who came here years ago? Will he tell them they shall no longer have the freedom of the country to which they are entitled? Speaking of this Act on September 11, 1917, just one month before he joined the Union Government, my old esteemed colleague from the province of New Brunswick, now Minister of Public Works, said: "I cannot understand the Government thinking that a Bill of this revolutionary character, which violates every principle of that British fair play which we have bragged about in this country ever since I was a boy, is going to be railroaded through Parliament." That is the way he characterized the Act. I would ask these two hon. members to get their heads together and when they are in

Councils to-morrow ask their colleagues to delay no longer but to bring down on Monday afternoon a simple Bill repealing the War-Time Elections Act.

There is another question on which I shall say only a word or two, and that is the question of assistance in the building of highways. We are very pleased that the Government is going to assist the provincial governments in the building of roads, but we on this side of the House wish to put the Government on their guard, as we did a few years before the war when the Government introduced a Bill with similar objects but which encroached on provincial rights. On that occasion we on this side of the House, and particularly my hon. friend the present Minister of Public Works objected to the method under which this money was to be spent. If there was one gentleman who had strong views on that subject it was the present Minister of Immigration and Colonization who, at that time, had a resolution passed in the Saskatchewan Legislature upholding provincial rights and declaring he would not accept any money for the improvement of highways under the terms laid down by the Federal Government. I ask him to see that in the framing of the Bill there will be no encroachment this time on provincial rights. I do not object to there being an understanding between the engineers of the local Governments and the Federal Government, but there should be no pressure brought to bear on the provinces in the expenditure of this money.

While the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) is here, I shall take the liberty of drawing his attention to one or two matters which I have been asked to bring before him. I understand that there is a small number of printers, pressmen, feeders and compositors working in the Militia Department for a pittance which, according to my informant, is not worthy of the department. Sixteen of those men are working at a salary of $66.75 per month, working 42 hours per week, and receiving no extra pay for overtime, although they are often called upon to work overtime on Sundays. I do not know the facts myself but I have every reason to believe that the information given me is correct. I might say that the stenographers in the Separation Allowance and Assigned Pay Branch also make the same complaint of long hours and inadequate pay.

They have to work long hours at rates of pay not adequate to the service rendered. I know that the Minister of Militia will inquire into these matters, and if he finds my statements to be correct, I am sure he will give consideration to these deserving officials.

I close my present remarks with the hope that the result of this war may be to bring lasting peace and harmony among the nations of the world. And may that harmony be reflected in the relation between the various nationalities in this Canada of ours. We all share the same sentiments, a love of democracy, of freedom and justice, and I trust that, having these glorious ideals in common we shall be united in our appreciation of one another's efforts to carry them into practice.

On the motion of Major General Mewburn, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Burrell the House adjourned at 10.48 p.m.

Monday, March 10, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Volume 3 of the Auditor General's Report for the year ended March 31, 1918.—Sir Thomas White.

Order in Council appointing the Minister of Railways and Canals Receiver for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System.—Sir Thomas White.

Orders in Council respecting pay and allowances to ex-soldiers receiving treatment and training under the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment.—Mr. Hugh Clark.

Orders in Council respecting pensions.—Mr. Hugh Clark.

Ninth Annual Report of the Commission of Conservation, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

STRIKE OF PRESSMEN—STATEMENT BY HON. MR. BURRELL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I would like to ask the Secretary of State if he has any information to communicate to the House in regard to the strike in the Printing Bureau and if he would tell us what progress is being made towards a settlement. I would also ask him if he would be good enough to lay upon the table of the House the report that I understand was made to the department by the men.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): The report made by the committee

has already been laid on the Table. I have received no report from the men, although I understood that some report was to be made. As this is a matter of some public importance, perhaps I may be allowed briefly to explain the situation as it stands. The Bureau employees consist altogether of about twelve hundred. Of these the pressmen, comprising roughly about one hundred, have struck. The Act of Parliament lays down that current wages paid in commercial establishments shall form the basis of pay for similar work within the Printing Bureau, and it says: " For better guidance, the cities of Toronto and Montreal shall be taken, and those rates shall not be exceeded." The Act does not say that the highest amount payable in either Montreal or Toronto or in both of them may be taken, and the custom has been to take the average rate between Toronto and Montreal in commercial establishments. I might also state that the outside firms embody their rates in agreements which are entered into between the employers and the men. The present agreement, for instance, running until June 1, next. I might also point out that some outside firms, notwithstanding the fact that they lay down a rate to be followed in regard to the wages to be paid to the various services in their establishments, exceed that rate in the case of especially skilled workmen and in respect of various trades in those establishments. It has been contended by the Bureau employees that in fixing the rates for the Bureau, this excess rate for efficient employees in various outside establishments should be taken into consideration in applying a flat rate to all the employees in the Bureau. This, of course notwitstanding the fact, which will not be denied by any one, either employers or men, that the efficiency of the Bureau is away below the efficiency of outside establishments. Indeed, the committee itself says that work in outside establishments is from ten to fifty per cent better than work in the Printing Bureau and the cost of production in the Bureau is unquestionably greater.

As the agreements were to expire next June and fresh agreements were to be made, and as we would then have to adjust the rates, it seemed best to the Government to leave all questions in dispute until those agreements expired and fresh ones were made. The question of a bonus also came up. As hon. members in this House know, the Civil Service were being given certain bonuses. It was thought by the Government—and I do not think it will be disputed by any one—that as a matter of fact or right, the mechanical forces of the Bureau, which were paid according to outside schedules, could manifestly not participate in the advantages of an Inside Service, and that the bonus would not apply to them. But as some outside firms had paid a bonus, and as these differences of opinion did obtain amongst the Bureau employees and the minister, we concluded to pay a bonus, and accordingly a bonus of $2 a week was given to all the men in the mechanical forces and one dollar a week to the women in the bindery establishment. This applied to all of them and left the weekly pay received by the Bureau employees unquestionably somewhat higher than the average weekly pay received in all outside establishments. Moreover, this does not take into consideration, what the committee took into consideration, namely the question of holidays, for which they are paid $112 a year or $2 a week more, when outside establishments are not. This is all set forth in the committee's report. And whatever differences of opinion there might be in the employees' minds or in the mind of any hon. member in this House as to the accuracy of the various details of this report, I do not think that the substantial accuracy of this report will be disputed. and I think no member of this House will dispute that the closing words of the report must be accepted by all. They are:

> We are firmly of the opinion that if our recommendations, arriving at a greatly reduced wage cost through the elimination of unnecessary labour and higher standards of efficiency are not adopted, the only recourse in the public interest is to close the Bureau.

In view of this report and in view of the obvious necessity of some reorganization of a government department which is running in this way, it was thought that as during this fiscal year anyway the Government Bureau employees, were in regard to their total weekly receipts, whether you call that bonus or wages, placed in certainly as good, if not in a better position, than all outside employees, they might very well wait until this report was considered before any increase of wages or new schedules in regard to hours were taken up. That was our position. That position was practically stated to the employees, that the matter should rest, as they were provided for fully, until the dispute was adjusted later on and the report was considered. I think it is the wish of the Government, as I am sure it is the wish of the members of this House that nothing less than justice should be done to the employees, common justice to the ratepayers of this country being kept in view. In the face of that report and my letter to

the mechanical department that the matter should be allowed to stand until the Government could consider the report, the pressmen, numbering about 101, have struck, while the rest of the mechanical forces have not struck.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: May I preface a question that I desire to ask the minister, by pointing out to him that there is in the public mind some doubt as to the application of the concluding words of the report which he has just read, and there is general uncertainty as to whether the closing of the Bureau would be as much in the public interest as in the interest of certain outside printing concerns which, like Oliver Twist, have been clamorous for more pap. However, we will not discuss that now. Did I understand my hon. friend to say that when he receives the statement of the men's case he will bring down a copy for the information of hon. members?

Mr. BURRELL: I do not wish to enter into a discussion as to the accuracy of the report, but if I may be allowed to say one word in reply, my hon. friend who had charge of the Bureau for some years, will admit that unless there is a greatly reduced cost in running the Bureau, eliminating all unnecessary expense, and releasing on just terms those who are notoriously inefficient, nobody can justify the continuation of the Bureau.

Mr. MURPHY: These inefficient men should not have been put in the Bureau since 1911.

Mr. J. D. REID: They were put in before 1911.

ALLEGED TRADE DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CANADA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): The Acting Prime Minister will have read in the newspapers of Saturday last an interview with Mr. F. P. Jones, from which I shall quote one or two extracts, upon which to base an inquiry:

> Mr. F. P. Jones of Montreal, who has just returned from England and France, where he acted in an advisory capacity to Sir Robert Borden, says that the import licenses as they are administered in Great Britain discriminate against Canada and all countries that went to war in 1914.

Then comes the text of the interview, from which I quote these sentences:

> The general election, followed by the Peace Conference, continued to occupy the minds of the heads of the Lloyd George Administration, and evidently purely commercial affairs have been left to the Board of Trade. Now that the Canadian Mission in London have repeatedly and forcibly brought the matter to the attention of the British Government and also to the attention of our Canadian Ministers, in Paris, I feel confident the discrimination which does exist will be done away with.

Then, in the Evening Citizen of March 7th there appeared a further despatch on the same subject, purporting to give a summary of a discussion in the British House of Commons in these terms:

> In the course of a speech in the House of Commons, Lord Wolmer informed the president of the Board of Trade that considerable feeling existed in Canada as a consequence of the policy of licensing prohibited imports. He asked whether licenses had been issued for imports from neutral Allied countries of goods which had been refused from Canada.
>
> Under-secretary Bridgeman replied that it was true that, owing to their geographical position and to the difficulties of shortage of tonnage, a policy had been adopted respecting import restrictions which had had the undesired effect of discriminating against colonial goods. Now that the tonnage question was easier, he hoped that it would be possible to avoid this discrimination. The question was being considered and an announcement would be made shortly.

I desire to ask my hon. friend if he has any information as to the removal of the discrimination, and if not, whether he has any information in his possession to impart to the House.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I am glad to say that I am able to set at rest any apprehensions my hon. friend may have with regard to discrimination, especially intentional discrimination, against Canadian trade by Great Britain. I have received two cables to-day on this matter. The first is from Mr. Lloyd Harris, of the Canadian Trade Mission overseas, in which he says:

> In reply to question in House, this afternoon's Parliament, Secretary Board of Trade says:
>
> The Government has decided no import restrictions shall be or continue to be imposed on goods coming from any part of the Empire without the assent of the Cabinet, which shall not be given unless some unforeseen necessity arises. It is not possible at present to remove all restrictions on imports from foreign countries because of the state of the exchange, but all raw materials will be free from import restrictions.

The other cable is from the Canadian Trade Mission in London to the Canadian Trade Mission here, as follows:

> Board of Trade announced yesterday removal of all restrictions on imports from British Empire.

RIOTS AT KINMEL CAMP.

STATEMENT BY MAJOR-GENERAL MEWBURN.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): Can the Government give the House any information regarding the cable reports of riots among the Canadian troops at Rhyl? Has there been any loss of life?

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): Late on Friday evening I was informed that there had been some trouble in one of the camps in England and I immediately cabled the Overseas Minister of Militia for full information. My cable was crossed by his report on the matter, and which appeared in the Ottawa Evening Citizen of March 8th, as follows: (Reads official statement appearing in Ottawa Citizen, March 8th).

"Official statement of the disturbance at Kinmel Camp. In view of the splendid discipline and record uniformly maintained by the Canadian troops since the beginning of the war, in England and France, the incident at Kinmel Camp is very deeply regretted at the headquarters of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada. It is considered that in comparison with others the discipline among Canadian troops has been of high order.

"It is greatly regretted that some of the reports of the incident have been exaggerated.

"Immediately after the armistice had been signed, Kinmel Park was secured as a concentration area, through which Canadian troops passed on their way to Canada, being situated convenient to Liverpool, their embarkation port. There all documentation is completed and troops sorted into drafts according to their destination in Canada.

"Considering the shortage of shipping, the Canadian authorities have congratulated themselves upon the splendid record which has been made, on the whole, as despatching troops to Canada in the month of February. However, the ministry of shipping were unable to furnish sufficient ships to carry out the programme, as promised to the Canadians. Owing to this, in February and early March the shipments of troops having fallen short by fully one-third, there occurred a backing-up from Kinmel Camp through the areas in England and through them to France.

"This has caused very great disappointment to Canadian soldiers who have been overseas for periods ranging up to four years or more without leave to their homes. The withdrawal of some ships and the postponement of sailings of others from time to time, particularly after soldiers had been documented and medically boarded in numbers based on the shipping allocated, has been very trying to the drafts, and this is what it is considered led chiefly to the disturbance.

"Immediately upon the matter being reported to the chief of the general staff, Lieut.-General Sir Richard Turner, V.C., K.C.B., he went to Kinmel Camp and addressed the men in fifteen different places. They seemed to appreciate his explanations and there are not likely to be any further disturbances.

"There are at Kinmel Camp approximately 15,000 troops, all ranks, who have been despatched there as being the last step before boarding ship for Canada. Had the number of men been able to embark in February according to the programme which it was confidently thought could be carried out, the trouble would not have occurred, but the shipping situation, owing to strikes and for other reasons, is admitted to be an extremely difficult matter to control. However, it is hoped by the Canadian authorities that there will not be a recurrence of the delays which have hitherto taken place.

"It is not attempted in the slightest degree to excuse the conduct of the men who took part in the disturbance. Many of the offenders have already been placed under arrest, who, with others involved will be rigorously dealt with.

"During the disturbance there was a certain amount of damage done and it was discovered that civilians were concerned. Up to the present time twelve of these civilians have been arrested and handed over to the civil authorities.

"During the disturbance there were killed three rioters and two men on picket duty. There were twenty-one wounded, of whom two were officers. There is no foundation for the report that a major who is a V.C. has been either killed or injured.

"The troops at Kinmel Park are concentrated in wings representing the military districts in Canada to which they will proceed. They are not in their original units, these wings being composite formations consisting of personnel belonging to many different units. This sorting out is done in deference to the authorities in Canada to avoid delay when the men reach the Dominion. There has been some alleged dissatisfaction because of troops drawn from Canada under the Military Service Act getting priority over those who have seen longer service.

The troops who were in the Canadian corps at the time of the armistice are being returned to Canada by units in the formations that then existed, the first to return being a small number which were embarked on March 1. Soldiers not in the corps such as casualties, railway and forestry troops and others, where available, are demobilized on the principle of the longest service first demobilized, married men having the preference.

A court of inquiry has been convened to make a thorough investigation into all the circumstances in connection with the disturbance, of which Brig.-Gen. J. H. MacBrien C.B., C.M.G., D.S.A., is the president.

That is the official cable. I sent a further cable to the overseas Minister of Militia asking him to furnish us, at the earliest date, with any information he possibly can. He cabled:

All information that can be given out re Kinmel Park disturbance until court inquiry makes report contained in despatch to Government.

The moment that report is received the House will be advised. Later, if I may have permission, I will explain some of the problems of demobilization.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the minister know if all the casualties are Canadians?

Major-General MEWBURN: That is not stated in the cable. I have cabled and asked for a complete list of the casualties.

Lieut.-General Sir SAM HUGHES: I was informed by an officer who has been at Kinmel camp that there was lack of fuel, lack of warmth, for the men there. I would ask the Minister of Militia to inquire into that. If there be any truth in it, why cannot Canadian coal be sent in ballast in our ships to be furnished to the camp to keep the men warm?

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RECEIVERSHIP.

THE MINISTER OF RAILWAYS APPOINTED RECEIVER. STATEMENT BY SIR THOMAS WHITE—CORRESPONDENCE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Before the Orders of the Day are called, I desire to make a statement as to important action just taken by the Government respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system upon which I think it desirable the House should have immediate information. The facts are fully set forth in certain correspondence which I shall read to the House, and an Order in Council which I have laid upon the Table, and which, as it is somewhat lengthy I shall summarize.

Under date of 25th February last, Mr. Frank Scott, Vice-President and Treasurer of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company wrote me as follows:

Montreal, February 25, 1919.

Hon. Sir Thomas White,
Minister of Finance, Ottawa.

Dear Sir Thomas,—Referring to our recent conversations.

I am in receipt of a cable from Mr. Smithers, stating that in the anticipation of receiving the balance of the appropriation of $7,500,000, viz.: $951,911.33, to apply for interest on Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Debenture Stock due March 1st, payment was duly advertised. In consequence, however, of the remittance being coupled with the condition that it is to be used only for operating obligations, the company will be unable to meet the interest due on the first proximo, and serious situation will result.

I respectfully beg to direct your attention to the matter in order that the actual position, and possible consequences may be fully appreciated.

Yours very truly,
Frank Scott,
Vice President and Treasurer.

To this I replied:

Ottawa, February, 28, 1919.

Dear Mr. Scott,—I beg to formally acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 25th instant which you personally handed to me at my office here. I note what Mr. Smithers states in his cable as to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company being unable to meet the interest due upon its securities on March 1st. With reference to the balance of the appropriation of the vote of $7,500,000 by Parliament, the sum of $923,311.26 was paid to your company on your certificate No. 10 dated January 28, 1919, duly approved by the Acting Deputy Minister of the Department of Railways and Canals. This certificate expressly states that this sum is on "account of a cash deficit in the operation of the company from April 1st to November 30th, 1918, inclusive," and "is required to enable the company to meet its operating obligations." The small balance of the vote amounting to about $28,000 will, I understand, be required for the same purpose. There seems no doubt that the deficit in operation should have priority over all other charges.

I have already informed Mr. Kelley, President of the Company, and yourself that it is not the intention of the Government to ask Parliament to provide a further vote for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company while our negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company remain in their present unsatisfactory condition. As I indicated to you, it will be for the Board of Directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to determine the question of their responsibility in respect of the interest maturing tomorrow upon securities guaranteed by their Company.

Yours very truly,
W. T. White.

Frank Scott, Esq.,
Vice-President and Treasurer,
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway,
Montreal.

Subsequently I received the following:

Montreal, March 4th, 1919.

Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.,
Minister of Finance, Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir Thomas,—I am instructed to inform the Government that in view of the fact that the increased rates applicable to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have not been sufficient to meet the increased operating expenses, it will not be possible for that Company to continue its operations when the present funds have been exhausted, which will be about the 10th inst.

May I ask you to be so good as to acknowledge receipt of this letter.

Yours very truly,
Frank Scott,
Vice-President.

I acknowledged that letter in these terms:

Ottawa, March 5, 1919.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge receipt of yours of the 4th instant informing me of the intention of your company to discontinue operations about the 10th instant.

Yours truly,
W. T. White.

Frank Scott, Esq.,
Vice-President and Treasurer,
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway,
Montreal.

Under existing legislation it is not possible, except under proceedings for foreclosure or sale, to have a receiver appointed for a system such as the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Government, therefore, was

confronted with what we regarded as imperative necessity in the national interest of providing for the uninterrupted operation of the system. It was found that the War Measures Act gave the Government a complete jurisdiction for the action which it took, viz: by Order in Council to appoint the hon. the Minister of Railways and Canals as receiver for the system. I have made a summary of the provisions of the Order in Council as follows:

Re—Grand Trunk Receivership.

Provisions of Order in Council.

(1) Order recites that the continued operation of the G.T.P. System is essential in the present position of Canada resulting from the war, especially in connection with the transport of returning Canadian troops and of supplies, equipment and freight, and that the duty of continuing such operation is thrown upon the Government of Canada inasmuch as there are no effective provisions in the existing laws whereby such continued operation could be otherwise secured and that therefore immediate action is imperative.

(2) Order applies to Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the other companies embraced in its system.

(3) The Minister of Railways is appointed Receiver with all the powers and duties of a Receiver under the Exchequer Court Act.

(4) The Exchequer Court is authorized to make such orders respecting the Receiver and his powers and duties and the carrying out thereof as the Court may deem necessary or expedient in the public interest.

(5) Provides for taking possession by Receiver.

(6) Orders the several Companies embraced in the system and their officers to facilitate the carrying out of the powers and duties of the Receiver and the delivery to him of books and papers and personal property of the various companies.

(7) Provides that nothing in the Order contained shall render the Government or the Receiver liable to the Grand Trunk Railway Company or any Company included in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system or to any creditor or holder of any bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities of the said Companies or any of them for any claim by reason of the making of the order or anything done under the authority or under the authority of the Government Receiver or of the Exchequer Court, nor shall afford any defence to, nor prejudice any claim, action or proceeding of the Government of Canada which the Government might lawfully make or take had the Order not been made.

(8) All Officers of the System to continue to discharge their duties under the Receiver so that no interruption in operation may occur.

(9) Nothing in the Order shall prejudice the exercise by the Exchequer Court or by any Court of any Province of Canada of its present jurisdiction to appoint a Receiver or to order a sale of foreclosure of any railway or section thereof or other property affected by the Order, provided that notice of any application for the purposes mentioned shall be given to the Minister of Railways and that he and Counsel for him shall be heard on the application and that the Court in granting, refusing or postponing the application shall take into consideration the public interests involved and shall make such order as shall in the opinion of the Court protect the public interest.

(10) Provision is made whereby the Governor in Council may from time to time and upon the security of Receivers' certificates or otherwise, advance to the Receiver such sums as may be required to enable him to exercise his powers and perform his duties as Receiver.

While, under the War Measures Act, that Order in Council has the full effect of a statute, as Parliament is sitting, it is manifestly desirable that the Government should introduce legislation validating and confirming the Order in Council and sanctioning what the Government has done. Within a day or so, I shall introduce the necessary resolution to that end. There are two further letters which I desire to read. I am making, as I stated, a statement of the facts only. I received on Saturday a letter containing a cable from Mr. Smithers which refers to a statement made in one of the letters which I have read to the House. It is as follows:

Montreal, March 7, 1919.

Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.,
Minister of Finance,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sir,

I have been instructed by Mr. Smithers to forward the following cable message to you as from him:—

"Mr. Howard G. Kelley has handed me cable message from Mr. Frank Scott containing extract from your letter to him, as follows:— That it is not intention of the Government to ask Parliament to provide further vote for Grand Trunk Pacific Railway while our negotiations with Grand Trunk remain in their present unsatisfactory condition. I beg to recall, when Ministers came over last summer, it was stated in Parliament negotiations would be resumed in London. I accordingly saw Ministers, with members of Board several times and at last was told that Ministers could make no advance in their original offer without consent of full Cabinet in Ottawa. In these circumstances progress in negotiations was impossible, but with a view to facilitating matters, just before the Prime Minister left for Canada, a committee of the Board and myself, saw him, with two of his colleagues, and made a fresh proposal involving very big reduction on our first offer. This offer was not accepted, but on the 5th November High Commissioner of Canada sent for me and said he had message from the Prime Minister asking me if we wished to continue negotiations, and if so, he thought I should go to Canada. I told High Commissioner of Canada, looking to the fact that the Government had given no sign of any intention of departing from their original offer, I thought it was useless going out, unless I had some further explanation, or assurance as to Government's intentions. To this we have had no reply, and I really fail to see how the company can be held responsible for the unsatisfactory condition of our negotiations. Mr. Howard G.

Kelley is returning in a few days and I think it would be advantageous if you could cable any reply you may wish to make to this communication before he leaves. Smithers.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) Frank Scott,

Vice-President and Treasurer."

To which I replied as follows:

"Replying to your cable received through Mr. Scott: Government considers unsatisfactory condition of negotiations due to Board of Directors of Grand Trunk Railway Company entirely failing to appreciate its responsibilities towards the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway undertaking and the bearing of its liabilities in respect thereto upon the question of the net earning power and value of the Grand Trunk Railway System. In November last the Prime Minister cabled to Sir George Perley to suggest to you that if your company desired further negotiations, the Government would be glad to see you in Canada as soon as convenient. He pointed out that it did not seem useful to continue discussion by correspondence. He also suggested that if you came you should be invested with ample powers to conclude an arrangement if one could be reached. Your attitude towards the reasonable suggestion contained in the Prime Minister's communication seemed clearly to indicate indifference towards the continuance of negotiations. Confirmatory of this is the peremptory notification on Thursday last to the Government, without previous intimation, or discussion, that the Grand Trunk Pacific would, on March 10th, discontinue operations, entirely regardless of consequences to Canada through interruption of traffic over a ssytem so extensive and important.

(Sgd.) W. T. White,

Acting Prime Minister."

Mr. CAHILL: I wish to ask the Government if it is their intention to continue governing this country by Orders in Council and then merely bringing in their Orders in Council for the approval of Parliament. If so, why was Parliament called?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If an answer is necessary I would point out that, if the Government had not the powers under the War Measures Act, and the Grand Trunk Pacific had carried out its expressed intention of discontinuing to-day, the entire system of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, embracing all the subsidiary companies, would have been at a standstill with consequences which, I am sure, my hon. friend will appreciate.

Mr. CAHILL: There is no evidence of the Grand Trunk Pacific having made default.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. RICHARDSON: May I ask the hon. the Acting Prime Minister if he is in a position to tell us what the obligations of the Grand Trunk Pacific are for which the Grand Trunk is responsible?

[Sir Thomas White.]

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would suggest to my hon. friend that, as I am, within a day or so, to introduce a resolution looking to legislation, he defer his question until that matter is under discussion in the House. I shall then be glad to bring down full information respecting what my hon. friend desires to know as well as other information that, I think, will be regarded as necessary to a proper discussion of the question by the House.

Mr. RICHARDSON: Is the Grand Trunk Pacific actually in default now?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think not actually in default, but the notification we received was that they would discontinue operations.

READING ROOM OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

On the Orders of the day:

Mr. JULES EDOUARD PREVOST (Terrebonne): (Translation) Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, may I inquire why there are no longer to be found in the reading room of the House of Commons any more French publications such as " L'Illustration," " Le Monde Illustré," "Le Journal des Débats," "Le Matin," and a few others. Neither do we find any more " Le Courrier des Etats Unis," and " The Canadian Record," which were previously on file.

I hope the Government will see to it that the subscriptions are renewed.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The question that is being submitted by the hon. member (Mr. Prevost) is not one of such importance as to warrant taking up the time of the House on the Orders of the Day. He should place his question on the Order Paper in the ordinary course. I might say that I think every reasonable latitude should be allowed hon. members in putting questions on the Orders of the Day if they have reference to important matters of policy but this privilege should not apply to questions of minor importance which can receive consideration in the ordinary course by being placed on the Order Paper.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session resumed from Friday, March 7.

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): Mr. Speaker, it was not my intention to have taken part in the present debate, but during its progress several questions pertaining to matters that are of present importance have been raised, so that I feel it incumbent upon me to make a statement regarding two or three subjects that I think would be in the interest of members.

First, may I be permitted to say one or two words with reference to the sad event which occurred immediately prior to the House convening. It has been my privilege, and the privilege of other hon. members, to listen to the wonderfully eulogistic statements made concerning the late lamented leader of the Opposition, that great Canadian statesman and courteous gentleman. It would be folly for me to attempt to add anything to what has been already so well said, except to briefly state that I sincerely and honestly concur in everything that has been uttered regarding the deceased gentleman.

May I also be permitted, Sir, to extend my congratulations to the two gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne—two gentlemen who have served their country with distinction at the front. What impressed me, Sir, was the high tone and the high note which characterized their speeches; and I have also been impressed by the high tone that has permeated the speeches delivered during the past ten days, together with the apparent sincere desire by members on both sides of the House and their hope and trust that henceforward unity and harmony will prevail in this country. In this hope I entirely concur. I trust, Sir, that the remarks made along this line will not fall on deaf ears. I hope they will sink deep into the hearts of the members of the Government, that they may profit by them, and that the great national work to be undertaken will be carried out in the spirit of several of these speeches to which I have referred.

As I have already stated, there are one or two matters that I would like to touch on, Sir, and relying on the courtesy of the House I may have to refer to a few notes and statistics in doing so. First, I would like to explain to the House the object and reason of the Siberian Expedition. Certain hon. members mentioned the other day that a statement as to this expedition should be made, and this I am now glad to give to the best of my ability.

In order to understand the origin of the Siberian Expedition, one must cast his mind back to the spring of 1918, and in these days of victory it is difficult to do so. In order to properly appreciate the circumstances connected with that expedition one must recall the situation at that time and the gloomy outlook which prevailed. The danger which then prevailed was of a two-fold character. The enemy at that moment appeared to be very strong, and it was necessary to try and reduce his strength and to deprive him of the goal he was after. The second great feature had reference to the Czecho-Slovak race, who had been loyal and faithful to the Allied cause. They were in dire need of help, and the Allies had undertaken to come to their asistance. Had the Allies failed to do so, it would have been at the expense of their honour, to say nothing of the risk of creating additional danger to the Allied cause. During the early period of the war, as is well known, Russia engaged a large number of German and Austrian troops. In 1914, when the war broke out, Germany rather ignored Russia and threw her full weight against France, which accounted for some of the early Allied losses of that period. Now let us follow the course of events down to the fall of 1917, when the Bolsheviks got control of Russia, and made it their business to sue for peace with Germany. This was a deadly blow to the Allies, because it enabled the German military machine to transport from the Eastern to the Western Front over a million men, with a very large mass of artillery and other war material. That great accession of strength enabled the German army to make a tremendous offensive in March, 1918, and to continue the attack during that year. If in 1919 the Allies could in any way reconstitute the Eastern Front, and thereby deprive Germany of the tremendous resources of Russia and compel her to detach troops from the Western Front and despatch them to the Eastern Front, it was worth trying. The Czecho-Slovaks, to whom I have already referred, were friends of the Allies. They had been conscripted into the Austrian army, but deserted in large numbers; some three hundred thousand surrendered to Russia, some thirty-five thousand to Serbia, and twenty-five thousand to Italy. Subsequently, they were recognised and fought with distinction for the Allies on the Russian Front. Then came the revolution in Russia. The Czecho-Slovaks endeavoured, and partially succeeded in crossing Russia and reaching Siberia with the ultimate intention of obtaining transportation across the Pacific and joining the British and French troops

in the fight on the Western Front. The Allies had promised to come to their assistance, and the question was, were the Allies going to desert them? While the Czecho-Slovaks were crossing Russia there fell into their hands a very interesting document which was dated 28th April, 1918. The document in question, which was signed by both the German and Austrian Emperors of that time, was directed to all the subjects of Germany and Austria that were prisoners of war in Russia, and instructed them to endeavour to return home. If that was not practicable, they were to join the Bolsheviki army, as being most harmful to Russia and the Allied cause. The document further set out that everybody complying with the order would be considered as serving his country, and would be rewarded on his return home. Finding it impossible to comply with the first direction, and being directed in that event to unite with the party most harmful to Russia and the Allied cause, these prisoners joined the Bolsheviki, and I may say that from the documents received, these men were all trained soldiers and constituted a very formidable accession to the Bolshevik army. At that time in Eastern Siberia the Bolshevik army numbered thirty-six thousand men, twenty thousand of whom were German and Austrian prisoners. The Czecho-Slovaks were now in dire distress.

The Allies agreed to come to their assistance, and here I would like to point out the feeling which prevailed among the Allied War Commission in the spring of 1918. In June and July of that year, the Supreme War Council held that there was not the smallest chance of an Allied victory on the Western Front until 1919, if even then, unless the Eastern Front could be re-constituted. In the middle of June, 1918, the British General Staff viewed the whole situation, and took a decidedly gloomy view of the outlook. The most favourable outcome that they ventured to hope for was that the French and British armies should hold fast until the campaigning weather of 1918, and in 1919 it was then apprehended that the Germans would be able to concentrate at least one hundred and eighty divisions against one hundred and fifty French, British, and American divisions on the Western Front.

They also held that there was a real possibility of the Germans breaking through the Allied lines, forcing the British back upon the sea coast or across the Somme and inflicting a decisive victory on the French army. That was the feeling in the spring of 1918. About the end of June or early in July, 1918, the Prime Minister was in England; I myself had the privilege of being there subsequently, in July. The Imperial War Cabinet discussed the situation with the Canadian ministers who were then there, pointed out the whole of the difficulties and the problems which had to be faced and urged that Canada should assist Great Britain in the organization of a small force to go to Siberia. An arrangement had been made with all the other Allies in the matter of sending a small force to Siberia, not to become engaged in any great military operation, but for the purpose of endeavouring to reorganize the loyal Russian army and to render assistance to the Czecho-Slovaks. It was agreed that Japan should send a force there, and Japan did send some 70,000 men. The United States sent nearly 10,000 men; I think the actual number was 8,500. France and Italy sent from 1,000 to 2,000 men. It was absolutely essential that all the Allies should be represented there. Great Britain was unable to withdraw any of her forces from the western front. All she had available at that time was one British regiment, the 25th Middlesex, stationed at Hong Kong, which was immediately sent to Vladivostok; and it pas expected that another battalion would be available later. The matter was very carefully considered and all the phases of the situation duly weighed, and it was felt that Canada could not very well refuse to go to the assistance of Great Britain at that period. It was agreed, therefore, that a force of Canadian troops not to exceed 5,000, would be raised for the purpose of proceeding to Siberia, this being done on the distinct understanding that such action would in no way interfere with the flow of reinforcements to the western front.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is this force under the Minister of Militia in Canada or the Minister of Militia in England?

Major-General MEWBURN: Under the Minister of Militia in Canada. The reasons why this force was raised may be summarized as follows: First, to help the Russian people throw off the German yoke; second, to prevent Germany from exploiting in her own interests Russia's vast resources, military and economic; third, to prevent Germany from moving troops to the western front from the eastern theatre, and even to compel her, by despatching troops to the eastern theatre, to weaken herself in France and Flanders; fourth, to shorten the war by re-establishing an eastern front; fifth, to deny Germany access to supplies

and stores collected in Siberia, of which there was a very large amount; sixth, to help the Czecho-Slovaks, who had made great sacrifices and on whose existence as an independent nation much will hereafter depend.

I should like to state the composition of the force that was sent to Siberia from Canada, in order that the House will have full knowledge and information respecting it. It consisted of small Headquarters, one Cavalry Squadron—Royal Northwest Mounted Police; one Field Battery, one Field Company of Engineers, one Signal Company of Engineers, two Infantry Battalions, one Machine Gun Company, one Field Ambulance, one Stationary Hospital, one Army Service Corps unit—transport and supply; one Sanitary Section, one Ammunition Column for Battery and Small Arm Ammunition; one Mobile Veterinary Section, two Depot Units of Supply, one Bakery Section, one Butchery Squad, half an Ordnance Company, Pay Office, and General Base Depot and Base Guard.

It was arranged and agreed upon that the British force that went to Siberia, plus any others that proceeded there for military operations would be under a Canadian officer. That Canadian officer was Major General J. H. Elmsley, C.M.G., D.S.O., who had proved his worth with great distinction at the front, a man of high standing and high military attainments, a man well thought of in the War Office. General Elmsley proceeded overseas and arrived at Vladivostok with the first detachment about the end of October, 1918.

Then came the armistice, and the question was, should we send the balance of the force? Urgent cables came from the Imperial Government requesting that the balance of this force should proceed, otherwise a very embarrassing situation for the British Government would be created. The matter was given careful consideration, and the greater portion of the balance of the force proceeded. The total number of Canadian troops in Siberia now amounts to 4,434. It was decided not to send the remainder of the troops that were in British Columbia; most of them have been demobilized and those remaining are being demobilized immediately. Canada is responsible only for the pay of these troops in Siberia; all other expenses are borne by the Imperial Government out of Imperial funds. A very large amount of the supplies that have been shipped forward to Siberia have been purchased in Canada and paid out of Imperial funds.

4 p.m.

The majority of the troops now in Siberia will be returned at a very convenient date. I am not at liberty to give that date, but it will not be very far distant, and any who remain in Siberia after that date will remain there voluntarily.

Now, one hon. gentleman has remarked that the Siberian force should not have been sent without the consent of Parliament. In this connection I should like to refer to the wonderful special session of Parliament that was called in August, 1914, and at which what was considered to be Canada's duty was laid down. The late leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, during the course of a very impressive address, said:—

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

He said further:—

> More than once I have declared that if England were ever in danger,—nay, not only in danger, but if she were ever engaged in such a contest as would put her strength to the test—then it would be the duty of Canada to assist the motherland to the utmost of Canada's ability.

The British Government urged that that force should go, and the decision to send it was arrived at in the spirit which is manifested in the remarks which I have just read. I think that no hon. member of this House, or no citizen of Canada, would for one moment say that it was our duty to refuse to carry out the wishes of the British authorities at that time. Our withdrawal when the armistice came would have been an undying discredit to Canada, having regard to her splendid effort in the war.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Were there any "draftees" amongst the soldiers who went to Siberia?

Major General MEWBURN: Some men who were obtained under the Military Service Act went with the Siberian expedition. The Siberian expedition was originally

started on a voluntary basis, because we did not want to take any chances on disturbing the flow of reinforcements to the western front. As time went on, there were not enough to fill up this expedition. We had then more than satisfied the demands of the overseas requirements in certain branches. For instance, a large number of men who were really liable under the Military Service Act, but who had come in and reported prior to the proclamation calling them out, were given the option of going into any of the various branches of the service, such as the artillery, and so on. As I understand the Military Service Act, they were enlisted for this war, no matter where it was. These men were given the option of going to France or to Siberia, and the units that went to Siberia volunteered to go there instead of going to France.

Another matter which I would like to touch upon more particularly is the present question of demobilization, and I shall be glad to give hon. members what information I can regarding that. The problem of demobilization is on the minds of everybody to-day. The first question is: Was the Government, on the date of the armistice, prepared for demobilization? I think the Government and the Department of Militia took every precaution and endeavoured to the best of their ability to make all necessary arrangements. As far back as 1916, this matter was given most serious consideration by the Department of Militia and Defence. A considerable quantity of data was prepared and, as time went on, the whole problem of the war, which was ever increasing in difficulty, occupied almost the entire attention of the department. This big problem of demobilization was not, however, overlooked. On the 24th of June, 1916, because this all touches on demobilization, the first thing that was considered on a big programme was hospitalization, because at that period we were getting back to Canada a considerable number of casualties; that is, men who had been wounded or injured were from time to time being returned to Canada for hospital treatment. On that date, one of the celebrated Orders in Council was passed, constituting the Military Hospitals' Commission, which was authorized to take charge of and look after those returned soldiers who were wounded.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Under the Militia Department?

[Major-General Mewburn.]

Major General MEWBURN: No, not under the Militia Department; it was not even an adjunct of the Militia Department. The Military Hospitals' Commission was authorized and organized and operated until February, 1918. It was considered—and I think finally admitted—that as long as a soldier was a soldier he must be treated by the army as a soldier; that a civilian organization could not very well deal with a soldier while he was a soldier. That I think will be admitted by everybody. That attitude has been approved by every country in the world. The functions of the Military Hospitals' Commission were carried out with great vigour and ability until the 21st of February, 1918, when it was decided that it was not feasible that they should look after men prior to discharge. At that time another Order in Council was passed bringing into being the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment and the Militia Department took over the control and hospitalization and medical care of the soldier until the period at which he was fit to discharge. As a necessary corollary the Military Hospitals Commission Command ceased to exist, it being amalgamated with the District Casualty Units in District Depots. Details of all this are very fully set out in what is known as memorandum No. 5, which I have had prepared and which will be laid on the table of the House in a few days. It is a very complete document giving the whole work and machinery of the Militia Department, covering the period from last session to date. I need not bother giving the details of it now. At the time the Militia Department took over the care of the soldier previous to discharge, the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department was organized—I will deal with it later—to take care of the man after he was discharged, that is, when he became a civilian.

Let me now deal with the military side of demobilization. For some time past and prior to the armistice men were constantly coming back from overseas as individuals. They were not coming back in any distinctive unit, but, coming back as individuals. They were, immediately on their return to Canada, sent to one of the various military districts, the headquarters from which they originally came. They were then boarded, all their documents completed, and if they were for discharge, and not requiring medical treatment, their discharges were carried out and the men were allowed to go to their homes. In the spring of 1918, the

Militia Department published what was known as the "Returned Soldiers' Handbook," which was sent overseas and distributed to every man who was returning to Canada. That handbook set forth in detail everything the returned soldier required to know about himself until he became a civilian, and also gave information regarding pensions and so forth so that each individual man had full information.

Demobilization has both a military and a civil side. The first includes transportation to Canada and the steps necessary to carry out discharges from the Canadian Expeditionary Force. The second comprises all measures possible towards returning the man to civil life under the most favourable conditions. I would like to point this out, to show what the Government have been doing prior to that period as to demobilization. In April, 1917, the then acting overseas minister appointed a committee in England to deal with this problem. That committee consisted of Hugh A. Allan, chairman; J. H. Plummer, Brig.-General W. St. P. Hughes, Lieut.-Col. J. H. D. Hulme, Lieut.-Col. J. L. McKinnon, Major George Whitmore and Lieut.-Col. Arthur Sullivan.

Sir SAM HUGHES: You mean Sir Montagu Allan?

Major-General MEWBURN: The information I have is Hugh A. Allan. That committee proceeded to work and spent a long time working in conjunction with the overseas authorities, the corps, and also the war office. Subsequently, a report was sent back to the Militia Department and an Order in Council was passed in 1917 dealing with that problem. Subsequently in 1917 another report was made and further interim reports were published from time to time and sent to the department here, dealing with the whole problem and laying down certain schemes and suggestions that would be carried out when the day of demobilization came. That was followed down until 1918. That committee has been at work from time to time compiling information, working in conjunction with the war office on the general demobilization scheme. In April, 1918, we had an officer overseas who was working in conjunction with the overseas authorities who had been in consultation with General Currie, and all the brigadiers and corps commanders in France. Subsequently, another committee was appointed on which was a representative from Canada, the overseas authorities, and also the representatives of the corps. The report was finally completed in July, 1918, and that report was approved by the Prime Minister when he was in England. It sets forth in detail all the organization, and the suggestions made. While I wish to take all the responsibility that is coming to me in the matter, still I should like to point out to the House that the demobilization overseas is entirely under the control of the overseas authorities, and the responsibility is laid down in the following memorandum

> The responsibility for carrying out the demobilization of the Overseas Military Forces of Canada up to and including the arrival, but not the debarkation of the troops in Canada, shall rest with the Headquarters, Overseas Military Forces of Canada, in London, who will issue all necessary instructions and be responsible to the Overseas Minister.

At that time the whole scheme of demobilization had been worked out, but it was realized that changes would have to be made from time to time.

I should like to point out what else the Government have done for the soldiers. An Order in Council was passed dealing with pensions for soldiers, and the Pension Commission was established. A Select Committee of this House dealt with the question of pensions last year, and I understand that a Bill will be brought down this session,—but I shall not deal with that here as the matter comes under another department and will be fully explained to the House in due course.

Then, provision has been made for settling soldiers on the land, through the Soldiers' Settlement Board. This legislation was approved by Parliament in August, 1917. I have no doubt that the Minister of the Interior will make a full explanation of the work the board is doing. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment deals with the soldier only after his discharge. Our full duty to the soldier is certainly not done when he has been discharged from the army. Even those who have not been disabled in any way should be given all possible assistance to fit themselves for a higher walk in life if they should so desire. This department deals with vocational training for the soldier after his discharge and there are many men who wish to get on in life who are being trained by the department in some particular line.

With regard to demobilization, the question, of course, was to get the men back from overseas and get them discharged. We were ready here in Canada to meet the

situation but the question was how rapidly could we get the men back. The original scheme, which I think was sound, provided that the men should be returned according to length of service, married men being given the preference. We were at once confronted by the most urgent solicitation from the corps, who were most desirous that the corps should be returned in complete units. This proposal received our very sympathetic consideration, but the question was how to accomplish it. We must remember how the corps were constituted at the date of the signing of the armistice. Each corps consisted of so many battalions, batteries, and other units, composed of men from all over Canada. The 16th Battalion which originally came from British Columbia, is to-day a Manitoba battalion. Would it be right to take these men out to British Columbia, disperse them there and then bring them back to their respective homes? Another battalion which was raised in Winnipeg is to-day a New Brunswick battalion, and there is hardly a battalion or unit at the front to-day that is composed of men from one particular locality in Canada. It was, therefore, decided that the units would have to be re-constituted in some way, and it was settled, and received the approval of everybody, that the Dominion should be divided into dispersal areas. The number today is twenty-one. A postal guide was issued and sent overseas for distribution to all ranks, so that men who otherwise would not know in which dispersal area their home was could tell by consulting the guide, which showed the location of all the dispersal areas, it also included a map of Canada and enabled them to choose which dispersal area they wanted. A soldier could get this information by merely looking up his post office address. There are a large number of men from Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Nova Scotia, Quebec, and Ontario, who have enlisted in western battalions, and it was thought to be only fair that they should have the privilege of being dispersed in their home area so that they could go and see their people. The units are, therefore, being re-constituted on that basis

Then came the question of the documentation of the men, and I should like to explain some of the difficulties in connection with this matter. Every man must be dealt with individually. His pay book has to be made up. His discharge certificate prepared and cheques issued both for clothing allowance and the first instalment of his war-service gratuity. Finally, but most important, his medical history sheet has to be prepared. It is absolutely essential in the interest of the men and of the nation that a man's state of health should be determined at the time of his discharge. All these things take time. Under the new system of dispersal areas at least five hundred men can be cleared at an area in one day. Men may come to Ottawa who do not live in Ottawa, but in the area in which Ottawa is the dispersal station. A man can get his cheques for the money to which he is entitled, get his transportation to his home, and his discharge certificate easily within one day.

The chief difficulty we had was to get ships and railway transportation. Immediately after the armistice I had a conference with the Minister of Railways and the presidents of the Canadian Pacific, the Grand Trunk and the Canadian National railways to find out how best to cope with the situation and get the men back as quickly as possible. These railway experts decided that the very best the railways, with their combined rolling stock could do was to handle not more than thirty thousand men per month from the ports of St. John and Halifax. A committee was formed of representatives from the three railroads, whose chairman was selected by the three companies themselves, and ever since the signing of the armistice this committee has been sitting in Montreal looking after the routing, and transportation questions generally. The moment we get information of the sailing of a ship the Department of Militia and Defence notifies the chairman of this committee, who makes all arrangements for the routing of the soldiers. One suggestion that came from overseas was that we should open a camp in Canada, but I think most people will agree that to open a camp in winter at Valcartier or some other such place to handle ten or fifteen thousand men would lead to far more trouble than is being experienced in England to-day.

We decided, and it was agreed to overseas, that the proper way was to bring out the men in such numbers that on the disembarkation of a shipload at any port, it would be possible to move them rapidly to their homes. And we are insisting that these men shall be distributed equitably all over Canada. That is, we will not bring out, say, about ten thousand men to be dumped in Montreal at once, but we bring out a proportionate number to be distributed

among the several provinces. That has been done and the machinery is running, I think, fairly smoothly. For instance, in the case of a ship disembarking troops at Halifax to-day we are able to get every one of those troops out of Halifax before nightfall.

The question was, how could we speed that up? We consulted with the railway companies on that point. It was decided that, when navigation opens and we can use the ports of Quebec and Montreal in addition to those we have, then by using day coaches we can accommodate a great many more. It would be no great hardship, for instance, for the Maritime Province troops to use day coaches. The troops for west of the Great Lakes can disembark at Quebec and be carried in colonist sleepers, while those for Ontario and Quebec, except those for the city of Quebec, would disembark at Montreal and go in day coaches to their points of destination. In that way, we can speed up about 45,000 men a month, and with any sort of luck we can have every one of the Canadian troops, except some hospital cases, demobilized and back in Canada by the end of August.

One of the great problems which has confronted us and which touches another department, is the question of soldiers' dependents. That is a problem by itself. It is a well known fact—it has been reported in the public press—that there have been about 25,000 marriages among the Canadian troops in England and on the Continent. There are at the present time about 40,000 dependents to be brought back. In the early stages of the armistice, with the natural desire of these dependents to come to Canada as soon as possible, a lot of them were put on the troopships. This created a most embarrassing situation. We had our troop trains made up to accommodate 500 men, and fitted up with a commissariat car. You can conceive how embarrassing it was when large numbers of the dependents of soldiers desired to go on these troop trains. The situation became almost impossible. A new arrangement has been made under which those soldiers overseas who have dependents desirous of coming to Canada would come on a special boat carrying only soldiers and their dependents, and now, under the Department of Immigration we are dealing with that matter in conjunction with the overseas representative of immigration. We co-operate in every way, supplying the medical staff, nursing sisters and other facilities, and have set apart a hospital in St. John to receive cases that need treatment. Owing to the epidemic of influenza in England we have found the situation a very difficult one, many women returning who are ill, and who are taken seriously ill after disembarkation.

Mr. PECK, V.C.: I would ask the minister if the plan of Sir Arthur Currie for demobilization was ever laid before the cabinet, or was it settled by the overseas minister?

Major-General MEWBURN: Demobilization by units?

Mr. PECK, V.C.: Yes.

Major-General MEWBURN: I stated that the first idea was that the men should be brought back according to length of service, married men first. Subsequently Sir Arthur Currie proposed that they should be brought back by units. Subsequently he proceeded to England and discussed the whole problem. His complete plan was never submitted here, I never saw it; but many communications, letters and cables passed; and the scheme I have spoken of was concurred in by Sir Arthur Currie.

Mr. PECK, V.C.: That was not the original plan?

Major-General MEWBURN: No, because we thought it was not possible to work it out. Several members have asked me how it was that the Third Division came first—how the First Division did not come first. I had a good deal of correspondence with Sir Arthur Currie and other members of the corps at the Front, and a short time ago I had a letter from Sir Arthur Currie giving an explanation of why it was that the First Division did not come first. I think it will interest the House if I read a portion of that letter:

> After the signing of the armistice the first intimation that we received as to our future movements was to the effect that the whole Corps would move to the Rhine and I had made arrangements for the First and Second Divisions to leave, my intention being that as they would be the first to be demobilized by moving men first they would cross the Rhine in that order. After a time there they could be shipped by train to the Base, to get ready for demobilization, their places being taken at the Rhine by the Third and Fourth Divisions.

He gives in some detail the reasons why they could not all get through, and only two divisions went. He goes on:

> Shortly after the first intimation we were told that only two divisions of Canadians were to go, and I allowed the First and Second to proceed, my intention being that after they spent a short period holding the bridgehead I would endeavour to get them to the Base or

somewhere near there, and replace them at the bridgehead by the Third and Fourth Divisions, thus giving all divisions an opportunity of seeing something of Germany.

I may say that the first intimation was for our second and fourth army to proceed to Germany, we to be part of the second army. This was later changed and the second army alone went back, and with it 11 divisions, so that for us to furnish two divisions was giving us a very high percentage; the actual bridgehead was held by 4 divisions so that the Canadian Corps holds half.

On top of all this I know there is an intense desire to get back to Canada. I know the pressure that is being brought to bear on you to see that this is carried out. Our people in England have been pressing the War Office who have been brought to release two Canadian Divisions for demobilization, the first of which is to sail for Canada about March. As it was impossible owing to transportation difficulties, namely, supply of cars, etc., to get the First Division back in time to sail for home first, it became necessary for me to nominate either the Third or the Fourth, and because it was raised first I nominated the Third. A few days ago it began its march westward to a point from which it will be shipped by rail as cars become available to the Base.

By the time it is ready to embark we hope to be able to follow it by the First, then by the Second and finally by the Fourth.

As hon. members are aware, the Third Division has reached England and a part of it has come to Canada. As I have already stated, there are other departments of the Government dealing with the problem of demobilization. It touches the Departments of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Pensions, Labour, Agriculture, and Trade and Commerce, all of which are working in conjunction with what is known as the Repatriation Committee, whose work is to bring into co-operation in this service all branches of the Government so as to prevent overlapping and promote efficiency, and which, so far as I have seen, is doing great work.

Regarding the whole problem of bringing the men back, it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that no one branch or department of the Government, no one organization can successfully cope with this big problem, but that the nation as a whole, both collectively and individually, must co-operate, must put their shoulders to this enormous problem in order to make our solution of it a success. Through all these serious problems of the war since 1914, when the flow was to the objective on the western front, the greatest enthusiasm existed amongst all the people of the country. I cannot understand why, then, on the signing of the armistice, there should be a kind of backing up on the part of individuals.

It seems to me that if ever in the history of Canada co-operation and friendly assistance were needed, it is to-day, and until that need is met in the proper spirit this great problem before us cannot be successfully solved. If everybody will co-operate and try to assist the individual men as they come back and take their places in individual communities, I think we need have no fear of trouble in the future.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

A great deal has been said about looking after the men. From what I have seen, the men do not want to be pampered. They do not want charity. They want to come back, and, as far as possible, take their places in the community and be absorbed into the national life of the country. The difficulty is that when an individual has been overseas for years, and when he has been trained with one object in view—the object of killing—his mentality is such that it is hard for us to conceive his viewpoint. Whether that man was in an office, a workshop or a bank, his mind has been centred on one object and it is not human nature to expect that that man can come back and immediately take up his old job, or a new job, and get down to normal conditions the same as the man working beside him who has never been at the war. I feel confident that the employers of labour and the citizens of Canada will give the returned soldier every consideration. But, they have to go farther than that. They have to look after the men. I do not mean to pamper them or to follow them around like detectives but they must see that each man gets an opportunity to adjust himself and to do his best. If that spirit is not manifested I am satisfied that from time to time men will become disgusted with their work and will want to chuck it up and leave the job. The superintendents of large manufacturing concerns must show sympathy towards these returned men and I am satisfied that if that spirit prevails we will have no trouble whatever. To give approximate figures, on the 30th November the troops overseas were as follows:

England	123,024
France	152,264
Total	275,288

From that date to the 28th February we have brought back and demobilized 51,765 and in addition we have got rid of and demobilized something like another 50,000 in Canada; so that, since the 30th November and up to the 8th March, including troops in Canada, we have demobilized about 100,000 C.E.F. troops.

The movement of these troops is an enormous problem on the part of the railway companies but I think they are meeting the situation creditably and efficiently. I realize, and can sympathize with, the desire of the men to get back at as early a date as possible.

I would like to refer here, for the information of members of the House, to the question of priority of return. I am satisfied there is not a member of this House who has not been requested, or approached, to try and get back certain individuals from overseas. On the signing of the armistice, I was simply swamped and overwhelmed with letters, telegrams and requests asking me to bring back individuals. I took the matter up with the overseas authorities and corps commanders. I had explained to hon. members to the best of my ability the difficulty caused by the effort to secure priority of return. I have endeavoured to cope with the situation as best I could and I think that hon. members will realize the difficulties and the problems created by a request for the priority of return of certain individuals. This question, I am satisfied, is one of the causes of the trouble at Kinmel to-day. In the early stages in the British Army the principle of demobilization according to trades and occupations was adopted. That was found in the British Army to be an impossible principle to work upon. It created trouble not only in the British Army but in the Navy. I have had many requests from relations and friends to bring back certain officers from the front. It was said that there were jobs waiting for them or that their business interests required that they should return immediately. I cannot conceive why any individual officer who has the honour of having a commission in His Majesty's Forces should dream of having priority and of coming back and leaving the men whom he has had under his control there behind him. I think the officer is the last man who should expect to return. I have never had any applications from officers themselves but they have come from relatives and friends. I have had many applications myself from members of Parliament. I have, to the best of my ability, tried to meet the situation and the policy was finally determined upon that priority of return would only be granted upon compassionate grounds, such as where some financial or business matter was at stake, or where there was serious illness in a family—a man's wife or children dependent on him. In every case coming within this category we have cabled and a request under such circumstances has been acted upon promptly. In other cases that have come before me, I have sent the information over to the overseas ministry pointing out the request and endeavouring to see what could be done about it. But, where you have a thousand men in a unit and one man, say, John Smith, or a particular officer, is brought back in priority you can well see how a feeling of resentment would grow up in those who were left behind.

We have also the demobilization question in Canada. We are to-day confronting what might be called liquidation. Prior to the armistice we had at our various depots, or in the various military districts, battalions waiting to go overseas. When the armistice was announced we immediately started to clean house in Canada. A great deal of work is yet to be done. Each of the depots had to be wound up, discharges of personnel had to be carried out, ordnance stores and equipment had to be turned in and accounts had to be audited. All the hospitals have to be maintained. The various dispersal camps must be maintained and certain depots must be retained in order to carry on the demobilization until it is completed. I wish to assure the House that this liquidation is going on as rapidly as possible. There is also the liquidation of the war stores. Immediately the armistice was signed contracts were cancelled, stock is now being taken and steps are being taken to dispose of all surplus supplies to the best advantage and for the good of the country. I presume that in the final liquidation there will not be a very large dividend declared among the shareholders —the people of Canada. But, we are doing the best we can.

There are just one or two other matters that I would like to explain to the House. Questions have arisen as to service, war service badges, orders and decorations and medals, and I submit the following memo as to that subject:

War Service Badges, Orders, Decorations and Medals:

It is evident from correspondence in the Militia Department that there is much confusion in the public mind regarding War Service Badges or buttons, orders, decorations and medals.

War Service Badges. I have mentioned these first, although they are possibly least

in importance, but as they have been issued in large numbers and are generally worn by soldiers discharged, it is well that the House and the country should understand what their significance is. From time immemorial it has been the custom after military campaigns to award orders and decorations for distinguished service and medals signifying the service rendered by a soldier. Of this I will speak a little later but before doing so I wish to explain that War Service badges are a quite recent innovation.

In Great Britain His Majesty during the currency of this great war authorized the issue of what is known as the Imperial Silver Badge. This was to be given to officers, non-commissioned officers and men who had served and had been retired or discharged as no longer fit for military service by reason of old age, wounds or sickness. The idea was that this badge should be worn with civilian clothing to indicate that the man had done his duty, or, in other words, was not a slacker. There was compulsory military service in Great Britain and all men of military age who had served and had been discharged by reason of permanent disability, should have a badge which was at once a recognition of their service and an indication that they had done their duty and were no longer liable for service.

Since the Armistice, amended regulations have been published providing that such men as are unfit by reason of service when demobilized are to be issued with this badge.

In Canada, we have adopted a somewhat different course, in that we have issued three classes of these badges. An amended Order in Council is now in course of preparation making certain changes which are necessary by reason of new conditions. Without troubling the House at great length it will be sufficient to say that there are three classes of badges.

Class "A" designating men who have seen active service at the front in the present war.

Class "B" (Imperial Silver Badge) designating men who have served overseas (either in England or at the front) and who on discharge were unfit by reason of old age, wounds or sickness, but under similar regulations granted by the Imperial Government and issued by us.

Class "C" designating men who have rendered honourable service but who are not eligible for Classes "A" or "B".

[Major-General Mewburn.]

In view of the fact that the Imperial Silver Badge was made available for the Canadian soldier, it is proposed that the Canadian badges "A" and "C" shall be awarded to any member of the British Expeditionary Force as well as members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force (even though he may not have served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force) who complies with the conditions, and who (a) was a resident in Canada on or before August 4, 1914, and (b) has returned to take up his residence in Canada.

So much for badges. We now come to the question of medals. Of these I cannot speak with absolute definiteness. No final announcement has been made but despatches so far received indicate that as regards the army, it is generally agreeed that two medals should be issued, one being an international medal for all troops engaged in theatres of war, and the other a British medal for all troops serving at home and in garrisons. Troops serving in theatres of war would also be entitled to the British medal. Without being able to make a positive statement I assume that with the international medal there will be issued appropriate clasps, indicating either calendar years or different theatres of operations.

Apart from the foregoing two other decorations have been definitely decided upon (A) the "1914 star" commonly called the "Mons Star." Army Order No. 350 dated 24-11-17, stated that "His Majesty the King had been graciously pleased to signify his pleasure to recognize, by the grant of a distinctive decoration, the services rendered by His Majesty's Military Forces under the command of Field Marshal Sir J. D. P. French in France and Belgium during the earlier phases of the war in 1914 up to midnight of the 22nd-23rd November, 1914." The decoration will be a star in bronze; the riband will be red, white and blue, shaded and watered.

The House will be interested to know that a small number of Canadians are entitled to this decoration, principally, I think, members of the Medical Services who proceeded to Belgium or France before the date mentioned.

(B) " 1914-15 Star." This decoration is referred to in Army Order No. 20, dated 23-12-18. It will be awarded to those who served in theatres of war between August 5th, 1914, and December 31st, 1915, both dates inclusive. Those entitled to the 1914 Star already mentioned will not be eligible

for the new decoration. The Army Order referred to defines in detail the various theatres of war. This decoration will also be a star in bronze, riband will be red, white and blue shaded and watered. A large number of Canadian troops are eligible for this decoration, including the 1st, 2nd and part of the 3rd Divisions.

In connection with these two decorations it is interesting to note that the issue of the Mons Star led to a proposal on the part of the Governments of Australia and New Zealand to issue a special decoration for the operations in Galipoli. This in turn suggested similar proposals with respect to other theatres of war, and the matter became so complicated it was referred to a committee of which General Seely was chairman, and as a result of its deliberations the 1914-1915 Star was authorized by His Majesty.

In illustration of the difficulties attending the issue of medals in such a war as this, it is estimated that from 12 to 15 million medals will have to be struck by the British Government.

In addition to the foregoing there have been, as the House is aware, a large number of awards for special gallantry to individuals of the Canadian forces. To this must be added a further number of special awards to Canadian soldiers by the Allied Governments.

The latest list of awards to Canadian soldiers which I have includes the following:

Victoria Cross - - - - - - -	61
Distinguished Service Order - -	605
Military Cross - - - - - -	2,312
Distinguished Conduct Medal - -	1,453
Military Medal - - - - - - -	7,785

One hon. member in his remarks during the present debate referred to the desirability of the issue by the Canadian Government of a special medal for Canadian soldiers. Without expressing any adverse opinion on this proposal, I suggest that its consideration might well be left till the Canadian troops have returned home when the matter can be given due consideration perhaps after consultation with members of the Canadian Army Corps. In view of what I have said about the number of medals already decided upon, the difficulties in connection with design, manufacture, and distribution are formidable, and no harm will result from deferring decision on this point until a little later.

I may inform the House in this connection that apart from badges, decorations and medals there are other issues already decided upon which call for a vast amount of work by administrative departments. Among these are the following: (a) King's certificate on discharge. This is a special certificate issued by His Majesty to members of the British forces, including C.E.F., who have been retired or discharged on account of wounds, ill health, or disability caused or aggravated by service. (b) A memorial plaque, to be presented by His Majesty to the next of kin of those members of His Majesty's forces who have fallen in the war. This is to be of circular form, five inches in diameter. It bears an emblematic design with the inscription "He died for freedom and honour," and will have inserted in the field (by an ingenious method of casting) a raised tablet enclosing the name of the person commemorated. The design was a matter of open competition and the selection was made from more than 800 models which were submitted. Each plaque will be accompanied by a scroll with a suitable inscription surmounted by a special device, including the Royal Arms in colour with the initials of His Majesty the King. (c) The Canadian Government proposes to commemorate our soldiers who have fallen in a somewhat similar way by the use of a cross, the cross of sacrifice, to be worn by mothers and wives of those soldiers who have died for the country's cause. Designs have been submitted and it is hoped that it may be possible to arrange for the manufacture and distribution of these crosses at a comparatively early date.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): Have not Distinguished Conduct awards been made to the Royal Flying Corps?

Major-General MEWBURN: There is one other subject I would like to refer to while considering the question of medals. I have suggested it for the consideration of the Government, and I think the suggestion is one the Government might well act upon. It is that the Government should issue to the mothers, or wives of any Canadian soldier who has fallen in action a silver cross, which may be known as "The Cross of Sacrifice." While the idea is sentimental, I think it would be desirable; it would be a silent memento to be cherished by these gallant women who have suffered so much.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Major-General MEWBURN: Now, as regards war records, trophies and memorials. This is a subject which might well be dealt

with in a separate speech, and I can only touch on it briefly here.

War records and documents. These may be divided roughly into administrative and historical documents. It is sometimes said that a modern war is fought on paper, and the House may be inclined to share this opinion when I state that, apart from the vast number of current documents in the Militia Department, it is estimated that some 600 tons of files will be returned from overseas. These are of priceless value both for present use and future reference. The housing, indexing and preservation of these, and the consolidation of files made overseas with those in Canada dealing with the same subject, or kindred subjects, is a problem of first magnitude.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): May I ask the minister a question now which I should have put at an earlier period: Will Canadian who are serving in the Imperial Forces —such as our Flying Corps boys, like the son of the hon. gentleman who interrogated the minister a few minutes ago—be recognized in a similar way to our lads who served in the Canadian Forces?

Major-General MEWBURN: The soldiers to whom the hon. gentleman refers will be treated identically the same as members of the Canadian Expeditionary Forces in connection with gratuity and similar matters. Where a Canadian soldier is drawing a gratuity or emolument from the Imperial Government, if it is less than the Canadian, the difference will be made up. In the matter of decorations, medals and awards, they will be treated the same as the others.

Historical documents, which include war diaries, and all other written records of the operations of the Canadian troops, are of inestimable value. They will be a priceless possession in the archives of Canada for many generations yet unborn. It has been truthfully remarked "that the care which a nation devotes to the preservation of the monuments of its past may serve as a true measure of the degree of civilization to which it has attained. The chief monument of a nation is its documentary records, the preservation of which is recognized in all civilized countries as a natural and proper function in Government."

The value of these documentary records from a business standpoint cannot be overestimated. They are essential for immediate use, and in many cases have constituted the chief, if not the only, protection of the state against ill founded claims. They cannot be adequately protected by insurance, as they can never be replaced. Their destruction would involve loss beyond calculation. For this reason I have recommended to the Government the immediate provision of suitable fireproof structures in which these records can be housed.

By authority of the Privy Council, a commission on war records and war trophies, composed of Sir Edmund Walker, C.V.O., Toronto, and Brigadier-General E. A. Cruikshank, of the Militia Department, was constituted, and has submitted a valuable report which will be the basis of necessary action.

One of the most interesting things that could be imagined is the Canadian war records. I think I am safe in saying that the collection brought together embraces some of the most wonderful war records and photographs the world has ever known. I understand these will comprise some five or six hundred works of art, and it will readily be seen, therefore, how necessary it is that a suitable building should be erected for their proper housing.

There will also be a building erected for the custody of war trophies. In addition a large number of trophies will be distributed to different communities throughout Canada who desire and will require the same. Dr. Doughty, who has been overseas, but I understand is on his way back, is dealing with them. A large number of trophies after demobilization will be returned, and I hope that this commission or committee will be able to distribute them in an equitable way throughout Canada. I am satisfied the Government will desire that these records and trophies should be preserved for all generations.

The last subject on which I shall dwell is that of soldiers' graves, a sad but serious one. I need not remind the House that the graves of those Canadian soldiers who sleep in Great Britain, Belgium and France will be properly cared for. The question has been discussed in the press as to the burial of some of our men in Germany, and in this connection I received a few days ago a cable stating that arrangements have been made whereby the bodies of all Canadian soldiers who were interred in Germany will be removed into the boundaries of France before the Canadian corps leave Europe. In view of the fact that this matter is one of great concern to the Canadian people, I should like to explain that this whole question has been given the most earnest consideration for a long time. At the beginning of the war a department was

created to care for and preserve the identity of the graves of British officers and men overseas., The officers of this department were directly responsible to the Director of Graves Registration and Inquiries. Graves registration units were formed to register the position of graves and see that they were marked with durable wooden crosses bearing a metal inscription giving the name, number, rank, regiment and date of death. At a later date a report was received from the High Commissioner in connection with the provision by the Imperial Government, with the co-operation of the French Government, for the registration and care of graves and the creation of a permanent organization in which the Dominion Government is represented. That organization is now in operation and is doing wonderful work. The following despatch was sent by the Colonial Secretary to His Excellency the Governor General in connection with this matter:

His Majesty's Government have decided that all Dominion officers and men dying in this country should be buried at the expense of the Imperial Government in single graves. The land required for that purpose will be acquired in perpetuity at cost of Imperial Army Funds, and all possible care taken of graves. I am confident that it will be the unanimous wish of every one in this country that His Majesty's Government should be privileged to undertake this charge and insure that the last resting place of these Dominion soldiers may not be unworthy of their sacrifice and of the cause for which they gave their lives.

This despatch was duly published, and I have no doubt that the terms in which it was couched were a source of comfort and consolation to those of our Canadian people who had lost loved ones in the course of the war.

The Imperial War Graves Commission, as it is now called, has recently issued a report made to it by Lieut-Col. Sir Frederick Kenyon, K.C.B., Director of the British Museum, in which is outlined the manner in which the cemeteries abroad will be designed. The plans include regimental patterns of headstones, central monuments in each cemetery in commemoration of the fallen, and horticultural features of beauty and interest. Similar steps have been taken with respect to graves in England, varied to meet local conditions.

In the result, perpetual care, and, what is more, perpetual honour, is guaranteed for the resting places overseas of our dead. It is natural that parents of boys who have fallen on the fields of battle should desire to have full information, and when further information is available I shall be only too glad to give it. Some people feel that the bodies of those who fell should not be left there. I appreciate their feeling, but the gratitude for and pride in our victory will centre in those graveyards abroad. They will be the real, the most precious monuments of all; for my part, it seems a great, if sad, privilege to be represented there.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: Will the minister tell the House why a Canadian brigade composed of men and officers speaking the French language was not organized last year?

Major-General MEWBURN: I remember that during last session my hon. friend urged the formation of a French Canadian brigade. I pointed out at that time the many difficulties that would be encountered in carrying out that suggestion. However, I took the matter up when I was overseas, and when I was in France I spoke with French Canadian officers in command of the training camps there, as I did also in England. It was not considered practicable that these units should be withdrawn from the corps for the purpose of creating a separate and distinct brigade. The matter was taken up very fully with the overseas authorities, and they gave it very sympathetic consideration. At the time of the armistice I do not think there were sufficient troops to organize a complete, individual French Canadian brigade. It was arranged, however, that all these men who went from the province of Quebec to training camps should be drafted not only into the 22nd Battalion, which was
5 p.m. a French Canadian unit, but also into other units of the same brigade. If the war had gone on long enough—thank God, it did not—eventually these battalions might have become entirely composed of French Canadians and become part of a division and a complete French Canadian brigade. But I laid the request of the hon. member before the overseas authorities, as did the Prime Minister.

Mr. COPP: Why are soldiers now being kept at the different military districts? Some two or three hundred men are being detained at St. John and at Halifax; why is that necessary?

Major-General MEWBURN: I referred in my statement to the fact that in the various military districts a certain number of men were required to carry out the work of demobilization. We are also maintaining in each military district very small forces known as Garrison regiments, not ex-

ceeding 200 or possibly 250. It is considered wise and in the interests of the country that there should be a very small military force in each military district in order to carry out whatever work may be necessary in connection with the military organization within that district. The demobilization is being effected as speedly as possible. The men are not kept there for any special purpose, but it was considered advisable, as I have said, to retain these small forces.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I wish to draw the attention of the minister to the report that the United States authorities are bringing back the bodies of the United States soldiers who fell in France. I would ask him to give this matter consideration in regard to the bodies of Canadians who fell. I know that it would be a very heavy job, but the United States authorities are said to be doing it and a great many Canadians are urging that it be done here.

Mr. PECK, V.C.: The German armies have advanced over nearly all the Canadian grave yards. I noticed that a lot of the crosses marking the graves of soldiers had sunk into the sand and that the names were gradually fading away; in other cases the tops of the crosses had been knocked off. May I inquire whether anything is being done with regard to this? It is a very important matter.

Major-General MEWBURN: I have no personal knowledge of that. I have noticed a report that the Imperial Graves Commission has organized a large corps to go over all the battlefields of France and Flanders with a view to looking after this matter. I am personally interested in this because my own boy was left on the Somme battlefield and there is nothing to mark the spot where he fell or where he lies.

Mr. WILLIS KEITH BALDWIN (Stanstead): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address on their efforts. It has been said that soldiers have lost their personality and individuality overseas, but I understand that these gentlemen have both been overseas and have served their country, and such being the case, they have demonstrated that some hon. member on the other side of the House made a mistake in making that assertion.

I fully concur in what has been said in this House in the last few days in regard to the returned soldier and demobilization. I agree that they should not be coddled nor bothered nor the vocation of their life chosen for them. When they return to this country, let them choose the vocation which they wish to follow. I believe that they will come back here with much greater mental and physical powers than they had when they went away, because they have been under stronger discipline and have seen more material handled in a given length than they could see in this country in ten times that length of time. If any of them are maimed or disabled by loss of limb or anything of that sort which incapacitates them for being great captains of industry, they should be helped when help is necessary, and should be assisted in every way, but let them be the ones who shall choose their future vocation.

I have nothing but compliments for the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) for his frank statement as to the condition of affairs in this country. He has not endeavoured to cover it up by any legerdemain of finance, but he has given us a plain statement of facts showing us that Canada's debt is now $2,000,000,000. He also told us that our annual interest will be over $100,000,000. We, as a Canadian people, must face the facts that we have to carry on the affairs of this country and produce enough to pay that debt from our fisheries, our farmlands, our forests and our mines. The other day I received a letter from some one in Port Arthur stating that only 5 per cent of the minerals of this country are being mined. That is a tremendous mistake. If we are going to be buyers from the United States of raw products which we can produce in Canada, how are we going to develop the great resources of this country? It is bad enough to buy from the United States cotton and other tropical products, but it is an outrage on the ability of Canadians that we should be buying outside things that we have within our borders. Instead of appropriating money for housing and other schemes, the successful working out of which is problematical, we should appropriate money for scientific and industrial research. If the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. Alfred Thompson) knew whereof he spoke the other night, it was a mistake that the aeroplanes, which the Government would need for this purpose, should be sold for a mere trifle. The hon. member informed us that there were riches untold in the Yukon. He said that we had there vast resources which were known only to those who had travelled the broad expanses of that great territory. If that is a fact, we have made a mistake in selling these aeroplanes which have cost such a vast amount of money.

I notice that in the Maritime Provinces there are many trawlers which the Government are trying to sell for a mere trifle of

their cost. Those trawlers should be put into the fishermen's hands and the Government should take action in the matter. Canadian waters are teeming with fish and something should be done to develop this industry. Let us make living in this country cheaper and then the great question of capital and labour will be solved.

In regard to the housing scheme there are many questions to be answered. How are these houses going to be built? Who is going to live in them? Who is going to look after the repairs? I do not see how the Government can go into a housing scheme. The Americans, after the great rebellion in the United States put their shoulders to the wheel and developed their country and made themselves rich in a very short period of time. People went into the middle American States and lived in sod houses or dug-outs. We do not wish to class men who have done that with Mexican cave dwellers, and I have met some of them who are proud of the experience they have had. Until they had raised their first two or three crops and had got on to their feet financially, they lived in those sod houses, and they are no worse for the experience. Later on they were able to erect more suitable dwellings. But at this time when Canada is under the burden of an enormous debt, the Government is undertaking a housing scheme. It is not, in my opinion, possible to work it out without a great loss to this country. When the question arises as to who shall live in these houses, there will be intense jealousy amongst the people.

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), says that there are going to be wonderful changes in this country. The first change that I would suggest might be made is that the cabinet should be reduced from twenty-one to fourteen, and then, representation being taken according to population, a cabinet minister would represent only one individual as compared with twenty-five represented by each member of the cabinet of the United States which comprises seven members. This change could be made in the cabinet, and then it should be on a fifty-fifty basis, as I understand it was to be in the days of the Union Government.

We know that Canada must be developed, but how is that development going to be brought about? In regard to the development of its mineral resources, where is Cape Breton to-day? Is it American capital that is holding it back? The Bethlehem Works at Sandwich, Ont., some six years ago, put in foundations for a $20,000,000 plant. I do not see any reports in the press to-day from that great plant. The moment that our capital is utilized to start some work, the Americans come in and undertake some great work there that scares our capital away. Where is the great Clergue of the Sault and the Rainy River district? That was something we had great pride in. Clergue, we thought, was going to be a second Carnegie, but we hear nothing of that now. If capital cannot be induced to develop our great mines, it is necessary for the Government to do something, I do not know in what way, but we cannot build up a greater Canada without developing our own great resources.

In regard to capital and labour, the one is as necessary as the other. Living is so high at the present time that the wages of the labouring classes must be advanced, or we must have greater production to make living cheaper. There is but one way out of the difficulty. We cannot expect capital to come into this country if it is oppressed, and capital, I am sorry to say, is not over-abundant in Canada. If an industry is organized, we go to the United States in order to sell our securities. The United States is, in many ways, drawing the very life-blood out of this nation. For our amusement we get American films which are brought into our theatres, and our people rush into them and spend their money in order to see the foolish, nonsensical things that are going on there without one iota of improvement in intellect, and without receiving one cent back for the money spent. We have to get ourselves together. The brightest and smartest men are going to come from the ranks of the labour party. They can unite and start industries of their own. In this country of ours there are great water-powers, and unless they can be utilized in making goods for export, what is the object in developing them?

Both in the province of Quebec and Ontario there are hundreds of miles of Hydro lines. Under a proper housing scheme the labourers living along the railway lines and around the terminals should form their own co-operative manufacturing industrials, and they are quite capable of doing so, because the Labour party contains some of the brightest men in the Dominion of Canada to-day. Their leaders are amply qualified to organize and run these industries. That, in my opinion, would solve the problem of Labour and Capital. The men could own their own homes and have a few acres of land, and nothing conduces so much to the happiness of a man as to

own his own home. In the United States, industries have been started out in the country, and land that was purchased for a few thousand dollars is sub-divided into homes for the people who are operating the industry. One minister has told us that the Government is going on with its housing scheme to keep Bolshevism down. I want to tell the Government that the land on which these houses will be built will cost more than both the land and the house could be purchased for in the rural sections. Land could be bought in the country, accessible to the city by trolley lines, and the homes could have every modern convenience, and no one is so happy as when he is in his own shebang. I think that would be one of the finest things we could do in this reconstruction period. Last night at the Forum in Ottawa, the spokesman of the great Methodist Church said: "We are ready to join with the masses, not the classes." We certainly welcome that church with joy to the great family of democracy. That is only one of the great bodies in Canada to-day that says we must have a united people and that this must be attained by taking a practical interest in the common people. But we can never do this unless the cabinet undoes some of the things it has done by Order in Council. That notorious War-Time Elections Act should have been repealed long ago, as well as other legislation that has been passed by this Government. Unless we have good government in this country we cannot expect people to be attracted to it. I would urge the Government in framing a new Election Act not to disfranchise any nationality. Let them disfranchise the people who make disloyal speeches or commit acts of violence against the State, but do not disfranchise a man simply because he comes from Germany or Austria-Hungary, because many of these people have left those countries simply because they were dissatisfied with conditions there and were told there was a democratic government in this country. There are whole communities of these so-called aliens who have helped to build up Canada, especially in the middle West, and I have great respect for these people. An hon. member opposite said the other day that the population of this country will have doubled in a decade. I would ask him, if we are going to hand-pick the immigrants, where is this population to come from when they know we have an undemocratic and unbusinesslike government here and an enormous national debt? All laws should be enacted by Parliament not by Council.

[Mr. Baldwin.]

I wish to take issue with the statement of the Minister of Militia and Defence who said he did not know of any soldier in Siberia who was not a volunteer. I know that lots of men have been sent to Siberia after the armistice was signed who have protested every inch of the way they have been forced to go. Only six weeks ago some of the men were in Japan; they had not reached Siberia then. What right has this country, with its enormous debt, to protect the interests of the United States, Great Britain or France in Siberia? We have no trouble with the people over there. I noticed by the press that the Bolshevik were dropping bombs from aeroplanes on the Americans near Archangel the other day. Why should this country spend money on an expeditionary force to Siberia? There are a great many other things we could better spend our money on. Only the fringe of our resources has yet been developed and we must dig deep if we are to get something worth while from the bowels of this earth that will help to pay our national debt.

I have one or two charges to make against this Government. The Act for raising revenue by means of stamps on matches, powder puffs, perfume, toilet articles and patent medicines is a good one, and in view of the financial state of this country we could do with more taxes of this nature. But I want to protest against the way some of the officers of the Government enforce this Act. With the exception of toilet articles and patent medicines the manufacturers themselves affix the stamps on the articles I have mentioned. I remember well the hon. member for Bellechase (Mr. Fournier) condemning this Government last year for allowing—I do not know whether he called them "hounds"—but at all events, for allowing these "specials" to travel around the country and drop on some poor woman running a store, who may not have five hundred dollars worth of merchandise in the whole place. While the store owner was at lunch, a little child took charge of the shop and the "special" came in. He bought a certain article and as the child could not reach it, the "special" took it from off the shelf. Very shortly afterwards the woman received a visit from the high sheriff of the district, and she was fined $50 and costs; and as the costs always equal the fine in these cases, the woman had to pay $100. These "specials" have invaded practically every constituency in the Dominion. In the name of common sense, cannot we remedy this state of affairs? The concoctor of vile nostrums who

spills enough printer's ink may start out with a basket and become a millionaire in twenty years.

Why not have the manufacturers of patent medicines, perfumes, and toilet articles put on the stamps in their own factories? The Government gets a revenue of $196,000 from this tax, and it is a tax on every soul in Canada, and yet it does not pay the expense of its own collection. Fifteen years ago, when the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) was Minister of Finance they had a Stamp Act imposing a tax upon patent medicines. Notice was given to every dealer to estimate the stock in hand of patent medicines, and the stamps were sent to be affixed. It was a tax of only 1 per cent, instead of 4, and 4 is not too much. But it made unnecessary the operation of these special agents and obviated the necessity of these trials and fines. It was a measure decidedly in the public interest. One of these agents came into my county and got cases against two dealers who are by no means among the rich men of the county. I was discussing this matter the other day with a member representing a New Brunswick constituency. He told me that in his county a local druggist was running a little ice cream concern as a part of his business. For a time the person in charge of the drug department was absent and one of these specials—probably knowing the circumstances—dropped in. The girl serving the ice cream counter was asked by him for a package of talcum powder. She said she knew nothing about it, did not even know the price. He said, "That is no matter; it is never more than twenty-five cents." He put down the price, took the package and went away. That cost the proprietor of that store $50, and I never knew a case where the expense of the suit was not equal to the fine. That is simply robbing the dealers of this country to enrich the manufacturers who compound these nostrums, and we know that some of these are worth their millions, made out of the people by the lavish use of printers' ink which almost forces the people to buy these medicines. I asked the Finance Minister to reform this condition. Surely it can only be by oversight that it has been allowed to continue.

I have another charge to make. The farmers, who are the very backbone of Canada, whose work is the foundation of our wealth, upon whom we depend most to pay our enormous debt and who work, many of them, a hundred hours a week, are not fairly treated. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) said he asked no favours for the farmers, nor do I, but I do ask for them justice. The farmers were told to raise hogs for bacon. They went at it, and paid as high as $90 per ton for corn. Yet the Government did not guarantee the price of their produce as was guaranteed to the flour miller. But the flour miller makes twelve and fifteen per cent. By the time the farmer had his pork fattened, corn was selling at $70 per ton. Then, again, the Canada Food Board would not allow the farmer to export his cream. All the butter of this country was commandeered, and the farmer could not even eat his own butter, unless it were produced in his own house—he could not take it from the creamery. It was commandeered at 42 cents a pound, and was held by the commission merchants until they got 48 cents a pound, a nice profit for them of six cents. The profit went to the big men who could afford to do something to keep the Government wheels running. In January last butter was 72 cents in New York, and in Montreal 52 cents. A farmer on the border wrote the Food Controller in Ottawa for permission to send his milk into the United States, which would have made an advance in his receipts of about $100 a month. But the answer was, "No." The rich Americans could take out the cream and milk and make a big profit on it. Is not that suggestive again that there is a nigger in the fence? I do not accuse the Government, but we know that the people who enjoy the bénefits of this arrangement are Americans . I do not care to name them, but if anybody wants them he can have them. In this as in other matters the Government is for the big interests, while the welfare of the people is not considered.

It has been proposed that we should have a Department of Health. One department that we could do away with is the Department of Trade and Commerce. Last session, the minister of that department, who is one of the oldest men in this House, spent a week talking about eggs and the quality of eggs, and I presume how many there were in a dozen. He talked also of hay and the quality of hay, and about cement, and the quantity that should be put into a bag. But, as Hansard shows, he could not answer one practical question. Instead of the Department of Trade and Commerce, we need a Department of Industry, with a broad gauge man of energy and big ideas, at its head, a man

who knows the practical affairs of Canada and of the world. I am not personally acquainted with all the ministers and possibly they have among them a man of the calibre I have indicated. If so they should form a Department of Industry and put him at its head.

I wish to say a few words on this question of public health. It is a fact that, notwithstanding the almost inconceivable sins that are committed to prevent it, there is a pretty fair crop of babies arrive in this country every year. The lamentable fact is that only two-fifths of these live to the age of three years. Every one loves the soul of a child. I believe that this would be the prerogative of women if they ever turn their attention to Parliament. We all believe in the conservation of humanity to the fullest extent but we want to have fewer departments instead of more. I think that all hon. gentlemen on the other side will agree with me in that. As for adults, I would say: Stand straight, breathe deep, live temperately and you will live longer and more happily than you otherwise would. I said in my campaign that if I was elected to this Parliament I would not speak when opportunity offered, but when duty demanded it. I was a very close listener last session, as I hope to be this session.

Mr. RICHARD CLIVE COOPER (South Vancouver): Mr. Speaker, before dealing with the matters that I wish to take up in connection with the debate on the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I desire to refer at some length to the remarks made by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). I am glad to state that a better man than I will take this matter up and will deal with the Cambrai and Mons battles from personal knowledge of these great events. I allude to Col. Peck, V.C. The hon. member for Victoria-Haliburton has given us an honour roll of the members of this House. We find that it is very inaccurate and incomplete and that the recapitulation of services given by that hon. member is not actually in accord with events as they occurred. In dealing with one hon. member of this House, the hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie), the hon. member for Victoria takes occasion to defend his own action, as well as the action of the hon. member for Simcoe, at the battle of St. Julien in 1915. I have nothing to say in regard to the hon. member for Simcoe, but as the insinuation is made that the only man who could be confused with him is Brigadier-General A. W. Currie of the 2nd Infantry Brigade as he was then, I venture to take up the cudgels on his behalf. We find that the hon. member for Victoria is ubiquitous. There seemed to be some system of telepathy existing between him and the hon. member for Simcoe. We find that every movement of this particular officer during the battle of St. Julien was known to the then Minister of Militia sitting safely at home in Ottawa. I do not intend to enter into any discussion as regards where Col. Currie was at the battle of St. Julien but I will say that for the first time in my life, between six a.m. and seven a.m. on April 24, 1915, I saw Col. J. A. Currie of the 15th Battalion and spoke to him. I did not see him again until I came here last session. In the latter part of 1915 I was in England and I read with extreme disgust the remarks made by the then Minister of Militia and Defence in defence of this particular officer. As I before stated, it is only because of my intention to clear the name of our greatest Canadian soldier from any stigma that I am making these remarks.

On the evening of the 22nd April, 1915, I was, with part of my company, within 200 yards of the village of St. Julien and Gen. Currie was at Brigade Battle headquarters at Fortuin and there I received certain orders from him. It was at this time that the gas came over, the Turcos came streaming back while St. Julien was being laid flat. I moved out to the fields. It was wise. I met Gen. Currie and he said: "Cooper, come along over to Brigade Headquarters until we see what is going to be done." We got orders to move up in support of the 8th Battalion. I did not see General Currie again until the night of the 23rd April, 1915, when he came out to see how we were getting on at the Kerrselaere cross-roads. On the 24th April I spoke to General Currie about five o'clock in the afternoon at Fortuin. Subsequently, during the night he took the remnants of two battalions of his brigade on to the Gravenstafel ridge. The remnants consisted of my own battalion, the 7th, and the 10th, Western Canadians. General Currie placed us in position and told us what he knew of the situation in front of us. Then he went to headquarters of the 8th and 5th Battalions who were on our right flank. The next occasion on which I saw General Currie was on the early morning of the 26th when we rejoined the remnants of our brigade at St. Jean. General Currie then led the brigade composed of the remnants of the 5th, 7th, 8th and 10th Battalions up to a line in advance of Fortuin and the Hannabeke, where we re-

mained until the Tuesday night, he establishing his brigade headquarters alongside of us and personally went around to cheer up the men of the brigade. On leaving the salient on the night of the 28th April, General Currie was the last man out. I would further refer to the hon. member's remark.

> Well, Sir, from the outset of this war I am on record as standing for the saving of the lives of our boys unless it was absolutely necessary that they should be sacrificed.

Having placed this on record in Hansard, I may ask if he gave this matter the consideration he states when he forced the Ross rifle on the 2nd and subsequent divisions of Canadian troops. The hon. member speaks of Cambrai in the following terms:

> I know Cambrai well. General Mewburn has seen Cambrai.

And so on. He says he knows Cambrai. So do I, but only on the map, and I venture to suggest that that is the fullest knowledge the hon. member also has of it. The hon. gentleman quoted from a letter written by him to the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) which, in Hansard is undated and which says in part:

> Any ass can sit back and simply order battalion after battalion to go forward to certain death. General Foch does not want that sort of thing, neither do the people of Canada.

His remark is only to true, but also is it true of those who stand back 3,500 milles and, without full information to guide them, undertake to criticise.

For the information of the hon. member I would draw his attention to the result of the Cambrai battle. Official information shows us that the Canadian Artillery fired 7,000 tons of ammunition against visible targets of troops. In close formation our heavy artillery engaged two hundred such targets. We captured more than seven thousand prisoners and two hundred pieces of heavy and field artillery. Our total captures from the 8th of August until the 1st October amounted to twenty-eight thousand prisoners, five hundred guns, over three thousand machine guns, and an immense quantity of stores. The battle of Cambrai was the deciding one of this period of the war. It broke the great Hindenburg line, and left an open country with only natural obstacles for our troops to fight over in front of them. In giving this information, Sir, I am quoting from official sources. The hon. member spoke of Cambrai as though it were a tragedy. I submit, Mr. Speaker, that far from being a tragedy, it presents material for an epic, worthy to rank with those written of the " contemptibles " and our own First Division, at the second battle of Ypres.

Now let me refer to the capture of Mons. Official information shows us that on the 9th November, 1918, the Huns were in full retreat along the whole front of the British armies; that Maubeuge was occupied by the guards and the 62nd Division, with the Canadian Corps approaching Mons. Five British armies, with cavalry and cyclists operating in advance of the infantry, were making a steady forward movement; only in the neighbourhood of Mons was any determined opposition met with. Here we find the Canadians advancing towards the town from the south and west, and working round it on the north. Our Third Division captured Mons in the early morning of the 11th of November, killing, wounding, or taking prisoner all the German garrison. The total casualty list shows seventy-five of all ranks, while they took over a hundred unwounded prisoners. This battle, fought on the holy ground that their glorious predecessors, " the old contemptibles," had to retire from against overwhelming odds in 1914, must surely remain indelibly impressed on the memory of the splendid men who were privileged to take part in this action, and on the people of Canada as a fitting culmination to the great work of our corps.

The hon. member spoke as follows about the Mons battle:—

> I have just this to say about Mons. Were I in authority the officer who, four hours before the armistice was signed, although he had been notified beforehand that the armistice was to begin at eleven o'clock, ordered the attack on Mons, thus needlessly sacrificing the lives of Canadian soldiers, would be tried summarily by court martial and punished so far as the law would allow. There was no glory to be gained, and you cannot find one Canadian soldier returning from France who will not curse the name of the officer who ordered the attack on Mons.

The suggestion made there by the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton, and given broadcast to the fathers, mothers, wives and children of Canadian soldiers, is that General Currie, for his own glorification, deliberately gave the order to capture Mons on the morning of the armistice. A graver indictment of a man I have never heard; in effect, the indictment is wholesale murder. Now, I want to protect General Currie's name to the utmost that an humble member of the army, like myself, can. A little later I will endeavour to explain the chain of authority that exists in

the British army, and you will then see that whoever may have been responsible for the order for the attack on Mons, General Currie and the Canadian Corps were just a " cog in the wheel." The hon. member has, I believe, some claim to distinction in regard to winning the South African War. He is an honorary Lieutenant-General in the Service, and for this reason he should at least be as au fait with matters of a military nature as a sergeant. But a sergeant would know all about the chain of authority in the army and would not have made such a foolish statement as the hon. member made here. At the time of the armistice, on November 11, 1918, we find that the Huns were still an unbeaten force. We find that they still occupied entrenchments behind barbed wire, with their guns, ammunition, and units practically intact. They were still an efficient fighting force. Now, I would like to put the situation to the House in this way: Probably all of you, at one time or another, have seen, if not a prize fight, then a boxing match. I would suggest that the position the Allied armies were in on the morning of the 11th November is somewhat the same as a man who is boxing another, and has his opponent almost down and out. The winner knows that the bell is going to ring in about fifteen seconds, but from some notion of chivalry—doubtless a foolish sentiment—he does not knock his opponent out. That is the position of the Allied army before the Huns on the date mentioned. They had no guarantee that the armistice was going to be signed; they had to hammer the brute to be certain that he would sign it.

I would now like to deal with the chain of authority in the army, and I promise not to detain the House unduly in doing so.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. RICHARD CLIVE COOPER (continuing): Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was proceeding to detail the chain of authority as it existed in the British Army. As is well known to most people in Canada and the civilized world, Allied operations from last spring were in the hands of Marshal Foch, assisted by an Allied staff. Marshal Foch, assisted by his staff, was responsible for the plan of campaign in all theatres of war in Europe. He, therefore, laid out his plan of campaign, dealing more particularly with the western front. On forming his campaign he called together the leaders of the various Allied armies in France, explained what he wanted done, and gave them their part in the operation. These Allied Commanders in their turn called in the general officers—in our own case—commanding the British armies and allotted them their part in the operations to take place. The General Officer Commanding the army, in his turn, calls on the General Officers Commanding the army corps and allots them their portion of the scheme inside of his army. The Army Corps commanders then call the divisional commanders together, who are allotted their portion of the work inside of the Army Corps. The divisional commanders call the brigade commanders together and allot them their portion of the work inside of the divisional part of the operation. The brigade commanders call the battalion commanders together and allot them their part of the work inside of the brigade. The battalion commanders then collect the company commanders and company officers and explain the work in so far as it is necessary for these officers to know it, and they in their turn go back to the companies and tell the non-commissioned officers and men what is expected of them. In dealing, therefore, with the suggestion that has been advanced that General Currie was responsible for unnecessary loss of life in the Canadian Corps at Cambrai and Mons, it will easily be seen that General Currie was just one small cog in a very large wheel. His was the part that the Allied staff had allotted to him and, just as in the days of the old Light Brigade, " His not to reason why "; he simply carried out orders.

I turn now to another portion of the hon. gentleman's remarks, not made in this House. I regret that the hon. gentleman is not in his chair, as I hate to hit a man behind his back. Here, however, is a point that I feel very strongly upon and about which I should like to speak.

We understand, Sir, that we are entitled to criticise our own people; but we of the Canadian Army resent very strongly a criticism of the British Army by a man who was not there. I turn to a cutting from a newspaper report of a speech delivered by the hon. member at London, Ontario. He says:

> They stood their ground while the Yorks and Durhams threw away their Lee-Enfields and ran because they had "bum" ammunition. On the third day some of the Canadians got some of this ammunition themselves.

Sir, the hon. member rises to a wonderful defamatory height in this connection; his egotism and his dogmatism are absolutely inimitable. But I submit to you, Sir, and to the people of Canada that Canadian brothers in arms will not stand for one moment any reflection being cast upon our Imperial brothers. He referred to two regiments; I shall speak of one of which I know. The Durham Light Infantry came in across the Zonnebeke front and took over part of the trenches of the 8th Battalion, the "Little Black Devils", and they subsequently vacated their trenches during the afternoon of Sunday, the twenty-fifth of April, 1915. The hon. member has quite omitted to mention that these battalions were part of a Northumbrian division which had been less than two days in France, and were hurled into that hell of gas and high explosive and machine gun fire. He says they ran away. As far as the Durhams are concerned, that is not true; the Durhams retired in perfect order—too perfect order, Sir—they retired in platoons, and I saw them cut to pieces, leaving their dead behind in swathes. It is a pity that the license of this House is not better taken care of. Free speech is well in its way, but speech that is too free is very bad.

I turn for a moment to go one further than the Minister of Militia did this afternoon, and when I have gone that one further I think that every Canadian will thrill with pride. I have taken the trouble to work out a little bit of detail as regards our Canadian decorations. I find that 418,052 men went overseas and that 15,750 won decorations and mentions, of which 3,333 were mentions and 443 one bar or more to decorations. The Minister mentioned that this afternoon, but the point I would like to make is that if one decoration had been given to one man instead of one man earning two or more decorations, one man in approximately twenty-seven of the Canadians who went overseas to fight would have been decorated. I think that is a wonderful record. The tale is not yet told, of course, of decorations; we may find three or four hundred more going to our splendid men.

I quote from the Toronto Globe of the sixth of this month, and I feel sure that many thousands of the people of Canada will re-echo the sentiment contained therein:

> The terrors of the war have been great and manifold for our gallant men in France, but Sir Sam Hughes is a greater than any of them. The enemy never dealt a fouler blow than that directed by Sir Sam Hughes against the leaders of the Canadian Army still in the field and unable to defend themselves.

I turn now to a matter that I conceive it to be my duty—rightly or wrongly, I do not know, rightly, I believe,—to touch upon. I have the honour to suggest to the Government that they make General Sir Arthur Currie, K.C.B., some monetary grant of generous proportions as a recognition of his wonderful service in command of the Canadian Corps. It has been the custom in the Empire to reward our great men in a like manner and we here at home should not fail in this regard. We find that our great leader comes back with all the honours in the shape of decorations that a grateful home Government can bestow upon him, and we, in our turn, must do something worthy of the glory which he has brought to us. I am proud to say—this is reflected glory, of course—that I knew General Currie before the war in Victoria, B.C. I enlisted at the same time as he did and I served in the same brigade. Without a tinge of envy, I congratulate him on his work. Victoria congratulates her citizen, and Canada will congratulate her son.

Let me now discuss a few subjects that are of general interest to Canada as a whole, and possibly more especially to my own part of the world. In passing, I would like to refer to the two officers, members of this House, who moved and seconded the Address. They did well—"but then, they are Canadian soldiers."

The sudden transition from war to peace has, I believe, found us, to a certain extent, unprepared. I believe that we are better prepared than any other of our Allies, and I feel confident that if we all work together to help the schemes that the Government is now putting into operation, Canada will not suffer in any great degree, in the near future.

I should like to allude, for a moment, to the visits of our Cabinet Ministers to the West. There is only one way in which our country can be held together. It is vast; it has diverse nationalities; it has many diverse problems, and the only way for the Government to know the feeling of each portion is for the members of this Government to travel. I will welcome, as every man in my own province will welcome, the visit of any member of the Government at any time he can come.

As a comparatively new comer to Canada and as a new member of this House, it may seem presumption that I should refer to the late great leader of the Opposition.

I followed the late, great leader's career long before I came to Canada. I remember him as an outstanding figure in the Diamond Jubilee, although I was not at that time in England. Canada has suffered a great loss. The Empire has suffered a loss. I trust that Canada will rise to greater heights by reason of the example that he has left us.

I turn now to something that may be new to this House, and this may even not be the proper place in which to bring this matter up. In my notes, I have this headed "War Memorials." People's thoughts are now turning to memorials to perpetuate the memory of our fallen, but unfortunately, their thoughts are turning to stone and iron to perpetuate flesh and blood. That is wrong. It is not worthy of the men who gave their lives that we might be free. I suggest that there is a greater, nobler, finer memorial to be erected to our fallen. I suggest that education is the only possible, adequate method of perpetuating the memory of the "immortals." Before I came to Canada, I spent some eleven years of my life in South Africa and some eight years of that in Rhodesia. During that time, on three occasions, I was with the late Rt. Hon. Cecil Rhodes, in three of his trips into the south Gazaland country. On two occasions before the South African war, and the last time was a few months before he died. At that time, he was working out his scheme of scholarships. I was a youngster then and did not take very much interest in it. He often said to me: " Cooper, education is the greatest factor on earth." I said, " Yes." I did not think much about it. He said that he was going to establish a scheme that would reach into every country in the world, and he did so. I suggest that this country can perpetuate the memory of her immortals in no better way than by founding scholarships along the same lines, with such amendments to the Rhodes' Scholarships as may be necessary. These scholarships, I would suggest, would go, in the first instance, to those young men who, when the war began, were in the transition period between school and business life and who, owing to the war have lost one or more years of their lives. They should be the first to be considered. Needless to say, there would have to be some kind of educational test. The scheme would not be practical without it. The second people to be considered would be the children of our soldiers, not only of those who have fallen, but of those who are still living. At the end of a certain term of years, these scholarships could be turned over at large to the children of this country. There would be no question of creed. All would be on an equal basis. The scheme, endorsed by the Federal Government and supported by every provincial and municipal Government interested and given to the people of Canada to subscribe a capital sum, would, I have not the least doubt, bring from the people of Canada alone a sum amounting to twenty or more million dollars. Such a sum would be adequate for between one thousand to fifteen hundred children a year. Work that out in percentage of our population and see what it means in ten, fifteen or twenty years. I do not see any reason for the scheme not succeeding. I feel that the wealthy men in Canada will give freely; that those who have lost their sons or their husbands will give freely for other people's sons or husbands; that the poor people who cannot afford much, will, seeing so much likely to be offered for their children in the future, also make an effort to subscribe. So I think there is very little doubt that the money could be subscribed, and the scheme would be limited only by the amount subscribed.

There is another point. Our desire for the future is to receive such a class of immigrant that we will never think of turning him out. Our eyes naturally turn to the Mother Country, and I submit that if the many hard-working people who are anxious to emigrate, for many reasons, one of which is education, see the advantages that Canada offers to her children, they will come to this country. I notice in a cutting from the London Daily Mail of February 3 that two hundred Canadian fighting men are to be selected from students in the overseas forces for British university training while they are awaiting demobilization. One hundred are to be chosen from the men in France and the other hundred from the men in England, but only those students who have completed their second year in medicine, theology, agriculture, engineering, law, etc., in some Canadian university are eligible. That is good, Sir, but it does not go far enough. This scheme may seem somewhat Utopian, but I really do not see any reason why it cannot be made a reality if the Government will appoint the right men to foster the idea.

There is a matter of importance which I have not yet heard discussed in this House. I refer to national service. We have just concluded a great war which has taught us, if anything, one great lesson, and that is to be ready. I do not purpose to enter into

details of any particular scheme. I only say that now, with the ending of a great war, it is our duty to prepare for future wars. The training of our children should be carefully gone into in the schools so that if we are at any time confronted with another war our children will be ready to step into arms without any loss of time. If we had been prepared in 1914 it is more than likely this war would not have been fought. If it had been fought, and we had been prepared, it would have been ended very much sooner, with a huge saving of blood, misery and treasure. It is our duty then to provide properly organized units with proper leaders. I have talked with many officers coming back from France who have compared the men who enlisted under the Military Service Act with the volunteer, and not a single one will give the same credit to a draftee that he will give to a volunteer. There is not a volunteer that can possibly fight on equal terms with a draftee. It is our duty then to do away with such unfortunate things. Let us make every one serve the country. It should be the pride of every man, woman and child to serve the country that gave him or her birth. Further, Sir, it should be the duty of the Government to see that its people are ready.

I turn to another subject—one that has occasioned intense bitterness not alone in Government circles—I am not alluding to Ottawa, though I know it is rife in Ottawa —but in other parts of the country, and particularly in Vancouver. In the Government service there are employed very many women who need not of necessity earn their living. These women have, in most cases, got there, not by competence, but by influence, and I say it is unfair competition against their more needy sisters. I think the Government should take a hand in this matter and clean up the Government services as far as they possibly can. I know that a great many women worked during the war for patriotic reasons, but there were a large number also who worked for patriotic reasons plus salary.

I now come to the question of our natural resources, and one in particular I wish to mention. It seems to me the natural resources of our country have been the plaything of political parties. They have been handed out for services rendered; the nature of the service need not be specified. But now the time has come for that to cease. For the future we must as far as in our power lies conserve the natural resources of Canada for the British. One industry in particular—the fishing industry in British Columbia, with which I am more familiar than any other—is packed full of all kinds of aliens who only became naturalized for the sole purpose of exploiting the fisheries of British Columbia. They gave us no service in the war; in fact, in many cases they were openly hostile to the cause of the Allies. The smaller kinds of licenses, such as the gill-net and the purse-seine were granted largely as political favours and in a great many cases, particularly as regards the canneries, a virtual monoply has been created for a favoured few. I submit that in this particular industry very careful revision should be made of the licenses issued, and those who have not given service should be passed over in favour of those who have. At all events, those who have served should be given the preference. I find that last year there were 5,288 gill-net licenses issued in the province of British Columbia, of which 700 were held by Britishers, which includes natural born Canadians and men from all parts of the British Empire; Indians, the indigenous natives of British Columbia, 1,130; Japanese, 2,629, or 49.70 per cent; Swedes, 105, or 2 per cent, and Swedes in many cases were nearly as bad as the Huns; Finns, who are closely allied to the Swedes, 196, or 3.70 per cent; Norwegians, who are slightly better than the previous two, 220 or 4.20 per cent; Greeks, 59; Austrian, 32; Spanish, 25; German, 21, and other nationalities, 170. Of course, these are all naturalized British subjects. I am not dealing with the other and more valuable types of licenses, because I cannot obtain the figures from the department, but, what I want the House to note carefully is, that outside the Indians, the British born have 13.23 per cent gill-net licenses in British Columbia waters, the balance going to aliens.

I find a resolution standing in the name of the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements), dealing with the subject of enemy aliens. Should I be in order, Mr. Speaker, in discussing that matter now?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I think the hon. member could discuss the matter generally, but he would not be in order in referring particularly to that resolution.

Mr. COOPER: The province of British Columbia is concerned in having large government works undertaken at once, and wherever it is possible that a return may be had, even if not for years to come. In British Columbia we have not the industries of the older provinces, and we must necessarily have public works to carry us through this transition period. I congratu-

late the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) on the policy of public works which he has launched. I would point out in that connection that in our province we must re-absorb the 51,000 men—less casualties—whom we sent to the war, and many more besides. I am told that the wonderful climate of British Columbia attracts many, and I understand that we are getting some 35,000 more people. We have not work for them at this time, and the only way to absorb them at present is by starting public works.

I trust the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) will go carefully with immigration. Let him bear in mind the large number that are coming back, for whom it will not be easy immediately to find places. I further hope that the policy followed by previous party governments will not be followed by this administration but the future interests of our country will be considered—we do not hold our country for ourselves, we hold it for the future.

Amongst the Orders in Council brought down is No. 179, which deals with the payment of passage to the dependents of soldiers being brought back to Canada or who were never in Canada before. I wish to tell the Minister of Immigration and Colonization that that Order in Council is rank discrimination, that many of the women and children whose passages back to Canada are being paid by the Government, are people who remained in the Old Country and ate the Old Country's much-needed bread against the wishes of that government, with these people it was purely a matter of selfishness. One cannot condemn them, of course, because their nearest and dearest were there. But the majority should have been considered. I think that, if it is the intention of the Government to pay the passages of these people, then it is its duty to pay also the passages of those who came back to Canada prior to November 11, 1918.

The War Service gratuity is a method of covering the transition period between doffing the uniform and putting on the mufti. It is not the best way out, in my opinion; I am afraid it will cost the country much unnecessary money. But it is good. Yet here again we have discrimination; the Order in Council was not properly thought out. I want to bring to the attention of the Government a very just claim in connection with this war service gratuity, the claim of the Imperial reservist who lived in Canada prior to the war and who, when the war started, rushed home to join the colours. He went home and served for 1 s. 1 d. a day—say twenty-seven cents a day. Our Canadian soldiers got $1.10 a day. The Imperial soldier had no reason to complain because the Patriotic Fund came forward generously and augmented his pay to approximately the same as that of the Canadian soldier. But, while they are grateful for that, they are slightly discriminated against by this Order in Council dealing with the war service gratuity. I understand that that is not our business, but I submit to you that these men gave just as efficient service to Canada and to the Empire as did the Canadian soldiers. They have come back to their homes in Canada and have to live under Canadian conditions, and therefore they are entitled to the same war gratuity as are the Canadian soldiers. The Imperial Government has issued a war service gratuity, but no distinction is made between single and married men. Therefore, the private soldier with war service from 1914 up to the present time, if a single man, would receive approximately $200 less than his more fortunate Canadian brother, while the married man would receive approximately $450 less than the married soldier in a Canadian unit. I trust the Government will look into this matter; I sincerely believe that these men have a just claim.

Now, I turn to consider very briefly the case of the man who served in Canada. That man, metaphorically speaking, has been hooted by every Tom, Dick and Harry in the country, he has been called a slacker and other opprobrious names, in many cases without any justification whatever.

There are many splendid men in the service in Canada who have eaten their hearts out to go to the front but who have been discriminated against. We find that the man who had given service in Canada, and was demobilized prior to the 11th November, 1918, does not benefit under the terms of the war service gratuity. It is unintentional discrimination perhaps but it is certainly discrimination.

The Order in Council dealing with clothing allowance gives the first men to come back $8 to $13 and they had to hand in their uniform. This was subsequently increased to $35 but was not made retroactive. I can readily understand that the departments concerned in this matter would have to work possibly until the judgment day in dealing with these retroactive measures, but, in all fairness, I think something should be done to meet the many justifiable com-

plaints that are received from all over the country in connection with this matter.

In the clothing allowance, as in war service gratuity, the draftee benefits at the expense of his volunteer brother. This is hardly fair. I want to take up the case of the officers for one moment because they are not allowed to speak for themselves. I want to deal with the $100 that was given to the officers in England last year. We find that an officer who went to England and never got any farther than England, on August 1, 1918, was entitled to an extra $100 clothing allowance, making in a year or fifteen months $350. We have against that an officer who served overseas and in Canada since September, 1914, and who had to do with the inadequate allowance of $250. I do not believe that there is a single officer in Canada who would make any complaint except for what appears to be discrimination. I submit that men who have given good service in Canada, but who have not gone to England or France, should have been given this extra allowance, not because they desired it but in order to equalize matters.

The Minister of Militia this afternoon mentioned the War Service Button. We have been very generous in our distribution of War Service Buttons but there is a class of men that we have overlooked. There are many thousands of men who, with the best intentions in the world, joined up to go and have a smack at the Huns but who, for some reason or other, were disqualified and never got there. Many of these young men looking physically fit have had the finger of scorn pointed at them as they walked down the street. Is it not possible to give them some badge by which they could show their fellow men that they had tried to go?

The Land Settlement Act is an excellent piece of legislation. I would like to see it put into force just as quickly as ever the Government can, but I should like to see the matter dealt with according to various provincial problems and conditions. What might be adequate provision for a Prairie Province is not adequate for a province like British Columbia, we will say. I would like to see the measure very much increased in its scope. I think it desirable that men who have given good service in Canada should benefit by its provisions. I need hardly point out to the House that every man we can send to the land, who proves to be an efficient farmer, is a national asset, and that every man we can drag away from the city is a saving in labour unrest. A large amount of labour unrest comes in the winter months when we have men from the prairie, farms, bush, and fisheries flocking into town, some with a little money and who, when they have no money left and no work, sit around and make mischief.

Pensions are, in my opinion, inadequate. They are unequal in the way they are determined. I do not think that the method of determining pensions is the right one. I believe that better service could be given if a board were provided in each province, or, where provinces are alike in conditions, in two or more provinces, to deal with peculiar provincial matters. I believe also it would be a wise provision, or until conditions are stabilized, to look at this question of pensions from the rural or city standpoint. It is unquestionably a fact that a person cannot live in a city in the same way that he can out on a farm, and where a person of necessity must live in the city, that fact should be considered. I would suggest that pensions err on the side of generosity consistent with our financial strength.

Prohibition is a very vexed question. I will stand behind the Government, in so far as I am personally concerned, for total prohibition for one year from date. I believe it will be in the best interests of the country that liquor should not find its way freely into the hands of the people until our conditions are stabilized. After that time it should go to the people of the country to decide. I will not say what they should decide for.

In thinking out new taxes to meet the interest on our huge outlay during the war, I sincerely trust my hon. friend the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) will not overlook the very large number of people who to-day do not come within the provisions of the present income tax. I allude to single men earning from $800 to $1,100 a year and who might very well pay a small amount into the Government's coffers.

I will ask the Government to go a little farther in the matter of vocational training. It has been found in many cases that the term allowed for the learning of a certain industry or profession is not adequate. It would be an act of kindness to many young men who are in the transition period if an extra fortnight—in some cases a month, in other cases possibly as high as six months,—were allowed so that they could complete their course and become useful citizens of the country.

Further, I would ask the Government to enlarge the scope of the vocational training, whereby it could embrace the young man who went overseas under age, and whose return was asked by his parents on that

score, but who is now debarred from the benefits of the vocational training.

I congratulate the Government on its wisdom in placing the Royal North West Mounted Police in the Western Provinces, because I think it is really the only way whereby Federal legislation will be properly administered.

I have never been a party man, for I have always felt that the cult of party led to a neglect of national ideals, and that the country always suffered from it. I was glad when in December, 1917, so many men from the other side of the House joined up with those that were on this side, and made a strong party with a united front to face the problems of the future. I trust that hon. gentlemen will not be too exacting in their demands from the Government, but will help it in all reasonable ways in their power, in order to get the country back into a real stable condition.

One more remark and I shall close. It amused me intensely to listen to the wild poetic flights that some hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House indulged in. There was a delightful parody, for example, by the hon. member for Lunenburg (Mr. Duff). I cannot at the moment recall it, but if I remember rightly, it was plagiarized from a hymn book. That hon. gentleman enjoys a Scotch name, and must surely be familiar with Bobbie Burns. I will therefore quote from the words of the immortal Bobbie, in answer to the hon. gentleman's eulogy of the leader of the Opposition:

9 p.m.

Oh, wad some power the giftie gie us
To see ourselves as others see us!
It would from many a blunder free us,
And foolish notion.

Mr. JOSEPH M. DEMERS (St. Johns and Iberville) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, at first I wish to refer to the renowned and well beloved leader of the Liberal party whose sudden death has so brutally robbed his fellow citizens of their affection and admiration.

I shall not venture to even attempt to add to the remarkable tributes which have been successively paid to his memory by religious and lay orators in most eloquent sermons and speeches, as well as by journalists in writings that are wonderful in style and inspiration.

I simply wish to lay quietly the tribute of my grief on the grave barely closed of this great man, who personified so well the noblest and best qualities of his race, which is also mine.

I do not intend to prolong this debate, I am usually brief and so shall be to-day. But I thought it was my duty to address this House on this occasion, as I believe there cannot be a more favourable one for a member to express his views and make his observations on the political condition such as he sees it.

From the beginning of this debate we have heard of re-adjustment and reconstruction. Under ordinary circumstances, there would be not any question of re-adjustment or re-construction before we had made our inventory, so as to realize to what extent we were disorganized. However we find ourselves under such exceptional circumstances that we need not take stock, for the disorganization is complete, general, manifest and admitted by all.

We are politically, socially and economically disorganized. Such is the condition, Mr. Speaker, in which we find our country after the war. Before the war, we had a constitutional and democratic government, now we have but a dictatorship; we had a Parliament and this Parliament has been ignored by the Government during and after the war and now perhaps more than ever before. The representatives of the people were left aside, and instead of the guarantee of a parliamentary legislation, we were swamped by Orders in Council, thus doing away with our constitutional guarantees.

If the Government intend to carry on a work of reconstruction, first of all, they must re-establish democracy in this country, namely the government of the people through their representatives.

Before the war, Canada had the reputation of being above all a land of liberty. The Government has changed it all and individual liberty, the freedom of speech and of the press were abolished and replaced by coercion and intimidation.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, if we wish to reconstruct, we must re-establish freedom in this country; we must abolish the censorship immediately, for there is no reason now to maintain it and we must let the people absolutely at liberty to express freely their opinion.

Before the war we had an Election Act based upon principles of justice and fair play, but it was replaced by a system of selection.

That Act is a blot on our statute books, which it will be difficult to fully obliterate. That legislation was an Act of cowardice on the part of the Government and a flagrant

breach of the right inherent in British citizenship. None could have been more detrimental to our country.

At home, it proved loathsome to a great many people, and should such disgust be too often provoked through cynical and arbitrary legislation like the War-time Elections Act, peace would very likely be imperilled in this country.

Abroad, that law has put the fair name of our political institutions in jeopardy, and should Canada ever want to secure foreign labour in the future for the development of our immense resources, I am very much afraid that the War-time Elections Act will show that it has caused our country an irreparable prejudice, as it seems hard to conceive that foreigners will be very anxious to come to this country, when they know how Canada treated her alien population during the elections of 1917.

The great majority of those who came into Canada did so, because they wanted to avoid persecution at the hands of the autocratic governments of Europe and because they thought they were coming into a free country. They were attracted and almost carried here by lecturers and agents who had exalted the humanity of our laws, who had promised they would be granted and enjoy equal rights. And then, all of a sudden, they must realize that after they had been persuaded to abandon their nationality, they were made practically homeless, that is men without a country. What a splendid advertisement for Canada to have it spread abroad, how the foreign element was treated in this country! We had not long to wait to see the results, as it was reported in the press a short time ago that immigrants whom we had brought here at considerable expense, were withdrawing their deposits from the banks to go back to their native countries, notwithstanding the bad conditions that obtain throughout Europe. Evidently these people are absolutely disappointed; they did not find here that which they were looking for and which they had been promised to secure. They will now go back to Europe and advertise Canada in their own way, according to the treatment they have been submitted to here.

We heard—and I don't know whether it were not repeated in this House—that the Government should frame a policy with regard to aliens. Well, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that if the Government wish to adopt some policy to that effect, they should exercise great care and fully consider what may be the future needs of this country as regards immigration, because the policy thus adopted will surely have a considerable influence and will be an important factor in the foreigner's appreciation of this country's opportunities, in case they intend to come here and seek a fortune.

At any rate, Mr. Speaker, there is one thing which we need not think over very long, that is to repeal the War-Times Elections Act as soon as possible. I believe it is easy to do it. The war is over and there are members of the Government who were shocked by that legislation even in war time. Knowing as we do the earnestness of their convictions, we can easily imagine the efforts they must bring to bear upon their colleagues to induce them to repeal that evil and fatal legislation.

Then, Mr. Speaker, once we have carried out that work of clearing our statutes, let us enact such a law, that the people will be satisfied that the Government had not in view a political machine but a desire to secure the full and free experiment of public opinion. I hope that this new Act will be framed on the underlying principles of the Act which was in force before the war, particularly as concerns the making out of the rolls. I trust that the system of having these rolls made out by municipal councils will be maintained as much as possible, that is almost everywhere in Canada. And I also hope, Mr. Speaker, that we shall never see any more government appointed commissioners entrusted with that work.

The hon. gentlemen recall the Dominion Elections Act of 1896, the enforcement of which resulted in such crying abuses that the Liberal party made the repeal of that famous legislation a special plank of their platform.

The making out of the lists of voters by commissioners appointed by the Government looked to me in my youth and would look to me yet like a board of arbitrators all the members of which would be appointed by one single party.

Now, Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to refer briefly to another very important issue which was dealt with by hon. members who spoke before me and more particularly by the hon. member for Dorchester, in the beautiful address with which he favoured this House the other evening. I refer to the question of the independence of the judiciary. I regret to charge this Government with having more than once infringed upon the independence and sullied the fair name of the judiciary, through their untimely interference with their duties. There was some serious clashing recently between the Department of Justice and some of the judges, and I regret to say that the Depart-

ment of Justice did not always emerge with credit.

For a Government to question the integrity, competence or wisdom of our judges and entertain any distrust for them is tantamount to shaking the confidence of the people in an institution which we always considered as being a guarantee of social order and the safeguard of the liberties and rights of the people. A Government who do not respect the independence of magistrates make an exceptionally serious mistake, for which we must call them to account, for it means the sapping of the foundation of our social structure.

I promised I would be brief, Mr. Speaker, and I shall pass on to another subject without any oratorical precautions.

Let me refer to the way of dealing with the defaulters. I believe this is a very important matter for this country at the present moment. I must say right now that I agree with hon. members who advocated a general amnesty, and here are some of the reasons which make me think so.

I was informed that there were 40,000 defaulters in the country, the majority of whom are among the rural population. In all, 100,000 young men answered the call under the Military Service Act, which meant that the Government has hit the mark and if all those who were called had reported, about 40,000 would have been left aside; but I will not use this as an argument.

The principal reason for which I favour a general amnesty is that I am convinced that this Government is responsible to a large extent for the passive resistance which was manifested.

Our people were not prepared for conscription which was repugnant to them, because militarism was unknown in America. Not only were they not prepared, but this Government exerted themselves in letting the people believe that conscription would never be established.

I refer you to the statement made by the Prime Minister himself within and without this House in 1916, and I ask hon. members to remember what occurred in the election of Dorchester in February 1917, when a Cabinet Minister was re-elected as an anti-conscriptionist and supported by another member of the Government who expressed similar views. Was that what you would call preparing public opinion for conscription?

Two months after the Dorchester election in which the young men were told how easy it would be for them to cross over the border if need be, this Government submitted their Compulsory Military Service Act. Then the elections came. What did they say to the people during the campaign? They said that the farmers and their sons would not be called upon to serve in the army, and it is through such false representations that they succeeded in securing the great majority of the votes in the rural constituencies throughout the Dominion, except in the province of Quebec. Furthermore, in order to countenance the statements made by the Unionist speakers during the elections in 1917, this Government passed an Order in Council providing for the exemption of farm labourers from military service. Is that what you would call preparing the people for the enforcement of conscription? And after that you are surprised that there were some refractory ones. It is under such circumstances that we are asked to deal rigorously with people who unfortunately were so candid as to believe in the sincerity of those who solicited their votes and the very men who benefited by such trickery and false representations would now like to enact legislation with a view to apprehending their victims!

Well, Mr. Speaker, I say: That is enough cynicism.

There is another consideration, namely that no good can come out of any harsh measures that may be taken regarding the defaulters. They say there are 40,000. If we decide to deal with them, we must deal with them all. How many millions shall we have to spend in our endeavour to detect them all? We shall be compelled to use an army for that purpose and then to apprehend them; we shall have to build jails to put them in and spend millions to feed them during their detention. When you consider that most of these defaulters are farmers, you will realize what waste of time and disorganization in labour it would represent.

Let those who expect any good out of such harsh treatment be undeceived. We shall only succeed in bringing shame upon 40,000 young men, who, under the present circumstances, represent not only an important, but also a necessary asset, and most of whom belong to respectable families who have assisted one way or another in carrying on the war. We would only discourage and demoralize an army of workers who could prove very useful to the country.

The Government, in spite of the elementary principles of any democratic system, recently passed an ukase imposing a penalty of from $250 to $5,000 or $10,000 upon defaulters, which means that only the poor will go to jail; the others who have means will, for a money consideration, continue to enjoy their freedom. Indeed, this is a nice

way to apply the principles of equal rights, but the same thing can be said of the selective Conscription Act which allowed the rich to take advantage of every kind of jurisdiction to avoid enlistment, while the poor were compelled to submit to this condition and enlist.

Therefore we should not be surprised that the workers are avowed enemies of militarism. They are so instinctively, because they know what is good or bad for them and history has taught them long ago that every time a war breaks out they, the poor, have to pay the greatest tribute of blood.

Moreover, Mr. Speaker, I submit that this Government, instead of collecting fines from defaulters, should remember the enormous and absolutely useless expenses to which the conscripts and their families were put. I would like this Government to recall the fickleness which they showed in the enforcing of the Military Service Act, which fickleness caused the conscripts and their families to spend millions, for we have not forgotten that after they had established exemption tribunals, the Government capriciously abolished all exemptions that had been granted, thus putting the conscripts to considerable expense.

I think the Military Service Act has cost everybody enough up to now and that this Government should not further burden the people of this country. Moreover, they would reap no benefit by being too severe. They would only cause a considerable discontent throughout this country which would impede the work of re-construction that we must soon undertake, as we would create much unwillingness among our people.

We fought to secure a world peace. Let us have it first at home. I believe there is enough unrest everywhere without making it any worse. This Government should not only use leniency, but, in all justice, pardon those boys whose education they neglected and perverted, inasmuch as the purpose referred to was concerned.

There are many more matters upon which it is worth while calling public attention at the present time and which must be considered immediately by all those who are interested in the welfare of our country. There is the question of autonomy.

Since I have uttered the word "autonomy," though it was not intended to come within the scope of my remarks, I feel that all I need to say is that this question of the autonomy of Canada is causing much interest throughout this country at the present time. Public opinion feels anxious and uneasy over what is going on to-day in Great Britain regarding the Dominions. As far as I am concerned—I regret to say it, but I do so because I feel it is necessary—I have no confidence in the ability of the Prime Minister in defending and safeguarding Canada's autonomy; I do not believe in his patriotism as a Canadian because I look upon him as an Imperialist first and always.

At the present time, the status of our Dominion is undetermined, unsettled and uncertain; the press reports are contradictory; we do not know whereat we stand. They have talked about the creation of an Imperial Council in which all the Dominions will be represented. Well, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the creation of any Imperial body in which all Dominions should be represented, would mean the complete surrender of the autonomy of these Dominions. But I hope, Mr. Speaker, that we have not fallen so low that the status of Canada can be modified without the representatives of the people being consulted, and I trust that if ever a change is made, it will be made by those who received the proper authority from the hands of the people.

There are many other questions which were discussed in this House and which will come up again before us, such as the cost of living, a most important problem at the present time; the tariff; the civil re-establishment of returned soldiers; the labour question and the special attention which we are called upon to give to what I shall call the great industry of the country, I mean agriculture, every one of these problems is of vital interest to the future of Canada and I intend to deal with them later during the present session, but, on this occasion, I thought I should limit my remarks to what I consider the first step in the work of re-construction.

After we have re-established a constitutional and democratic government and freedom in this country, when we have a Franchise Act based upon principles of justice, when the Government realize the importance of the sacredness of the prestige and dignity of the judiciary, when the sword of Damocles that is held over the head of many of our fellow-citizens is taken down, then, Sir, we shall have established a solid foundation upon which we may confidently build up our national fabric.

Mr. HENRY ARTHUR MACKIE (Edmonton East): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House this evening, I feel somewhat subdued. Last summer I read in one of the magazines published in Canada that this House was composed of mediocrities, and that we looked the part. As for your humble servant, he was described

as the Italian poet who came to this House without originality, and, withal, described as having ready-made clothes—or ready-made speeches; you can draw whatever inference you like. I do not know whether one mediocrity is capable of passing judgment upon another, but if I am not wrong, the mover (Mr. Redman) and the seconder (Mr. Manion) of the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne demonstrated rare ability and a clear conception of the conditions of a new era brought about by the war. If, perchance, my appreciation of these two gentlemen is wrong, I know that I am right in saying that whilst our literary genius was being safeguarded at home, meanwhile writing his own persiflage, these two mediocrities were not such inferior individuals but that they found their place in the front line of battle. As for your Italian poet, he is before you once more, again with ready-made clothes. And let us hope that they will be more pleasing to our friend, J. K. Munro, who has condescended to become the parliamentary fool. Every court has had its clown; why not Parliament?

As I have listened to the speeches on the motion for an Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, I have classified them under two headings. On the Government side the position may be summarized quite briefly as this: we have been subjected to a storm, tossed about by the sea, and at times the sun has disappeared almost entirely behind a lowering sky. The sea has grown calmer, the sun has re-appeared and the sailors have fixed their latitude so as to be able to guide their ship safely to destination. In other words, the Government has been subjected to a storm, the ship of State is riding a calmer sea and the ministers have a clear conception of the new conditions brought about by the war and are meeting them in a well defined programme.

Let me digress for a moment, Mr. Speaker, before I pass to the attitude which I think the Opposition has taken in this matter, to say a few words about the League of Nations, which has been touched upon by the member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe), the member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), and slightly by the member for St. Johns (Mr. Demers). In this connection the speech from the Throne is somewhat positive in its nature. It says:

> And effectually promote the formation of a League of Nations which will ensure for all time the peace of the world.

A wave of fraternity is passing over the world. Many believe that it will carry away

the ativic passions and that regenerated nations will live side by side in a friendly rivalry. It is audacious on my part even to express a doubt. Augustine, Bishop of Hippo, incorporated this idea in his "City of God," a most marvellous work for that time. He speaks of the Christian universe as being under the crook of the one shepherd. The bishop, having become pope, crystallized this idea and formed a league of nations of which he was the head, and the expression of its creation was given in the following sentence:

> Roma locuta est;
> Causa finita est.

The papacy developed the spiritual rather than the material side; otherwise, individualism in the world would have been seriously threatened. The church, being afraid of shedding blood, chose the holy Roman Empire as its secular arm, and that settled the fate of the society of nations. From arbiters the Popes became partisans, and the princes were not docile sons of the Church. The Holy Roman Empire was incapable of enforcing its decisions, and you have the reason therein for the bankruptcy of the League of Nations under the tutelage of the papacy, a most extraordinary power which could reach the bodies and the souls and whose sanctions pursued man beyond the grave. The unbridled Ego of the Renaissance and of the Reformation is as strong to-day as it was then. Peace can reside only in an agreement of interest and can be maintained only by an equitable distribution of the forces at play, and never by the magic virtue of an abstract ideal. The new social order is, as we are informed, to be based, not on fighting, but on fraternity, not on a competitive struggle for mere existence, but on a deliberately planned co-operation in production for the benefit of all who participate by hand and by brain. The labourer demands an equal share of enjoyment, or, at worst, equality in misery.

Let me pass a few centuries in one bound and, following the example of the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) be brief, and let me quote to you our lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier who, on the 12th day of May, 1911, when speaking on the security of Canada and Imperialism, said:

"We shall not allow ourselves to be detracted from duty to worship Utopias."

At the time of the Coronation of Edward the Seventh, he stated that he "believed in a Parliament of Great Britain but not in a Parliament for humanity."

I should like also to call your attention, Sir, to an article in the Devoir of the 31st day of January, 1919. It is a resumé of an address given by Monseigneur L. A. Paquette, and I desire to say that the Rev. Bishop is one of the leading philosophers in America. He refers to the league of nations, about which I have said a few words and which was intended to bring about a Christian universe. This is what he says in part:

> It was therefore a veritable society of nations organized over the principles of Christianity, placed under the tutelage of the Church and submitted to the law of Christ, the law of equal justice, of charity, of fidelity, the law of peace and of freedom. It is the rock upon which the intellectuals and the politicians have perished. It is the problem upon which the most stubborn and self-willed have spent themselves uselessly.

I leave it to you, Sir, as to whether we should keep our powder dry. Whilst speaking of the League of Nations, may I incidentally pursue my digression by referring to something that was said by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) the other night? He said: We are a nation, and we should be treated equally with England; that is, Canada should be on the same footing as England. I do not agree that Canada is a nation. The position which has been given to Canada overseas to-day is due entirely to its splendid participation, not by reason of its status as a nation. Even if we had a status as a nation, we are in Canada a federation of provinces, and I would still deny that we are essentially a nation. A nation is an agglomeration of people who have the same love and the same hate, who have tasted the same joys and undergone the same reversals, who revere the same great historical figures, who salute the same flag, interpreting its meaning in the same way, because they received in the same school the same mentality. In a word, it is an agglomeration of people whose intellectual, moral and political formation is the same. This is not the case of Canada. Let me prove it to you, Sir, in three instances alone, which I choose amongst others. In 1884, at the time of the Soudan war, the flag meant one thing to the French and another thing to the English. In 1899, the same thing occurred again. In 1914, for the third time, the message of the flag was heard with the result which you know as well as I do.

May I, in passing, touch upon a few remarks made by the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers) in this respect? He does not attempt to excuse entirely the position of Quebec in this matter, but places the blame upon the Administration then in power, if results have not been handsomer than the actual facts show the case to be. Conscription, he says, was not popular. Our people were not accustomed to the word, nor even to the measure, and above all, we had been promised that there should be no conscription. To me that argument can have absolutely no weight, because a people will fight only upon the patriotism that resides within them, and when that patriotism fails then there is no other way than to impose conscription upon them, and it is quite evident that not only in Quebec, but in Ontario as well, the patriotism was not as great as it was in some of the western provinces. Therefore, the reasons given by the hon. member for St. Johns cannot be accepted by me at all events as being sound for excusing the position which his province has taken.

I wish to come back to the appreciation of the speeches made on the opposite side in this debate. I believe I may summarize them as follows and briefly: Come to us, come to liberty, freedom and low tariff. I would say: Liberty, freedom, advocated low tariff, maintained high protection. Come to a state of contradictions, but come anyhow. The question of tariff has been more or less mooted in this House, and we are told that an amendment is coming that is intended to bring about a decision on that question. I am afraid the members of the Opposition will be disappointed in that respect. We shall wait until we have a decision from this side of the House, and the advice given to the Prime Minister the other day by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) was well directed, and I can do no better than to endorse his position in that respect.

Those who hesitate to deal with a question of this sort are neither frank with themselves not true to their country. The question must come up. This Administration may or may not continue to exist; that makes no difference; the present membership must necessarily leave it to the people finally to decide what shall be done in this country. When our friends opposite endeavour to allure us to their side by speaking of a low tariff I would say to them: Come to us with a well-defined programme. Tell us what commodities you intend to subject to low tariff, and how low. Tell us what commodities you intend to subject to protection, and how high. Not only that, but they must argue their case and show conclusively what will be

the effect upon the country if the changes they propose are adopted. Furthermore, in view of the changes they would propose they must show how they would raise the revenue. Until then without offence intended; I say that historically; what they have done they have done by stealth and the rest is on record.

I wish to take up the other invitation passed across the floor of the House with reference to liberty and freedom, which I heard mentioned several times to-night by the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville (Mr. Demers). Liberty is defined as follows:

> Liberty is freedom for crowds to dominate individuals. It is collective thought, collective emotion. It is the reverse of freedom.

Let me give a few examples. A member of a union may not agree in every respect with the policy of the union, but if he wishes to remain a member of that union he must subscribe to the general policy. Otherwise, he will be thrown out. If a man is a member of a certain church he must subscribe to the tenets of that church, or be excommunicated. The member of a political party—I believe there is a party on the other side, but there is none on this, although one may be growing up—must accept the general policy of his party, otherwise, he will be read out of his party, as happened to an hon. gentleman who sits beside me. Liberty, then, is that circumscribed freedom which the collective body is willing to give to the individual. Freedom is defined in this way "Each individual is free to do and live as he pleases, so far as he does not interfere with the corresponding freedom of other individuals." I do not wish it to be understood that these words have any importance in political issues in Canada to-day. My only reason in referring to them is that I wish the Opposition to know they cannot allure us by catch words or catch phrases. They must convince us.

The balance of my appreciation of the speeches is that there has been a little constructive criticism and much destructive criticism. There has been a great deal of talk by hon. gentlemen opposite of ministers on this side of the House abandoned to all sense of virtue and honour, because they happened to be at one time Liberals—and I believe some of them say they still are. I think I am better justified than they when I talk of the anti-ministers and mock patriots whose whole course of opposition is motived so far as I can see by envy and resentment because the ministers have not complied entirely with all their wishes. Am I right in saying that the dart of 1917 still rankles in their side?

Let me give an illustration of the destructive criticism that has been offered without any justification whatsoever by the hon. member for Dorchester (Mr. Cannon) and the hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville. According to the hon. member for Dorchester we have lost three freedoms: the freedom of speech, the freedom of the press, and the freedom or dignity of the Bench, and these freedoms have been lost, he says, through the action of this Government, once democratic, but now autocratic. As to the freedom of the press, if the press of this country has been bought as suggested by the hon. member for Dorchester, or if as might reasonably be inferred from his speech, the press has been muzzled by Order in Council, let me tell him that there has been no censorship on the press of the Dominion of Canada except in matters which might affect the war. And if my hon. friend complains of the lack of publicity which the Canadian press has given him he should remember that he has not been neglected by the German press if I can believe Canadian press reports on that matter. Would my hon. friend have the press used by a certain class of people for the purpose of fomenting insurrection in this country in time of war or now when conditions in Canada have not yet become stabilized? Is that what he desires? As to the freedom of speech, I have been almost from one end of the country to the other and I have heard and read that men can say what they like, and do as a matter of fact. I do not care how many Orders in Council have been passed nor what control of the press there may be by this Government; there never has been any hesitancy on the part of the editor of the Bulletin in the town in which I live to give full vent to his feelings and sentiments. Freedom of speech has not been curtailed so far as I can judge. If the hon. member for Dorchester means that certain radical elements of our population who advocate the use of force to bring about the conditions they desire should be allowed full scope to create trouble in Canada, I take direct issue with him there. What is the other freedom that has gone? The freedom or the dignity of the Bench. Judge Langelier has been referred to. Let me tell my hon. friend that he is no more a judge than I am, but a Justice of the Peace, liable to be discharged like any other civil servant; and he ought to be discharged.

The hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville said in his speech this evening that

we ought not to take such severe measures against absentees and defaulters. The weight of the measures which are being enacted to-day, he says, will bear most heavily on the poor people because they are unable to pay the fines imposed. He argues, in effect, that we have no business to impose fines under the Criminal Code, and he would not have us imprison these defaulters.

The general result of his argument is—if a man has committed an offence against his country and the Criminal Code provides that he shall be punished for it by imprisonment or by a fine, if he has the alternative of going to jail, he ought to have the alternative of paying a fine. I cannot understand my hon. friend from St. Johns and Iberville when he says that this Government has acted unreasonably with regard to men charged as defaulters under the Military Service Act. If the law were less strictly enforced, what would the soldiers say, what would the reasonable, thinking people of Canada say after they have made their respective sacrifices—the soldiers by risking their lives, and the civil population by performing the duties incumbent upon them? What would be the result if these gentlemen were given carte blanche in this matter? The only difficulty as a matter of fact, is that the Government has not been more stringent long before. I say the dignity of the bench is curtailed when you find a magistrate—or a justice of the peace not a judge—who takes for his guide a letter addressed to a police officer, and governs himself accordingly in imposing fines or fixing terms of imprisonment. It is time that this Government should at least speak to such a man to let him know that he has a duty to perform, and that he shall perform it even if it is absolutely necessary for this Government to intervene. If the man were a judge I would be the first to impeach him. But he is a magistrate, a justice of the peace, and the province of Quebec should see to it that he is discharged at once. It is not the business of this Government to educate justices of the peace to conduct themselves properly in the administration of the law, but if it becomes necessary to do so this Government will not fail in its duty.

There is another instance of destructive criticism: Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of this country should be here in his place in Parliament. I remember that the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) said that it must be regretted that the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier was not invited to attend the Peace Conference. Assuming that, if Sir Wilfrid Laurier were alive to-day, and assuming that he had been invited to attend the Peace Conference, would these hon. gentlemen say he should be in attendance at that conference? If so, then it amounts to this: That Sir Wilfrid Laurier's place was at the Peace Conference, but the place of the Prime Minister is in this House. Are these gentlemen sincere when they take that position? I go further. What would be the criticism uttered by these hon. gentlemen if Sir Robert Borden were in his place in this House to-day? Only last session, my first session in Parliament, I heard the Opposition members state that the interests of Canada had been sacrificed at all times by Great Britain more particularly in the matter of boundaries, but to-day they would have the leader of the Government remain in his seat in Parliament to conduct affairs which, I think, are well conducted by the ministers who are here, and neglect this very question of boundary which is certain to be discussed overseas.

It is said that the Government are not making efforts to secure for Canada indemnity for her war expenditure. But Great Britain says that the colonies will receive pro rata, on the amount paid to Great Britain, and all who read the papers must have noticed that announcement. But I go further and say, that even if there is not one cent coming to Canada by way of indemnity, yet the honour of this nation having been maintained, and the security of its people guarded as a result of this war, the price paid is not excessive.

We are told that the Dominion of Canada is encroaching on provincial rights in the matter of education. True, in a general way, education is a function of the province. But it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect person and property, and there is no better way to protect person and property than by education. In the olden days, you had the stocks, the whipping post, the treadmill, the penal colony; and to-day we still have the state provided with expensive machinery to punish men, but not one cent for education. "Educate the people," was the admonition of Penn. "Educate the people," was the advice of Washington. "Educate the people" was the exhortation of Jefferson. But the Government of Canada to-day is nothing else but a hangman.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MACKIE (Edmonton): I am glad these hon. gentlemen realize it, and it is too bad some of them cannot be reached by

the tentacles of the law. If they will repeat outside of Parliament what they say here, they will come under the admonition of the law. We lock up, we hang, we strangle to prevent crime, and judges impose long terms of imprisonment on persons to give an example to others. That is a queer way to form character. The Government of the country should see to the education of the common people just as it does to its national defence, and as it sees to the rewarding of the soldier, so it should see to rewarding the teacher who forms the character of the people. We spend millions in bonusing railways, in assisting agriculture, in teaching people how to grow wheat and cattle, but we do not spend a cent in teaching people how to grow up to be men and women. We spend a dollar in education and five dollars in prosecution. We make the calling of the teacher degrading, and pay instead the police magistrate and the judge. We are anxious to bestow extended franchise upon the people and to make them all-powerful, but we withhold from them the instruction without which that power becomes a curse. It is time the Dominion Government took notice of education in this country, and if necessary amendments should be made to our Constitution to meet the case.

I say that the criticism by hon. gentlemen opposite has been destructive in the main. I do not blame my hon. friends opposite. I wish they were more constructive, but there is a reason for their attitude, and that reason is that we are a democracy. The hon. member for St. Johns and Iberville says that we are an autocracy. If we have had criticism it is due to the fact that we are a democracy, and I intend to prove it. We must not lose ourselves in details lest we may imagine that by showing here and there some imperfections or defects inherent to democracy, we aim a mortal blow at the system itself. History, the educator of statesmen, teaches us that by following the same methods we have in the past undergone the same reverses with the same final achievement of success.

In 1754, at the beginning of the Seven Years' War, what was the political system in New France and New England? In the case of the former it was political absolutism, parental government, military discipline. There was a chief to whom all subordinates were ready and willing to render blind obedience. It was governmental and military discipline in all its perfection. If the chief said "Advance" no subordinate would ever have dreamed of saying "Retreat." Montcalm, the military expert, was the one chief whose orders suffered no contradiction.

In New England a contrary system held sway. Everybody had the right to express his opinion. There was no Louis XIV, nor a Pompadour. When the New Englander left the Mother Country, she wished him good luck, never intending to follow him to the shores of the Atlantic or impose upon him an Intendant Talon. In other words, they were masters of themselves, and when New France advanced upon their frontiers they found the New Englanders engaged in private quarrels. There were wranglings with the Mother Country about the supreme command, and the desire to secure ranks of less importance was the cause of much dispute amongst the colonists. On all sides there were wranglings as to the quota of men and money, and there were those, even the Quakers, who, on principle, were unwilling to fight. But pressure on the farmer and his sons actually set the powder on fire. What was the result? There were humiliating defeats, that of Monongahela amongst others, whilst new friends, thanks to its unity of purpose and action, crushed Montgomery at Carillon. Does this prove that autocracy is superior to democracy? By no means. When, after a time, education had taught the New Englander what the object of the war was he realized that the political absolutism of New France intended to drive him and his democratic ideas into the sea, then the Dutch of New York, the English, the Scotch, the Irish Colonists, the Catholics of Maryland, and the Quakers of Pennsylvania, rose as one man ready and willing to shed their blood in the dethronement of political absolutism which meant the triumph of democracy. Has not history repeated itself. The same causes produce the same results. Canada is a democracy where everybody takes advantage of the right of expressing his views on public matters, and it is on that account we find so many Zoilians who find time to criticise the Government in military matters and even in their efforts at reconstruction. All the imperfections they point out are inherent to the democratic system, and with the great Corneille I believe that the most difficult state to govern, especially in war time, is a democratic state.

Clinton was a great patriot and he desired to serve his country well. He proved to be a great organizer, yet he suffered reverses which would have disheartened a man less great than he. But he lived long enough to see the supporters of political absolutism depart for France, and twenty-five years afterwards receive from Madame

Guillotine the reward of their stubborn resistance in the acceptance of the new conditions in a new political era. In this war, as in the Seven Years' War, neither England nor France has escaped entirely the more or less serious discords in its political, social and economic sphere. But did they allow these minor quarrels to minimize their effort in the war? Nor will minor quarrels minimize the united effort of these two countries in peace. Nor did they consider these minor quarrels as serious attacks upon their governments. It is only in Canada that you will find so-called statesmen so famished for power that they are ready and willing to sacrifice the good name of democracy to the exigencies of their own ambition, which under present circumstances is misplaced; for it neither corresponds with their ability and talents, nor with the unbounded devotion which they ought to have for democratic institutions. In the twentieth century, as in the eighteenth, democracy at times advanced imperceptibly, yet surely. To-day it goes forth like that army in array mentioned in Scriptures, acies ordinata. This last victory of democracy, let us hope, will silence forever the detractors of these methods in war time.

Mr. HERMAS DESLAURIERS (St. Mary) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, I wish to tender my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address for the ability displayed in presenting the policy of this Government in showing the spirit in which it is intended to conduct public affairs in the future.

They said that during the last four years the millionaires stood side by side with the workers. I do not intend to deny that, but I believe my hon. friend from Calgary should have told this House the actual and foremost reason for that combination, which was great. No doubt he overlooked this detail, but those who, like myself, on account of their position or profession, are in continuous contact with the working people, are in a position to state that on every occasion the millionaires, specially in the industrial field, never failed to show in a most peculiar manner their interested patriotism.

In many industries the workers were treated as so many tools, even exacting from women and young girls certain kinds of work which require the strength of a man. This was done by day and night, holidays and Sundays without any rest, and on pain of losing their job, while the profiteers, under the protection of the Government, were raising the prices of commodities to prohibitive rates. For that reason, how many healthy bodies, how many fathers or others with dependents were taken to the cemeteries, while our millionaires, by the side of the workers, were getting more and more numerous under the cover of patriotism. The difference that exists between these two classes of citizens is that those who are the majority have met their death and the few others have become happy and prosperous. I will not insist. It was the period of destruction. This Government had made up their minds to destroy everything in order to save the Empire and re-establish civilization overseas. We must admit that unfortunatly they were very successful. Now, that the war is over, there is no reason why this destruction should go on. So they announce a period of re-construction. Let us hope that our millionaires and their kin the Trust magnates will carry their gun on the other shoulder for the greatest good of Society and that they will do their duty.

According to my hon. friend from Calgary (Mr. Redman)—and I am with him in this—the soldiers should be absorbed into our civilian life. That is meet and just, but where I differ from him is in the manner of that absorption. To my mind, what would be desirable, what the Government should try to do, would be to re-establish the social order as it existed before the war, when the people on this soil of America led a happy and contented life.

As a consequence every soldier back from the front should have the right to resume the position he held before the war and the duty of the Government should be to oblige the employer to reinstate the man. In this way, Mr. Speaker, we should see the bookkeeper going back to his desk, the machinist to his shop, the shoe worker to his factory, the bank clerk to his bank, and all with the most perfect order. But I strongly condemn what is being done in Montreal and probably elsewhere, a state of things which seems to be approved of by the Government, judging by the remarks of my hon. friend from Calgary, namely that the civilian should be thrown out without pity in order to make room for the soldier. That denotes a sad lack of justice and of fairness towards the man who has done his duty; it disorganizes society; it is anti-humanitarian; it will bring wretchedness and misery to the people; it is a school for the Bolshevism which seems to make the Government so anxious. To place signs outside and inside industrial establishments admonishing all comers to "Make way for the Soldier"

is to bar out any other person who is in need of earning food for himself and family. Allowing the soldiers to step into any place they choose, without regard to their qualifications or their past experience in civil life paralizes industry and throws out of employment faithful workers who from now on will find it very difficult indeed to earn a livelihood; and in certain cases it helps towards promotion a forger or an embezzler, who enlisted to escape sentence.

That is going a little too far. It indicates approval of what is going on in numbers of our shops where soldiers, about 97 per cent I am told, go from shop to shop, working two or three days here and there, after having caused the dismissal of those who supported them during the war. Why do these things happen? Because there is no effort at regulation. I find this method decidedly unjust. It is a very bad policy, to my mind, and the Government should lose no time in setting up some sort of regulation of these things so that each and every man should be treated according to his deserts.

I wish to point out to the Government that if, at a certain period, ships were more necessary than men, on the other hand, production, to provide for our warriors on the battlefields, is most assuredly the essential factor in warfare; that the soldier be kept in proper fighting trim.

The finest proof we have of this is in the forty years of preparation undertaken by Germany so that when war did come she could call upon her immense reserves of production. In the same way, during four years, our workers have laboured to the very utmost so as to uphold those who, on the other side, were sacrificing their lives, having willingly offered themselves up on the altar of Civilization and Freedom. It would be not just that those who for so long upheld our fighters should to-day have only poverty in return. I believe that, without in the least working any harm to the re-establishment of our soldiers, the Government could give a square deal to our civilian population.

I perceive, moreover, that the immigration problem demands the very special attention of the Government this session. This question is decidedly one of capital importance; but for us, of the old French province, faithful to our traditions and to our faith, and who are following in the footsteps of our ancestors, the problem is not quite so acute. However, we admit that, for other provinces, for which we entertain the highest consideration, when the women will have been completely emancipated, thanks to the ballot and to their introduction into Parliament, I admit, I say, that the problem will then constitute for our province an equation in the second degree rather difficult of solution. Still, since we have a Unionist Administration which on more than one occasion, has shown its liking for force, I have no hesitation in believing that it will see to it that some sort of selection is exercised in the choice of the immigrants who sooner or later will honour its memory. At all events, in the public interest we reserve the privilege of expressing our humble opinion on this subject.

Now I come to a far more serious problem brought up by the mover and the seconder of the Address: I mean, Bolshevism in Canada, the natural consequence of the policy of a Government which is much too inclined to use force. This is certainly one of the most serious political problems that the Union Gevernment was justified in mentioning in the speech from the Throne. There is decidedly something to stir up an Administration if the news we get from Red Russia be true and they will likely be confirmed by our soldiers who were sent to this territory through force, always for the defence of our borders.

While we are speaking of Russia I recall an incident or rather an echo of this afternoon, when the Minister of Militia spoke about the Canadian Expedition to Siberia. I must tell the House that I am far from looking upon the action of the Government in this matter from the same angle as the hon. Minister of Militia. I believe his information to be more or less trustworthy. I do not know where he found the explanations he gave us, but what I can affirm here to-night is that this expedition, from beginning to end, was never done under the volunteer system. And I have in mind just now an instance of the absolutely Prussian brutality with which the military authorities forcefully withdrew 70 recruits from their battalion, the C.O.T.C., Laval, Montreal. Following the custom of the Iroquois the chiefs had notified the officers of this battalion that they required 70 heads and during the night the choice was made, not by vote, but according to the officers' whims, of the young men who were to sacrifice themselves to go and fight in a territory which is decidedly not our boundary line.

And besides I am not of one opinion with the hon. Minister of Militia who claims that the Government accomplished a very worthy deed on this occasion; I would rather share the opinion of Mr. W. L. Smith, a regular contributor to the Toronto "Sun"

who calls this expedition to Siberia the "Siberian Crime." Those are the terms he uses to qualify this shipping off to Siberia of Canadian conscripts drafted unwillingly into the expeditionary corps on the way to Vladivostok:

"Canada committed a national crime in sending to Russia, to participate in a domestic quarrel, men who had no business to interfere with this country's striving after freedom, no matter how blind its efforts may be. The crime is doubly heinous when you think that men who refused to go were nevertheless forced to embark for Siberia. It is a flagrant violation of the law of the country which allows men to be sent beyond the borders of Canada "for the defence of Canada" only. No matter what distortion is made of the phraseology of this clause it can never be claimed that men sent to Siberia to interfere in the quarrels of factions at war with one another are fighting "for the defence of Canada." All these men can do is to implant throughout Russia the hatred of everything Canadian, thus endangering Canada's future welfare in ways that we have not space to dwell on. Every Canadian citizen is a party to this crime so long as he does not protest against what is taking place. The crime is more than all on the head of N. W. Rowell. Yes, the President of the Privy Council is the only one among the ministers who was so bold as to not only defend what is being done but further to try and get some kudos out of it. On the Judgment Day I prefer to be in the place of the last Publican, of the greatest sinner rather than in that of the "First Layman" of a great church, a man whose hands will be red with the blood of his fellow-citizens sacrificed in a nameless quarrel."

It goes without saying that the terms are perhaps a little overdone, but I believe that in the matter of this expedition we can find more in the nature of a crime than we can of a worthy deed for which we deserve congratulation.

The Government must keep an observant eye on this pagan, this savage organization which strives to overthrow everything in its passage, and by any means that offer. If Bolshevism has become a burning question we must believe that it exists in certain parts of the Dominion. For my part, representing as I do a riding in the largest city of the Dominion (Sainte-Marie, Montreal), with a population of nearly 65,000 souls, I feel bound to assure my hon. colleagues on the other side of this House that there is no danger of this national calamity getting a foothold in Montreal, that our soil is not favourable to the growth of this disloyal plant. Of course, a short while ago, we had two or three spouters, who looked like Bolsheviki, bob up on the scene, but the folks felt they were related to "Ti Noir" Desjardins and his silent partners of unholy memory. Their arrest had no effect whatever and they are awaiting the return of the hon. Minister of Justice to receive like "Ti Noir" Desjardins a generous cheque to pay them for their trouble and lost time. It is said that in the days of "Ti Noir" the motive behind the affair was to apply martial law to the peaceful city of Montreal. To-day people are wondering if the Government is not working along the same lines so as to establish a Mounted Military Police Force throughout the Dominion, similar to the North West Mounted; and this very plan was put forth some time ago by Sir John Willison in the Star of Lord Atholstan, still all a-tremble from his dynamiting at Cartierville by his friends. There you have what is being said in Montreal, despite all the unfair things and all the silly prattle that is being dished up to us daily by a certain part of the press. I must assure the party now in power that the character of Quebec province does not lend itself to this sort of violence but, if I am to believe my own eyes, things do not look so reassuring in other parts.

Listen to this Bolshevik propaganda, copies of which were distributed by the thousand around the chief industrial centres in Toronto, Niagara Falls and Hamilton—who would ever believe it? Why, to believe certain newspapers, all these places have a monopoly of loyalty to the end of all time:

"After more than four years of massacre, famine and poverty for the workers of the entire world the rival factions of the Capitalists have come to an understanding. Fifteen million workers have given up their lives to decide what gang of exploiters will fleece the workers of the world. Millions of women and children have died of hunger while capitalists were living in luxury. During the war the workers were told repeatedly that they must save the Empire. Working men, you have played the game of your masters. Victory, for you, means only hopeless toil from day to day, mean food, shabby clothing, a hovel for a home, death after a little while. Wake up! Do not let your souls be the souls of slaves. Away with the Capitalist classes. Make the Proletariat supreme. Strive with all your might to establish national institutions in which the workers will possess and control

all the means of production and distribution. You have to choose between revolution for the establishment of Socialism, and degradation and poverty.

"You must follow the example of the workers who have founded Red Russia. You have shed your blood for the benefit of your masters. Surely you are ready to take decisive measures for your own good. Set up councils to administer the affairs of the country. Take hold of the industries. Establish military discipline. Crush the Capitalists as they have crushed you since you were born. You must do this if you no longer wish to be cannon-fodder in time of war and beasts of burden in time of peace."

That is what is being distributed in the centres which are fondly believed to be imbedded in loyalty for all eternity. And I really believe that this manifesto was distributed. And what further strengthens my belief in the existence of this state of things is the speech delivered by the hon. Minister of Militia on the 13th of December, 1917, before a large gathering in the county which he has the honour to represent, East Hamilton. He was speaking to his constituents:

"In the name of God what possible reason can the people have for supporting the Labour Party. This Party sold us soldiers for an immediate gain just as they did to obtain better wages while the soldiers at the Front were going 'over the top' with fixed bayonets to meet the Teuton hordes. I emphatically warn alderman Halarow (the Labour candidate in East Hamilton) that he is taking a very grave attitude at this time. A day will come when he will be called upon to give an account of his deeds. All the backing he has comes from the yellow dogs who are seeking to evade conscription."

Well, I do not know whether it was really Providence that protected our hon. friend the Minister of Militia, chief representative of our gracious Sovereign George V, or whether the yellow dogs shrank away before his literary broadside, at any rate we have the honour to have him with us in this Parliament. I wonder whether this is not an opportune time to call back Sir Robert Borden from his jaunt to Prince's Island so as to lead the Government in putting down Bolshevism. Anyway, it appears to me that nothing should be dearer to the Prime Minister of a country than to work for the good of his own country before trying to settle matters in other countries.

One thing is certain: the Government was justified in putting this item into the speech from the Throne. Bolshevism certainly has taken deep root in this country and the situation is serious, since this doctrine is growing in a very dangerous part of the country: an ultra-loyalist section. I hope that under the circumstances the Government will show itself worthy of their position.

History tells us that every time a handful of men have arrogated to themselves the right to do as they please, to disregard the rights of the people and the laws of the country, to gag the people's representatives and the Press and muzzle Public Opinion, without advice and without reason, as the present Government has done and is still doing—and I fail to see why this policy is still continued—we must not be surprised if what is happening elsewhere should be seen in Canada, for in Canada, as elsewhere, there is a limit to patience, and the awakening of the people is often horrible to witness.

I do not think that the theories of the views of Sir John Willison would prove an efficient method of holding in check or rather of putting down this class of people or rather this despicable organization: Bolshevism. I must say that this plan of Sir John Willison was the establishing of a Mounted Police Force throughout the Dominion, similar to the Mounted Police in the Northwest Teritories, with a head-office at Ottawa, and holding priority over all the forces already in existence, municipal, provincial or federal; and this, in all the provinces, even in those where there is no call for such a thing.

I believe that the Government could find a much wiser way of coping with this serious problem. I sincerely believe that should the Government stop administering Canada in an autocratic manner, by Orders in Council; should they repeal those nefarious laws which are their offspring; and start to forget, before asking others to do likewise; should they permit to breathe the air of freedom those who crossed the seas for the defence of this same freedom, I believe that Bolshevism would hold no menace for this country, and that the general feeling of unrest which we find throughout the Dominion would disappear.

Another way of solving all these questions, without omitting a single one, would be to hold a just and fair general election and give once more the place of honour to British fair play.

We can say now that we have undergone a period of destruction in a frightful manner, that we are going through the period of

reconstruction in a guilty manner and that all that remains for the people to do is to make the Government suffer a period of destruction in a pitiless manner.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Rowell the debate was adjourned.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. Maclean the House adjourned at 10.50.

Tuesday, March 11, 1919.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

OFFICIALS OF THE HOUSE.

THE CLERK OF FRENCH JOURNALS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That the recommendation of His Honour, the Speaker, laid on the table of the House on the 3rd instant, respecting the appointment of Mr. Lionel Dansereau to the position of Clerk of French Journals, Votes and Proceedings and Orders of the House of Commons be concurred in.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: I have been requested to ask that this motion might be allowed to stand for a few days as some hon. members who wish to speak on it are now absent.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With your permission, Mr. Speaker, I request that the motion be allowed to stand.

Motion stands.

RAILWAY ACT CONSOLIDATION.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals) Bill No. 19 to consolidate and amend the Railway Act was introduced and read the first time.

RIOTS AT KINMEL CAMP.

REPORTED RIOTS AT WITLEY CAMP.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): May I direct the attention of the Government to a cable despatch from its special correspondent published in to-day's Montreal Gazette, relating to the Kinmel riots, in which it is stated:

Responsibility for this distressing affair must rest primarily on the Overseas Administration. There was lack of frankness in dealing with the men in Rhyl Camp. The staff in command of the camp knew of the unrest among the men over the delay in getting home—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member is not in order at this stage in introducing any matter of a controversial nature reflecting upon the administration of the Government or of any of its departments; and the reading of that despatch undoubtedly would have that effect. It is in order for the hon. member to submit any question with respect to the riot, but not to read a despatch of that character.

Mr. MURPHY: If you will permit me, Sir, just to finish the sentence I was reading—

Mr. SPEAKER: There is a very important point involved in the reading of a despatch of that character upon the Orders of the Day being called. There being no subject before the House, strictly speaking, no proceeding whatsoever can be had, but it has been the custom to allow questions touching matters of principle or of grave national import with respect to the administration of the Government. Under no circumstances can matter of a controversial nature be introduced which reflects upon the Government or upon any minister or any department of the Government.

Mr. MURPHY: I bow to your ruling, Sir. I think I have already read sufficient of the despatch to acquaint the Acting Prime Minister with its general purport. Still following your ruling, Sir, I submit that this is a matter of very grave national importance, and I would ask the Government if they can give the House and country any information regarding responsibility for this unfortunate affair, and what steps have been taken to remedy the undoubted evils complained of at Kinmel Park.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) has already announced to the House, I believe, that a board of inquiry has been constituted to ascertain the facts in connection with this matter. Pending the finding of that board it would seem inadvisable, upon the imperfect information contained in newspaper reports, to make this matter the subject of discussion in this House. As soon as the Government have any further official information I shall be glad to communicate it to the House and the country.

Mr. MURPHY: Orders in Council will be the death of this country. May I ask what information my hon. friend has with regard to the reported riots at Witley camp?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand we have no official information as to reported riots at Witley camp.

LIEUTENANT-COLONEL JENKINS' REPORT ON THE C.A.M.C.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): I have received a communication to the effect that in July, 1918, Lieutenant-Colonel Jenkins of the Canadian Army Medical Corps was appointed by Sir Edward Kemp to investigate and to make a report upon the financial affairs of that branch of the service overseas, and that a full report was submitted in November, 1918. May I ask if the report in question will be brought down to the House, and if so, when?

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia and Defence): I have no information with regard to that report. The matter has never come before me, but I will have inquiries made immediately.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session resumed from Monday, March 10.

Hon. NEWTON W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): Mr. Speaker, in resuming the debate on the motion for the adoption of the Address, it is not my intention to discuss or even to refer to the important measures foreshadowed in the speech from the Throne. These will come up for consideration when presented to the House. Nor is it my intention to-day to refer to the important questions of domestic policy within the Dominion of Canada relating to demobilization and reconstruction. These have been discussed and dealt with ably and effectively by my colleagues and members on both sides of the House.

What I desire to address myself to for a short time might be described as Canada's external relations, or to be more specific, the effect of the war upon Canada's status as one of the nations in the British commonwealth, and upon her status among the nations of the world; and if time permits, to give some information on the situation in Russia, so far as the information is in possession of the Government. I am sure all must recognize that the situation in Russia to-day is one of the gravest problems with which the Peace Conference will be called upon to deal, and constitutes one of the greatest perils to the future of our civilization.

The question of the status of Canada within the Empire has already been mentioned in two or three of the addresses, and was discussed particularly by my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) in a very interesting and able address with much of which I found myself in hearty agreement, although to some of his propositions and statements I could not give my assent.

It is not without interest, in speaking of Canada's status to recall the fact, Mr. Speaker, that the German Confederation, which shortly thereafter developed into the German empire, and the Canadian Confederation started on their national existence on the same day, the 1st of July, 1867. Germany, not extensive in territory but having a large population, was founded not on a democratic constitution with the assent of the governed, but with a government established on the basis of an autocracy supported by military power. The German people devoted their thought and attention to the development of a material civilization and to the strengthening of the military power of the State. Probably in no other country in the history of the world was such great progress made during a period of fifty years in material development or in the perfecting of a military machine. When the time arrived that Germany's material civilization or her industrial development had reached a point where she had penetrated all the markets of the world, and her military machine had reached such a degree of perfection that she believed she could safely challenge all the democracies of the world for world supremacy, she started the war which set the world aflame. The result we know to-day. A civilization based absolutely upon material progress and military strength has collapsed in conflict with the moral forces of the world and with the free, democratic peoples who joined in waging war against it. Canada, large in territory but small in population, travelled a different road. With a democratic constitution under which government was carried on by consent of the governed, the people of Canada, loving liberty and cherishing worthy ideals, devoted themselves to the task of subduing nature within their own borders and establishing an ordered democratic civilization upon this north half of the North American continent. Fifty years have passed, and during that period we have developed in Canada such initiative, such courage and such resource on the part of our people, such a love for liberty and for

true democratic ideals, that when Germany started this war Canada, without hesitation and without delay, by the spontaneous action of the people, and with the unanimous consent of Parliament, ranged herself side by side with the Mother Country to wage war upon the most powerful military autocracy that the world has ever seen. To-day we know the result. Canada, entering this war strong in her determination to stand by the Mother Country, yet not fully conscious of her own strength or of the extent of her own resources, or of the full possibilities of her own efforts, has emerged from the war one of the really effective powers of the world; whereas Germany, who has always occupied a prominent place in the councils of Europe and at the various peace conferences for more than two hundred years, is not to-day represented at the Peace Conference. Canada is there for the first time, and her voice is heard effectively in re-establishing peace and ordered government throughout the world.

The German people, living under a government which was maintained by military force, could not understand a government based on any other principle; and when the war broke out the people of Germany confidently anticipated that the British Empire would fall to pieces, for they knew that the Mother Country would be engaged in a bitter struggle in Europe. They fondly imagined that the Dominions would take advantage of the opportunity to break away from England and declare their independence. The German mind did not understand the principle of liberty and the loyalty that is born of liberty. During the past fifty years, as the power of self-government, the power to manage our own affairs has been extended, the loyalty of the Canadian people has grown stronger and stronger; and we emerged from this war with the ties that bind Canada to the Motherland and the sister dominions stronger than at any period in our history. We draw this lesson from the history of these two countries, that the larger the liberty consistent with unity, the stronger the loyalty, the greater chance of the permanency of the Empire of which we form a part.

In his address in this debate my hon. friend from Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) drew attention to the fact that in the Imperial War Conference of 1917 a resolution had been passed to the effect that the question of any permanent change in the relations of the different parts of the Empire should stand in abeyance until after the war. He then went on to suggest that, by reason of some action taken at the Imperial War Cabinet or the Imperial War Conference last year, that resolution had been departed from, that some action had been taken which impaired the autonomy or freedom of Canada. And he went on to suggest that matters relating to Canada should be settled in Ottawa and not in London.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend says "hear, hear," and we all agree cordially with that sentiment. But my hon. friend from Kamouraska was wrong in his supposition that the affairs of Canada were being settled anywhere else than in Ottawa. Let me recall the situation with reference to the various meetings of the Imperial Conference and the Imperial War Cabinet.

At the Conference held in 1897, the first conference attended by the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whose loss we all lament, he took the position that Canada was a nation, that the people of Canada should recognize that fact and claim the status of a nation, and the people of the Motherland should recognize this claim and concede to us the status of a nation. I venture to think that in no act in the life of Sir Wilfrid Laurier did he more correctly interpret the situation or more accurately forecast the future which lies before the Dominion of Canada than in the position he then took. It may be that he was somewhat in advance of his time, but certainly he rightly interpreted our position. For I am sure we all agree that there can be no permanent unity among the nations that compose the British Empire except upon a basis of the equality of those nations. That position Sir Wilfrid Laurier maintained throughout the period of his Prime Ministership, and that position has been maintained with equal strength under the Prime Minister who succeeded him and who is at the head of the present Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has there ever been a period in the history of Canada, since 1840, when any other contention was held?

Mr. ROWELL: I can only say that, apparently, there was in the minds of many people—I should think in the minds of most of the people in the early days—the thought that Canada was a colony, a dependency of Great Britain; that we did not occupy the position of a nation.

Let me turn to even a comparatively recent page in our history to show the contrast. At the Imperial Conference of 1911, for the first time in the history of the Empire, the statesmen of the dominions were admitted into the inner councils of the Empire and listened to a review of the foreign affairs of Great Britain. That statement appears so remarkable in the light of present day events may I be pardoned for quoting a paragraph from the address of Mr. Asquith at the close of that Conference:

> Gentlemen, I again advert to a matter which has been referred to by Mr. Fisher and Sir Joseph Ward, that this is the first time—and this conference will be significant in memory in that respect—when, in Mr. Fisher's happy phrase, the representatives of the Dominions have been admitted, as it were, into the interior, into the innermost parts of the Imperial household; what in the old classical phrase were called the "arcana Imperii" have been laid bare to you without any kind of reservation or qualification.
>
> Those, gentlemen, are matters as to which we cannot take the world into our confidence; we cannot even take our own fellow subjects and our fellow citizens into our confidence in the full sense of the term, but we who have gone into it with the frankness which such confidential discussions admit of, will agree that, even if the Conference had done no more than that, it would have been a land mark in the development of what I may call our Imperial constitutional history.

So recently as 1911, and for the first time in the history of the Empire, the Dominions were permitted to have a full knowledge of the foreign affairs of the Empire. While we were asserting that Canada was a nation and that thought had been taking possession of the minds of the Canadian people, while the British people were gradually coming to recognize that Canada was a nation, yet during all that period we had no voice whatever in questions relating to foreign affairs or to anything that had to do with determining the issues of peace and war. I repeat, in 1911, for the first time, Canada and the other Dominions were admitted to an intimate knowledge of foreign affairs. The Imperial Conference had decided that meetings should be held every four years. The conference would have resumed in 1915 had not war broken out. Personally, I think it was a misfortune that they did not hold the Imperial War Conference in 1915 so that the world might have witnessed the spectacle of the unity of the Empire, of its statesmen coming from all portions of the Empire, meeting in London, and devising means as a united Empire to defeat the German forces in the field.

Mr. Lloyd George, who became the Prime Minister of Great Britain in December, 1915, had the imagination to see that no act on his part could have greater significance for the Empire than that he should invite the statesmen from all the Overseas Dominions to meet the statesmen of the Motherland to confer upon the war, its progress, the terms of peace, and upon after-war problems. Therefore, the Imperial War Conference of the spring of 1917 was convened. The overseas ministers met with the members of the British Cabinet, and from that meeting has issued what has been defined as the Imperial War Cabinet. What is the Imperial War Cabinet? Let me summarize the position. As a full statement already appears in Hansard, and which was made by the Right Hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) in June, 1917. The Imperial War Cabinet consists of the Prime Minister of Great Britain and of the ministers who are in charge of the departments dealing with Imperial Affairs—the Foreign Secretary, the Secretary for War, the Secretary of State for India, the Secretary of State for the Colonies, and probably the Secretary for the Navy, and the Prime Ministers of the Overseas Dominions. They met together and discussed matters affecting the whole Empire, more particularly those relating to the conduct of the war. It is of interest, in considering the constitutional position which was thus brought about, to note, as was pointed out by the Prime Minister in 1917, that the Crown acts throughout the whole Empire. The Crown acts in Great Britain on the advice of the advisers there; the Crown acts in Canada, and in the other Dominions, on the advice of the Dominion ministers; in the provinces on the advice of the ministers of the province; so that, throughout the Dominions and States of the Empire, the Crown acts upon the advice of its constitutional advisers, having regard to the particular subjects that come up for consideration. It was pointed out in reference to the Imperial War Cabinet that there were two cabinets sitting in London. The British War Cabinet which advised the Crown on matters relating to Great Britain, and the Imperial War Cabinet which advised the Crown on matters relating to the Empire as a whole.

Some one said that it was not a Cabinet, that the name was altogether inappropriate, that you cannot have a Cabinet unless it is responsible to a particular parliament.

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. gentleman says "Hear, hear". I am not going to quarrel with a name; you may call it a Council if you think it is any better, but what I

shall point out to my hon. friend is that the Cabinet has no existence in any written constitution. My hon. friend knows that the Cabinet, like so many other British institutions, was developed to meet the exigencies of the situation, to have the advisers of the Crown responsible to Parliament Here we have another Cabinet which has grown up out of the exigencies of a new situation, to meet new conditions. It is a characteristic development of our British constitution and which, as the Prime Minister said in London last summer, and as he said in this House, is a Cabinet differing from the others in that it is a Cabinet of governments. It is composed of men responsible to different Parliaments and each one responsible to his own Parliament for the advice that he gives, each being under the necessity of justifying that advice before Parliament, just as any other Cabinet or Prime Minister must do.

There are several hon. members who were not here in 1917 and for their benefit particularly may I read a statement which was made by Mr. Lloyd George in the British House of Commons and which was read in this House during the session of 1917 with regard to the creation of the Imperial War Cabinet, so that the members of the House may know just what the constitutional position is as outlined by Mr. Lloyd George:

The Prime Minister (Mr. Lloyd George): I think that I ought to report to the House a very important decision that was arrived at as a sequel to the recent meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet. It is desirable that Parliament should be officially and formally acquainted with an event that will constitute a memorable landmark in the Constitutional History of the British Empire. The House will remember that in December last His Majesty's Government invited the Prime Ministers or leading statesmen of the Overseas Dominions and of India to attend the sittings both of the Cabinet and of an Imperial War Conference to be held in this country. It is to the former body which assembled in March, and held fourteen sittings before separating, that I desire to refer. The British Cabinet became for the time being an Imperial War Cabinet. While it was in session, its overseas members had access to all the information which was at the disposal of His Majesty's Government, and occupied a status of absolute equality with that of the members of the British War Cabinet. It had prolonged discussions on all the most vital aspects of Imperial policy, and came to important decisions in regard to them—decisions which will enable us to prosecute the war with increased unity and vigour, and which will be of the greatest value when it comes to the negotiations of peace. I should like to add on behalf of the Government that the fresh minds and new points of view which our colleagues from over the seas have brought to bear upon the problems with which we have been so long engrossed, has been an immense help to us all. So far as we are concerned we can say with confidence that the experiment has been a complete success.

The conclusions of the Imperial War Cabinet are of necessity secret, but there is one aspect of them which we feel ought to be communicated to the House without delay. The Imperial War Cabinet was unanimous that the new procedure had been of such service, not only to all its members, but to the Empire, that it ought not to be allowed to fall into desuetude. Accordingly, at the last session, I proposed formally on behalf of the British Government that meetings of an Imperial Cabinet should be held annually or at any intermediate time when matters of urgent Imperial concern require to be settled, and that the Imperial Cabinet should consist of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and such of his colleagues as deal specially with Imperial affairs; of the Prime Minister of each of the Dominions or some specially accredited alternate possessed of equal authority; and of a representative of the Indian people to be appointed by the Government of India. This proposal met with the cordial approval of the overseas representatives and we hope that the holding of an annual Imperial Cabinet to discuss foreign affairs and other aspects of Imperial policy, will become an accepted convention of the British Constitution.

My hon. friends who are interested in the constitutional aspects of this matter might very profitably peruse the statements of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, and the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in dealing with the question in this House in 1917.

This is the statement of Sir Robert Borden in reference to the constitutional change:

"Therefore the future of this proposal will be a cabinet of governments rather than of ministers, a cabinet in which the government of the United Kingdom, the governments of the Dominions, and the government of India will be represented. Having regard to the declarations of the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom and his colleagues, the proposal will carry with it much of advantage to the Overseas Dominions. I say that for this reason: It is not proposed that the Government of the United Kingdom shall in foreign affairs, act first and consult us afterwards: The principle has been definitely and finally laid down that in these matters the Dominions shall be consulted before the Empire is committed to any important policy which might involve the issues of peace or war. The language in which the Prime Minister of Great Britain conveyed his proposal to the ministers from the Dominions made that abundantly clear. So, as I understand the proposal, and I think I understand it correctly, the British Cabinet shall continue to discharge its functions in respect to all matters relating to the United Kingdom, but there shall be also an Imperial Cabinet in which not only the United Kingdom, but all the Overseas Dominions shall be represented by their governments."

Sir SAM HUGHES: King George is the Crown. How then does the hon. member reconcile the Crown in this case, which is the Crown of Great Britain only, with the

functions which it is intended to convey by this new cabinet council where His Majesty will represent the Crown in all colonies? May I make myself a little more clear: Canada and the other Dominions will sit in a war council under the Crown which is solely the Crown of Great Britain and Ireland?

Mr. ROWELL: The hon. gentleman is wrong in his statement of the facts. King George is not only the King of Great Britain and Ireland, but of the British Dominions beyond the seas.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I suggest to my hon. friend—I am very much obliged to him for his data, which, of course, I never heard of before—that the Crown is represented in Canada by a Governor, and not by King George. Perhaps that is news to my hon. friend.

Mr. ROWELL: I cannot give any further answer than the one I have already given, which I think is sufficient—that King George is King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, and of the British Dominions beyond the seas, and Emperor of India, so that the Crown is the head, the real constitutional bond of unity between the Motherland and all portions of the Empire, the representatives of which come together in this Imperial Cabinet to advise His Majesty on matters of importance to the whole Empire.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. gentleman has not met the question that I raised: Is the King of England appointed by the Empire, or by the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland?

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend knows that the descent in Great Britain under the Act under which the present reigning house came to the throne, is by heredity —it descends.

Sir SAM HUGHES: By law?

Mr. ROWELL: When the Crown was settled upon the present reigning house it applied to the whole Empire as it existed at the time that settlement was made.

The Prime Minister stated the situation further in this language.

> They go there as the representatives of autonomous governments, each responsible to an independent parliament. They meet there for the purpose of consultation, co-operation, and united action, but that action can be taken only with the sanction and authority of the representatives of the various nations of the Empire assembled in their own parliaments. Therefore, there is no sacrifice of any existing power of self-government. There is, on the other hand, opportunity for consultation, co-operation and united action, which I venture to think will prove of great advantage to the Empire as a whole.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have quoted these statements for two reasons: First, because these statements were made to the House of Commons in the year 1917, and because the constitutional position was not challenged by any member. Sir Wilrifd Laurier did question the use of the word "cabinet" and suggested that "council" was more suitable, but no member of the House challenged the constitutional position as outlined by the Prime Minister at that time.

Mr. Speaker, neither this Government nor its predecessor has undertaken to change the existing constitutional relations without the consent of the Parliament of Canada, Parliament by failing to dissent, by failing to offer any criticism, did accept that statement at that time as defining our proper constitutional relationship and since then the people at the general election have given their ratification—at least I have never heard that there was any real dissent in the general election to that proposition. So that whatever may be the constitutional relationship arising out of the presence of representatives of Canada in the Imperial War Cabinet that relationship has the assent of the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian people. I venture to think this development is a matter of very great importance to the people of this country—it is not the curtailment of our autonomy, it is an enlargement of our powers of self-government. The Imperial War Cabinet does not deal with a single question which in the past has been dealt with by the Parliament of Canada.

Mr. DUNCAN ROSS: Does the hon. gentleman seriously say that this question was an issue before the people at the last general election?

Mr. ROWELL: What I said was that the general election had since been held, but I did not hear of any dissent during the election to that proposition.

Mr. ROSS: Did you hear the matter mentioned at all during the election?

Mr. ROWELL: No, I did not hear it mentioned, and for this very good reason: It so commended itself to the judgment of the whole of the people that nobody thought an issue could be made of it. It must also, I think, commend itself to all hon. gentlemen if they take time to consider the situation. What is the situation, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: Before the President of the Council leaves the constitutional phase of the subject, I would like to put a question to him. The hon. member says that this Council, or Cabinet, of which he speaks, is constitutional and based on constitutional principles. Will the hon. member explain where he finds any basis for such an arrangement in the constitution of Canada, for instance?

Mr. ROWELL: I said it was a development of the British constitution, like so many others, to meet the exigencies of the situation, and that is the way all the great developments in the British constitution have been made. In that respect the British people have differed from most other nations under free and democratic governments. The majority of nations have prescribed for themselves a written constitution, and they must act within the terms, or the limits of that constitution. The British people, on the other hand, have had confidence in their ability to meet any situation when it arose, and they have adopted their constitutional procedure to meet the exigency of the case. That is the way this Imperial War Cabinet developed.

When my hon. friend asked his question, I was pointing out that the Imperial War Cabinet does not deal with any matter with which the Parliament of Canada previously dealt, or over which it had jurisdiction. There was always an area of sovereignty over which we had no jurisdiction, such as foreign affairs and matters relating to the issues of peace or war. Over these Canada had no control except in so far as she might make representations to the Imperial Government which dealt with these matters. Now, Mr. Speaker, the development is this: Our autonomy has been enlarged, our self-government has been enlarged, Canada has reached the status of a nation, not in name but in fact. Canada now has her voice heard in that area of sovereignty over which she previously had no jurisdiction. The representatives of Canada meet with the representatives of the other Dominions and the Mother Country to determine these questions of foreign policy—the issues of peace or war. There has been no curtailment of our sovereignty. On the other hand, there has been an extension of sovereignty, or self-government, to the people of Canada.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Ordinarily, when a member of a Cabinet disagrees with his colleagues on a question of policy, the course for him to follow is to resign from the Cabinet. Will my hon. friend say whether this course will be followed by a member of the Imperial War Cabinet if he disagrees with other members of the Cabinet on any question of policy brought before it?

Mr. ROWELL: The answer to my hon. friend's question is this: where the Cabinet, as in the past, is responsible to a particular parliament, that has been the constitutional procedure. But this is not a cabinet like any other cabinet.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWELL: It is, as the Prime Minister has said, a cabinet of governments in which the heads of governments represent their own peoples. You may call it a council, if you will; I will not quarrel over the term. But it is an assembly, an organ of government, a place where the representatives of the Mother Country and of all the Dominions and of India meet together to discuss matters of common concern and to agree on lines of co-operation affecting the whole Empire.

Mr. ROSS: My hon friend has not answered the question of the member for Kamouraska.

Mr. ROWELL: The question is answered. The difficulty with my hon. friend on the other side is that while he professes to be a Liberal, he cannot readily change. There should be a readiness to change to meet new situations and new developments; there should be new machinery of government to meet new exigencies.

Mr. ROSS: I admit I cannot change just as quickly as my hon. friend.

Mr. ROWELL: I have not changed; I have stood for compulsory military service and the backing up of our boys at the front.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend (Mr. Ross) should not get nervous when he does not have his own way.

Let me come back to the question we were discussing. What is to be the future relation of Canada to Great Britain and to the other Dominions of the Empire? Are we to continue in a position where we have no voice in questions of foreign policy or the issues of peace or war? That is inconceivable on the part of a nation such as

ours, which has taken such a part in this great struggle. It is inconceivable that Canada should be content to occupy a subordinate position in the Empire; to have the issues that affect the lives and welfare of her families, and citizens determined by men living elsewhere, and to have no voice whatever in their determination. There are only two ways in which Canada can have a voice in foreign policy. She can have it as an independent nation, or by co-operation with the nations that now form part of the British Empire. Here again I have not changed; I believe that the future of Canada is inseparably associated with that of the Mother Country and the other nations of the Empire. Canada's future is to be found in association with these nations.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I am very glad that the hon. gentleman is coming to the right line. Now, would he kindly tell us where the question of responsibility for the colonies—I use the term in a broad sense—comes in?

Mr. ROWELL: Responsibility for the colonies?

Sir SAM HUGHES: Responsibility under the new form. There must be responsibility in all governments, or there should be.

Mr. ROWELL: I will come to that point in a moment.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Well, I have a fad of my own.

Mr. ROWELL: I think I have given my hon. friend a good deal of information and light so far, but I will tell him this: the Imperial War Cabinet, as was announced by Mr. Lloyd George and Sir Robert Borden, was a creation for the purposes of the war. The question of the permanent constitutional relationship is to be settled at a conference to be called after the war, and all these other questions will come up then when the permanent constitutional relationships are being settled.

May I point out the contrast between 1911 and 1917? In 1911 the statesmen of the overseas Dominions were admitted for the first time and on one occasion to a review of foreign policy—in 1917 and 1918 the statesmen of the overseas Dominions and of India meet around a common council table with the statesmen of the Mother Country, there to consider together these very questions for the benefit of the whole Empire.

Mr. NESBITT: If a representative of this Dominion did not agree with the other members of the War Cabinet, would it not be his duty to report back to this Parliament and to get its approval or otherwise of his position?

Mr. ROWELL: Absolutely. Nobody can be bound except by the assent of his own Government, and his own Parliament. That is clearly set forth in the statement of Sir Robert Borden which I read to the House.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Am I to understand—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: If you gentlemen will kindly keep yourselves in place, I shall—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the minister mean to say that at that conference in 1911 there was no consultation with or asking of the opinion of ministers and others concerned? Because I can tell him to the contrary that there was.

Mr. ROWELL: I did not say anything of the kind, Mr. Speaker; I quoted Mr. Asquith and I said that that was the first occasion upon which the statesmen of the Empire had been admitted into the secrets of British foreign policy.

Now, let me come back to the point that I was discussing. Perhaps I could make my statement clearer to the House if my hon. friend (Sir Sam Hughes) would permit me to proceed without interruption. Most of the questions he has in mind may be answered by what I have to say.

While we have been claiming the status of a nation within the Empire since 1897, we did not get the status of a nation until 1917, when the statesmen of Canada and of the other Dominions met with the statesmen of the Mother Country around a common council board to determine questions of common interest relating to the whole Empire. So that during the period of the war there has been a remarkable development in our constitutional position, not by way of a curtailment of our rights or powers, but by way of a great expansion and enlargement of those rights and powers.

Now, my hon. friend from Kamouraska quoted from an address of the Prime Minister in London in June last in reference to the change in our constitutional position and he suggested that we had departed from the resolution passed at the meeting of the Imperial War Conference on April 16, 1917. Let me read that resolution:

The Imperial War Conference are of opinion that the readjustment of the constitutional relations of the component parts of the Empire is too important and intricate a subject to be

dealt with during the war, and that it should form the subject of a special Imperial Conference to be summoned as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities. They deem it their duty, however, to place on record their view that any such readjustment, while thoroughly preserving all existing powers of self-government and complete control of domestic affairs, should be based on a full recognition of the Dominions as autonomous nations of an Imperial commonwealth and of India as an important portion of the same, should recognize the right of the Dominions and of India to an adequate voice in foreign policy and in foreign relations, should provide effective arrangements for continuous consultation in all important matters of common Imperial concern, and for such necessary concerted action founded on consultation as the several governments may determine.

There has been no departure from the position defined in that resolution. You ask what of the action which was taken last year, and to which my hon. friend referred? Under our constitution, under the constitution of all the Dominions, the Governor General occupies a dual position, which has grown out of the old colonial status. The Governor General, under our constitution, is the representative of His Majesty in Canada. He acts upon the advice of his constitutional advisers, and in that respect occupies exactly the same position as does His Majesty the King to his constitutional advisers in Great Britain. But the Governor General has another function in Canada; so has the Governor General in each of the Dominions, a function that is a survival of the old colonial days. The Governor General was the representative in Canada of the Colonial Office, the high official in Canada of the Colonial Office to receive communications from the Government of Canada. Therefore, if the Prime Minister of Canada wished to communicate with the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the message went to the Governor General of Canada; he communicated it to the Colonial Office, and the Colonial Office communicated it to the Prime Minister of Great Britain. When the Imperial Conference met this year, it was the view of the statesmen, not only of one Dominion but of all the Dominions and of India as well, that the time for that process of circumlocution had passed. It was a relic of the old colonial days. If the Prime Minister of Canada could discuss matters with the Prime Minister of Great Britain around the Council table face to face, when they separated and the Prime Minister of Canada came back home, why should he not communicate directly with the Prime Minister of Great Britain instead of through the Governor General and the Colonial Office as in the old colonial days. That was the view at the Imperial Conference, and a resolution was passed that there should be a change in such channels of communication. Let me read to the House the resolution, moved by Mr. Hughes, Prime Minister of Australia, seconded by the Prime Minister of Canada, and unanimously adopted:

1. That this Conference is of the opinion that the development which has taken place in the relations between the United Kingdom and the Dominions necessitates such a change in administrative arrangements and in the channels of communication between their Governments as will bring them more directly in touch with each other.

2. That the Imperial War Cabinet be invited to give immediate consideration to the creation of suitable machinery for this purpose.

This was not the first Imperial Conference at which this question had come up. It had been raised by the Prime Minister of Australia in 1907. It had been raised by General Botha, Prime Minister of South Africa, at the Conference of 1911. They suggested at both of those conferences that the communications in reference to Dominion affairs should be direct to the Prime Minister of Great Britain himself. The Prime Minister of Great Britain in 1907 and in 1911 took the ground that the burdens and responsibilities of his office were so great that he could not undertake the additional work involved in receiving communications from the Dominions. Therefore the change was not made, but a permanent secretarial was established in connection with the Imperial Conference. The resolution I have read of July last was passed on to the Imperial War Cabinet. The Prime Minister of Great Britain at the present time felt very much as the prime ministers did in 1907 and 1911. He did not wish to be burdened with the additional administrative duties that would be involved in his receiving all these communications but he recognized the justice of the contentions of the dominions and this resolution was agreed upon at the Imperial War Cabinet on the 30th of July last:

1. The Prime Ministers of the Dominions, as members of the Imperial War Cabinet, have the right of direct communication with the Prime Minister of Great Britain and vice versa.

That was the establishment of the principle for which the dominions were contending.

2. Such communication should be confined to questions of Cabinet importance. The Prime Ministers themselves are the judges of such questions.

3. Telegraphic communications between the Prime Minister should, as a rule, be conducted through the Colonial Office machinery, but this

will not exclude the adoption of more direct means of communication in exceptional circumstances.

The principle is now firmly established that in all matters of Imperial Cabinet concern the prime ministers of the dominions may communicate direct with the Prime Minister of Great Britain and vice versa. This new procedure was put into effect when the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) returned. Communications passed directly between Mr. Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of Canada in reference to the terms of the Armistice and the terms of peace and also in reference to attending the Peace Conference. This is another evidence of the equal status of Canada with the Mother Country and the other nations of the Empire. This further clause was passed and formed part of the resolution:

4 p.m.

In order to secure continuity in the work of the Imperial War Cabinet, and a permanent means of consultation during the War on the more important questions of common interest, the Prime Minister of each Dominion has the right to nominate a Cabinet Minister, either as a resident or visitor in London, to represent him at meetings of the Imperial War Cabinet to be held regularly between the plenary sessions.

The Prime Minister of Canada did not avail himself of the power of nominating a cabinet minister, as he returned to England shortly after to attend the Peace Conference. I should think it would be a matter of pride and satisfaction to every Canadian that Canada, not only in theory, but in fact, has reached the status of a nation, one of the free nations of the British Commonwealth; that on these vital matters affecting foreign policy and peace and war we have a right to be heard, and the means is provided whereby our voice can be heard in determining these questions so vital to our future. This result has been brought about during the war.

Our constitutional position has puzzled some of the statesmen at the Peace Conference. They could not understand an empire made up of autonomous nations, each having a parliament of its own largely determining its own policy. As a matter of fact, in all history there is no political organization like the British Empire. There is no state with which you can compare it. Never before has there been an empire composed of autonomous nations owing allegiance to a common Sovereign, and each exercising control of its own affairs. It is the greatest experiment in free democratic government which this world has ever seen.

I venture to think that just as the Anglo-Saxon people have been pioneers in the development of constitutional, democratic government in the world and their example has been followed by other nations—and they have been not only pioneers, but successful pioneers—so in this new and greatest experiment in democratic government, involving more than 400,000,000 human beings, more than one-fourth of the whole human race, living on all the continents and many of the islands of the seas, they will be successful; that this League of Nations which we call the British Commonwealth may prove to be the crowning triumph of the Anglo-Saxon genius for government.

Mr. H. A. MACKIE: In connection with Canada's status as a nation, may I ask whether Sir Robert Borden will be at liberty to affix his signature to any treaty drawn up in Europe at the Conference?

Mr. ROWELL: I have been dealing with Canada's status as one of the nations within the Empire, and I now come to discuss the question of Canada's status among the nations of the world. My hon. friend's question—

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: My hon. friend has said that another conference will be called for the purpose of discussing the changes in the constitutional relations of the Empire. Will the Parliament of Canada be consulted as to the stand our delegates should take at that conference?

Mr. ROWELL: While I have no authority to speak for more than one member of the present Government, I would unhesitatingly say, Yes. That is my own view, because I believe it is a matter of the deepest concern to the whole people of Canada and the Parliament of Canada is entitled to express its views on the matter. Coming now to the question of the Peace Conference my hon. friend referred the other day to the fact that Sir Robert Borden and his colleagues left Canada before the armistice was actually signed, and he offered some criticism, or at all events comment by way of criticism, as I understood him, upon that fact. He thought the Prime Minister and his colleagues had been over there a very long time, probably an unnecessarily long time. Why did Sir Robert Borden leave Canada with his colleagues at the time he did? I will tell my hon. friend. The moment it appeared reasonably clear that a Peace Conference would be held in the not distant future, the Government of Canada through its Prime Minister took the position that in view of the part Canada

had taken in this war, of the service and sacrifice of her troops in the common cause, and in view of the status of Canada as one of the nations of the Empire, she was entitled to be represented at the Peace Conference. One can at once recognize that that involved most serious constitutional questions, for while, within the family of nations that make up the Empire, we had reached that stage where all were prepared to agree that the Empire was a league of nations each of equal status, the other nations of the world had not yet been asked to agree to that position and it was entirely a different question to secure their assent to the new and unique position of the British Empire. When this contention was pressed by Sir Robert Borden upon Mr. Lloyd George it had his hearty sympathy, and he was of the opinion that if this new position of the British Empire was to be recognized, it was absolutely necessary for Sir Robert Borden, who had been so influential in bringing about this new and changed relation, to go overseas immediately to take up the question of the representation of the Dominions at the Peace Conference. It was because of this request and for this purpose that the Prime Minister left at the early date he did. The Prime Minister of Canada, I say, took the position that Canada was entitled to be represented at the Conference. The negotiations were protracted. First, the assent of the British Government must be secured. They did assent and the Imperial War Cabinet approved. The matter was then taken up with Allied Governments. I imagine it is quite true that at first the United States offered some objection, because they did not understand or appreciate our changed status, but I am glad to say when they did understand and recognize it they withdrew all objection.

You ask, what is Canada's status at the Conference? The Conference is composed of the five great powers, and other nations which are called secondary powers. Each of the great powers is entitled to five representatives, and the secondary powers are entitled to three, two, or one, according to their varying positions in the war and other considerations which entered into the determination of representation. What is Canada's representation? First of all, there are five representatives of the British Empire, one of the five great powers. Three or four of those representatives, I believe, are permanent members of the Conference. The other representatives are drawn from a panel which includes the statesmen of the overseas Dominions. At all plenary sessions of the Conference, therefore, there are a certain number of representatives of Great Britain and one or two representatives drawn from the panel composed of the statesmen of the whole British Empire, representing Great Britain and the Empire at large as one of the great powers. A representative of Canada, therefore, as part of the British Empire delegation, may be present at the plenary sessions of the Conference. In addition, the Overseas Dominions have the status of secondary powers at the conference and Canada is entitled to be represented, as a secondary power, at all plenary sessions and at all meetings where her interests are specially affected, by two representatives. The other dominions, Australia and South Africa, are also entitled to two representatives each, New Zealand to one, and India to two. The result is that at all plenary sessions of the conference there are five delegates representing the British Empire as a whole, one of whom is chosen from the Dominion's delegates, and nine other delegates representing the British Dominions and India, making a possibility of fourteen in all. At the first plenary session of the conference Canada had three representatives, two representing Canada and one serving on the British Empire panel. Canada has also had three representatives at other important sessions of the conference. The hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Mackie) has asked whether Canada will sign any peace treaty. The question has not yet come up for consideration, but my own personal opinion is that in view of Canada's status at the conference she undoubtedly would sign. I should think the British Foreign Secretary or Prime Minister would sign on behalf of Great Britain and the Empire at large, and the Prime Minister of Canada would sign as one of the secondary powers.

I come now to the constitution of the League of Nations, which is probably one of the most momentous documents that has ever been penned. It is too early to discuss its terms; they have not yet been discussed at the Peace Conference itself; the committee has simply presented its report. The covenant, however, makes express provision for the representation of the Dominions, and I venture to believe that when this covenant is signed the name of Canada will appear as one of the charter members of the league, as one of the nations of the British Empire. Hon gentlemen will recall that the direction of the affairs of the League of Nations is entrusted to a council of the league composed

of representatives of signatories to the covenant, and Canada as one of the secondary powers will undoubtedly have representatives on the general council of the league. Each nation may have not more than three representatives but only one vote. The executive of the league is composed of nine members, one representing each of the five great powers, the other four to be chosen by the general council of the league as they may hereafter determine. The management of the affairs of the league is vested in this general council and this executive committee.

I shall not enter upon the discussion of the terms of the covenant of the League of Nations, but in order to emphasize its importance, I would point out one or two of the matters covered by it. Not only is the object of the league to preserve the peace of the world—but to guarantee the territorial integrity of the different nations that are signatories of the covenant as against outside aggression. I will not go into the procedure provided to ensure that territorial integrity, but it means that every nation that signs the covenant of the league pledges itself to maintain the territorial integrity of the others, as against outside aggression. When a league is being formed under which not only our territorial integrity but that of the Empire is guaranteed, a league which will affect our whole future and obligate us to adopt the measures called for by the covenant of the league, then surely we have before us one of the most momentous questions to which the statesmen of this country can devote their attention. In view of the character of this document and of the issues involved at the Peace Conference, I am sure the Parliament and people of Canada will recognize that the place of the Prime Minister at this particular time is overseas looking after this country's interest. My hon. friend will remember that the peace treaty is to be based upon the negotiations that took place prior to the signing of the armistice and which formed part of its terms. These negotiations embodied President Wilson's fourteen points, one of these relates to the economic relations between the nations parties to the league and the enemy nations. Is it conceivable that negotiations should be going on in Paris touching questions of economic policy that will affect Canada as one of the signatories to the league and Canada not be represented or her interests safeguarded? I venture to say that no hon. member will say that Canada should not be represented. It is a great honour to Canada that she should be represented at this conference. It is an immeasurably more important conference than that of 1814,—that was a conference only of the nations of Europe. This is a conference not only of the nations of Europe, but of the nations of Asia, Africa, America, and of the islands of the sea; some thirty distinct nations are there represented. It means the redrawing of the maps of Europe, Asia and Africa, and determining the form of government of many of the islands of the sea. It means arriving at decisions that will affect the whole course of human history in the days that lie before us. No conference could gather whose decisions would have more weight, or in which it is more important that Canada should be represented. Canada should be just as influential in the settling of the terms of peace as she was in bringing the war to a victorious conclusion.

I mentioned a moment ago the situation in Russia. A veil of mystery appears to cover that great country, and no one can predict with certainty what the outcome will be. But there are one or two facts of which we here should not be ignorant. Some discussion has taken place in this House in reference to Bolshevism and what it means. I hold in my hand the fundamental law of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic, and I think the members of the House will be glad to know some of the fundamental laws upon which the Bolshevik government is founded. When the Bolsheviki came into power the Constituent Assembly was about to meet, an assembly that had been elected on a democratic basis representing the whole people of Russia. When the Bolsheviki found that the Assembly would not carry out their views and probably would not maintain them in power, they immediately dissolved the Assembly. Some of its members who were not prepared to consent to the dissolution of the Assembly fled for their lives, and some were killed on the spot. The Bolsheviki followed this up by providing for the disarmament of all people in Russia, other than their own followers, under the most severe penalty. On the other hand they armed their own followers. So the position was that the partisans of the Bolsheviki had arms and the others had not. Now, what is the object of this government? Article 9 provides:

"The principal aim of the Constitution of the Russian Socialist Federal Soviet Republic in the present transitory period is to establish the dictatorship of the city and rural proletariat and of the poorest elements of the peasantry in the form of a powerful All-Russian Soviet government for the purpose of completely suppressing the capitalist class, of abolishing the exploita-

tion of man by man and of establishing Socialism, under which there will be no division of society, into classes, nor any power of state.

This is a frank declaration that their object is to establish the dictatorship of the proletariat. Under this term they include only those who work with their hands, all other classes are absolutely excluded from participation in the government. The farmer who employs even one man in order to make profit out of his work is looked upon as belonging to the capitalist class and is excluded. It is simply the old autocracy inverted—it was a government by bureaucrats, it is now a government by a different class. It denies the fundamental principle of democracy that every citizen is entitled to a voice in the government of his country. They have confiscated all the land, without compensation, and turned it over to the workingmen and tillers of the soil, each man being limited to the area he could actually work. They confiscated all furniture, agricultural implements and farm stock. They took all factories out of the hands of their owners and turned them over to the workmen and soldiers. They repudiated the national debt, due not only foreign powers but even loans made by their own people. They do not believe in capital, and so do not recognize obligations to any person who has loaned money to their government. If they had a victory loan in Russia even the holders of these bonds would find the debt repudiated.

Mr. Speaker, it will be of interest to the people of Canada to know that one of their first acts was the establishment of compulsory military service throughout the whole of the Russian Empire. They established universal, obligatory, military service and they say that the honourable privilege of defending the revolution is reserved for the toilers while upon the non-working elements other military duties are imposed. They impose compulsory military service and the only men who are permitted to bear arms are the workers while the others must perform other military service. They also established obligatory labour service. You may say there is something to be said in favour of that. They suppressed, and took over, the whole of the press of the country.

Some hon. MEMBERS Oh, oh.

Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friends seem to be very anxious to get the press. Evidently they have not received as much support from the press as they desire But, Mr. Speaker, it is hardly necessary to go farther to point out the character of the Government which has been established and the principles upon which it is based. They have abolished all private ownership of property. They have abolished the right of a man to own his own home, the home is the basis upon which our Anglo-Saxon civilization rests. What is much more serious is that they have treated woman as a chattel. They have permitted divorce on any terms; a man can turn away his wife for any reason and for no reason, and power has been officially granted to the local Soviets to deal with the relations of the sexes. In many of the Soviets in Russia and some in Siberia they have nationalized woman and she is the common property of any man, or men who wish to take advantage of this provision of the law. It is this uprooting of civilization, this desecration and defilement of womanhood, this confiscation of property that is developing in Russia to-day.

If the Russian people wish that form of government in preference to the old autocracy and if they confine their operations to the limits of their own territory possibly it would not be open to us to object. But they do not confine their operations to their own country. They boldly proclaim that the faith they are preaching must prevail throughout the world. They are seeking to spread this propaganda among all the nations of the world and they boldly tell us that the time will come when Bolshevism will be universally accepted. That is the gravest menace to the world's peace and ordered civilization that we face to-day.

Undoubtedly this is one of the reasons why it is most important to expedite the closing of the Peace Conference, in order that there may be an established government in Germany with which to conclude peace and in order that there may be a government in Germany, after peace is concluded, that may combat Bolshevism. If the dykes between Germany and Russia are broken down, if Bolshevism spreads through Germany it may sweep through Europe as the Tartars overran Europe in the Middle Ages. Who knows whether it will stop there or whether it will not cross the Atlantic? That is one of the gravest problems which the Peace Conference must face. It is to be earnestly hoped that some solution will be found at the Peace Conference which will avert this menace to our humanity.

One word more and I shall conclude. It was my privilege last summer to visit

our troops at the front and see something of the courage and the achievements of these brave men. I would not be true to myself this afternoon if I did not as a layman pay my humble tribute to that great Canadian, and gallant soldier, Lieut.-General Sir Arthur Currie, under whose leadership the Canadian corps won such imperishable glory and struck great blows for liberty and peace. I shall not discuss the events of the past summer, but I want to say—and I am sure that my colleagues who were with me will join me in saying it,—that we never met a man who was more deeply concerned about the welfare of his men than was General Sir Arthur Currie. We never met a man who took greater precautions for the protection and safety of his troops. They were always expected to attain the objective that they were asked to attain, but he took all precautions to see that they did it with the least possible loss of life. This can be said for the Canadian corps under General Currie: They took every objective they were asked to take, and they took some of these objectives when others had failed. In August they drove through the German lines in front of Amiens and turned the Germans back toward the Rhine. The German High Command knew that they might be compelled to retire behind the Hindenburg line, but they were confident that once they were behind this system of defence no Allied force could break through and no Allied foot would stand within those impregnable defences. It was General Currie and his men who pierced the Drocourt-Queant switch of the Hindenburg line, and the Canadian soldiers stood upon the soil which Germany had considered inviolate. The piercing of this line gave to our war-weary humanity the hope that the war might really end this year, and that peace might speedily come to this war-cursed world. They fought their way through to Mons in a succession of victories unsurpassed in the history of the war.

The Canadian people will never be able to repay the lasting debt of gratitude that they owe to that brave Canadian soldier, untrained in the arts of war, who stood side by side with the best generals of Europe against the most powerful military machine that the human mind has conceived, or that the human hand has constructed, and under whose leadership the enemy were always driven back. We pay our tribute of respect to that gallant soldier, and we hope he may speedily finish the work committed to his care and return with his brave troops to Canada. The Canadian people eagerly await their coming, and we will give them the whole-hearted welcome their courage, their sacrifice and their achievements so richly deserve.

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (North Waterloo): Mr. Speaker, although much has been said, and eloquently said, of the life and achievements of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, I desire to pay my modest tribute to the great Canadian. The outstanding feature of his remarkable personality was his ardent desire for national unity and his effort to weld the Canadian people together and to inspire in them a national consciousness that will have no regard for race or creed. Coming as I do from a constituency which is populated very largely by those who, like his own people, are not of the predominating majority in this country, I appreciate with peculiar feeling his broad tolerance and his generous conception of what constitutes Canadianism. That, I think, will be the most enduring monument to the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

I desire to congratulate the hon. gentleman who has been chosen to succeed him. Sir, I think that his Scottish parents must have had some prevision of the honour which was to come to their son when they named him, and I trust that he may prove another Daniel come to judgment.

I also desire to thank the ex-Minister of Militia for the kind words which he uttered of the German-Canadian boys who fought in the war. When he said that those lads fought just as courageously as did those of any other racial origin, I knew that what he said was true, but I received his words with a depth of gratitude which he perhaps cannot appreciate, and for this reason: A racial prejudice has been allowed to grow up amongst us in this country, which is not what we were accustomed to, and which is not consistent with the spirit of British fair play which always prevailed heretofore. I would further say with regard to the acts of the ex-Minister of Militia that whereas he has his faults, as we all have, and is perhaps not a diplomat, he did after all, at one time in this country, in the early history of the war provide the driving force which I think no other man could have displayed in the same degree as he did. I further say that if he had not been interfered with by the Prime Minister of this country in the matter of recruiting, conscription would never have been thought of.

I listened, Mr. Speaker, with a great deal of interest to the address of the President of the Privy Council. It was a very learned discourse, and parts of it, perhaps, some

of us followed with difficulty, but, judging from the questions which were put to him, I think that possibly there is just a little misgiving on the part of members of the House as to whether Canada will properly retain her autonomy in the scheme which he has outlined. He laid considerable stress on one feature which did not appeal very strongly to me, and that was that it was rather epoch-making to find that the Prime Minister of Canada may in future be able to communicate direct with the Prime Minister of England instead of through the Colonial Office. Surely that is is a matter of mere detail. I am reminded of the time when, in my own city of Kitchener, or, as it was at that time, the city of Berlin, we did not have free mail delivery; we had to go to the post office to obtain our mail, which was a roundabout way of getting it. Now it is carried to our doors. It is just a matter of greater convenience but brings about exactly the same result.

Since the Union Government has come into existence, a good many of us have been curious as to what model they have taken for some of the legislation which they have enacted. Since the President of the Privy Council has read from a booklet, the Constitution of the Bolsheviki, which I understand, is forbidden by Order in Council, our eyes have been opened. First of all he read that the Bolsheviki had compulsory military service just like the Union Government. He went on to say that they had obligatory labour laws, and I wonder whether that is the origin of the Order in Council "Work or fight." The press, he likewise stated, was suppressed, and I could not but feel that we could draw a parallel between some of the enactments of the Bolsheviki and the War-time Elections Act. The President of the Privy Council stated that the Bolsheviki gave guns only to their own people, just as the Union Government, or the Borden Administration gave the ballots to its own supporters through the War-time Elections Act.

I listened to the speech of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) who spoke of the light in the window and the latch on the outside of the door. For my part I think I would use that lamp in the window for the proper purpose for which lamps are intended. Personally I would take that lamp out of the window. Those who may have strayed away from the house, I think, know the way back very well, and may be left to find it for themselves at the proper time. But the hon. member for Red Deer did not like the metaphor of the lamp and the latch-string. He rather fancied himself as a young lady who was receiving the attentions of two ardent swains. He rather enjoyed the experience, and thought he would wait for some time until he should finally make up his mind. There is an old saying in another language, which I cannot repeat in the vernacular, that under conditions of this kind the young lady may say at the outset, "Which one shall I take?" but overnight the question may revert to, "Which one will take me?" Further, Mr. Speaker, in these practical times, even young ladies have an eye to the main chance, and it may be that sometimes they postpone their decision in order that they may seize the opportunity of taking a peep into Duns or Bradstreets, to find out which of the two suitors can give her the best of the things of this world. Now, Mr. Speaker, I would not for one moment suggest that the hon. member for Red Deer was not entirely sincere when he stated that his reason for remaining on the other side of the House is entirely that of the national interest. I do not say so, and I believe that he was just as sincere when he made the statement in question as when he pronounced that magnificent and eloquent eulogy upon his old friend our late leader, the Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. But if it were otherwise we on this side, would admit at once that we cannot compete with the other side at all. We have very little to give, so that perhaps after all the young lady from Red Deer might as well make her decision at once, place her reluctant hand in that of the hon. gentleman from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt), and getting off that picket fence—which must be very uncomfortable and which they are said to be straddling together—might say to him in the words of Ruth:

> Whither thou goest I will go, thy people shall be my people, thy God, my God. Where thou diest I will die and there will I be buried.

I heard also the other day the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder). He appeared perfectly sincere in every way, and I for one would say nothing whatever in criticism of a man who feels that his national duty keeps him on the other side of the House. But I would say to him that if he feels, as he apparently does, that he should keep his former Liberal principles in cold storage for another season, that he be very, very careful that they do not perish in the rarified atmosphere in which they are now living.

The hon. minister invites suggestions, criticism and some indications as to the tem-

per of the people throughout this country. If he is absolutely sincere, and I do not doubt that he is, and if the Government desire to get information as to the temper of the people of Canada, I have a suggestion to make: There is in this country, a constituency known as North Ontario. There is another known as Glengarry, there is another known as Assiniboia, and unfortunately another in the city of Quebec. Two of these constituencies have been disfranchised for almost a year. I would suggest to the Government, through you, Mr. Speaker, that they bring on the by-elections in these constituencies, and I think they will get some indication as to what the people think.

Moreover, this House has not met for a period of nine months. That is altogether too long an interval between sessions of Parliament in a country that claims to have democratic institutions. I believe that, especially in war time, the members of this Parliament should be more frequently called together in order that they may give to the members of the Government the benefit of their views and advice. A fabled character of old received renewed strength whenever he touched earth; so might the Government of this country more accurately determine the wishes and the feelings of the people whose servants they are supposed to be by calling together in Parliament the representatives of those people.

I was interested a few evenings ago in reading upon the screen in a theatre in this city these words: "In days long ago, when men wore long hair, narrow trousers and narrower minds, there were placed upon the statute books many laws which have never been repealed." I thought to myself: surely history repeats itself. They must have had a Union Government in those days, because, Sir, we have laws on the statute book, placed there by virtue of Orders in Council, which, at least four months after the termination of the war, ought to be repealed. They are now obsolete; there is no longer any occasion for them. In fact, this Parliament might very well consider the repealing of the law which gave those powers to the Government, the War Measures Act.

What I am now going to speak of has been already dealt with at length, but it is something that should be mentioned again and again, because eternal vigilance is the price of liberty. That is the return of responsible government. We have a shackled press. Even Parliament can be gagged, because there was an Order in Council—I do not know whether or not it has bene repealed—under which the Speaker of the House might strike out of Hansard anything which he did not desire to have inserted in that publication. I am quite sure that our Speaker would do nothing of that kind, but the power is there, and it should not be there.

An innumerable number of publications, indiscriminately selected, were banned by Order in Council. I know whereof I speak, because I made inquiries in the matter and some of those of whom I inquired did not even know the nature of the publications which had been placed upon the proscribed list. Men were forbidden to use that strongest weapon which they have for their own protection, the privilege of striking. Free speech was not permitted at public meetings.

Another thing that I would like to mention, which, perhaps, will not meet with the approval of the House, is this: I am not a socialist, but I do not believe that it was either wise or fair to restrict socialist publications and the right of free speech as they were restricted, so long as the members of the organizations in question confined their discussion and propaganda to constitutional means and deprecated the use of violence in bringing about that which they desired to obtain. I do not think that that is wise. You cannot cure a sore merely by covering it; you simply drive the infection farther in, the whole system is poisoned, and the trouble will re-appear in aggravated form later on. If these men were allowed to meet and conduct their activities in a proper way, surely the Canadian people would see any fallacies if any characterized their views, and the evil would correct itself. If, on the contrary, they are suppressed, the result is what has often happened before; suppression merely aggravates the evil; it does not cure it.

Some of our magistrates—this may not be the direct result of Orders in Council, but I believe it is the direct result of the spirit that has been engendered throughout Canada by the arbitrary action of the Union Government—have convicted innocent men —I have called them "two-by-four magistrates"—absolutely without evidence and without giving them an opportunity of defending themselves or being represented by counsel. May I also express the view—it may not meet with favour on all sides, but I believe it to be the correct one—that there should be no law now, and never should have been, under which the man who obeyed his conscience so far as military service was concerned was sentenced to a long term of imprisonment. I do not see

what possible good could come from it. They are not criminals, but by associating them with criminals for a year or two or three years we simply destroy what is good in those men, who, after all, were trying to do their duty as they saw it. Any conscientious objectors who are still confined in prison—I know there are some—should be released at once. I agree with the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) that a much better method of dealing with military defaulters might be found than by confining them in the jails of this country.

We have to face three particularly great problems, and I shall give them in the reverse order, as I see it, of their difficulty of solution. The first is reconstruction; the second is the enormous debt which we have to carry; the third is the problem of allaying the unrest that prevails throughout Canada. Reconstruction I have placed first; I do not believe that that should be a very difficult matter to deal with. Surely every one will agree that the returned men, the maimed men, should be generously provided for. All others who by reason of their being away have lost opportunities, should have that made up to them. I do not think it should be a very difficult matter to provide for the assimilation of the 250,000 or 300,000 men that are to return to this country. In the years gone by, when immigration was at its height, Canada assimilated from 200,000 to 300,000 men who were not conversant with our conditions and who had to be assimilated into something entirely new to them. That is not the case with the returned soldiers.

The Minister of Public Works (Hon. F. B. Carvell) told us the other evening that the debt of Canada is now $2,000,000,000, which represents a financial burden of something like $250 to be carried by each man, woman and child in the country. We have to deal with that. In passing I would like to draw the attention of the House to what I felt at the time was a tremendous waste not only of money, but of patriotic feeling. The Government expended hundreds of thousands of dollars during the last Victory Loan campaign in newspaper advertising in endeavouring to induce the people to realize that they had a patriotic duty to perform in buying Victory Bonds. When they had accomplished their purpose and the people came with open hands offering of their substance to the country, the Government instead of making use of that opportunity, threw it away and made of it merely a cold financial proposition. They made the bonds tax free. I do not think that that appealed to one man out of twenty of the ordinary working people of Canada. Indeed, they hardly knew what tax free bonds meant. The exemption from taxation feature did not mean very much to them, anyway; nor did these people care particularly. I think those bonds might have been issued at par at 5 per cent interest. In the fervour of their patriotic feelings, I believe the people would have bought bonds issued at 5 per cent. They were not in a calculating mood; they were in a patriotic mood, and if those bonds had been placed at 5 per cent, and this one-half per cent had been saved, this country would have saved for a generation or two at least $10,000,000 a year in interest.

There is waste in the public service. I have made some inquiries, and I am told that this Government has followed the Biblical injunction, and has made two civil servants flourish where one grew before. To bear this out, we have had the report in connection with the Printing Bureau. I should like to say that I think the report with regard to the Printing Bureau ought to be a hint to the members of the Government to make a like investigation into all the other departments, and they will probably find something of a similar nature.

The other evening the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) made a suggestion with which I could not agree. He stated that in order to make up the deficit of $125,000,000 with which we are faced, the Income Tax should operate on higher levels and also on lower levels. I quite agree with him in his first suggestion, that the Income Tax on the higher incomes must be raised, but when he states that the Income Tax should be applied to incomes of $1,000, and perhaps less, I do not agree with him at all. An income of $1,000 is not equivalent to more than $500 a few years ago. If a working man gets a thousand dollars a year, what surplus has he, if he has five or six growing children to support under the present conditions of the high cost of food, clothing, rent and everything else in proportion? When the minister said that he proposed to tax these people in order that they might feel that they were helping to pay the taxes, I had no sympathy whatever with that. The workingman of this country has a very heavy load to bear now, and he is to-day bearing more than his share of the taxes. Last year this Parliament adopted what I thought was a picayune policy of placing a tax on matches and tobacco and some other commodi-

ties. That tax on matches and tobacco was the essence of inefficiency because for every dollar that was taken from the purchaser, only fifty cents reached the national treasury. A box of matches that cost five cents a package now sells for fifteen cents, and of the increase of ten cents, the Government obtains only five cents. But that tax is paid largely by the workingman. He is also taxed whenever he patronizes that one little luxury he has, the moving picture theatre. He is taxed when he buys medicine in the drug store, and the Government makes the druggist its collector by compelling him to affix a stamp every time a bottle of medicine is sold. What is the reward that is given to him by the Government? The druggist is rewarded by having spotters placed upon his trail, and whenever perhaps an inexperienced clerk fails to put a stamp upon a bit of camphorated chalk, or something like that, he is haled to the court and fined fifty dollars. If that method of taxation must be continued, I would suggest that the onus be placed upon the manufacturer of affixing the stamp to the article, thus saving a good deal of trouble and inconvenience.

5 p.m.

All of us, no matter what walk of life we may be in, have to lick stamps. A stamp has to be affixed to every cheque, note or draft, or any other kind of commercial paper which is used in this country. While I realize that a very large revenue is probably obtained from that source, I believe it is a primitive method of taxation, something like the window tax in the old days. I am sure, if men could express their views, they would much prefer that some other direct form of taxation be adopted that would not vex and worry them at every turn.

The other day the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) made a peculiar remark. He stated that a certain titled gentleman from Toronto owns the Union Government. I did not believe that, and as that gentleman has since denied the charge—

Mr. McMASTER: His offspring.

Mr. EULER:—denied his offspring, if you like, and as no denial of the charge has come from the other side of the bargain, perhaps we may assume that the statement is only partially true and that only one-half of the Government are owned by the gentleman from Toronto. If that be true, the suggestion that I am about to make will not meet the approval of the Government. Sir Joseph Flavelle, it was stated, had made $100,000,000 during the war. He has since denied that. But no man, no matter how able he may be, can earn $100,000,000, or $50,000,000, or $10,000,000, or $1,000,000. If he happens to accumulate that much money, he is simply appropriating the product of the labour of others. The suggestion I was going to make is that the Government might very well consider the imposition of a very heavy succession tax. That is not a new idea, and I know the province of Ontario is imposing a succession tax, although not a heavy one. I submit there would be no injustice under a law whereby the State would take a substantial part of large fortunes upon the death of the owner, leaving a reasonable amount for the surviving members of the family. Thus the people would receive back their own, that which is really the product of their own labour.

Thus when the time comes for this titled gentleman from Toronto to be gathered to his fathers, I believe the people of Canada, from coast to coast would approve if some seventy-five or eighty million dollars were restored to the people who created it in the first instance. That is a practical suggestion for the consideration of the Government.

The other day the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) made a statement with which I entirely agree and in which there is a world of truth. He stated that wars will never cease until the ethical influences operate in the hearts of men of all races. I believe that to be absolutely true. That can be applied also to what is to-day after all the greatest question that we have to settle in Canada or in any other country. I refer to the matter of the existing unrest throughout this country and the rest of the world. When you analyse conditions and the causes of things, you will find that there is one great cause for wars, and for restlessness of all kinds. It is the quality of human selfishness. That is all. That is the quality that permeates all classes and races of men and brings about wars, disagreements and troubles. Under the conditions under which we live, selfishness is the absolutely logical result. Where men do not know what the future will bring forth, whether they will have enough to subsist on in the years to come, there is only one thing for them to do, and that is to grasp as much as each one can, and "The devil take the hindmost." That is the condition in which we live to-day.

That cannot be overcome except by long years of ethical training. In the meantime the Government can certainly do something

to bring about the desired result. One broad principle may be laid down. Labour must receive a greater portion of that which it produces. Consciously or unconsciously, Labour demands, I think, three things: First, personal and individual liberty, and it is going to get that if it has to fight for it. Secondly, a comfortable living, and surely it is entitled to that. Canada is rich enough to keep all in comfort, and I think that an eight-hour day is long enough, if the working man uses those eight hours to good advantage. Third, it desires some sort of security for the future. Is it too much to expect the Government to remove from the minds of everybody, and particularly from the minds of the working people, that great haunting fear of the future? I am certain that in the minds of all there is a fear that they may not be able to produce enough to maintain themselves and their dependents in the coming years. If this means the introduction of old age pensions, pensions for unemployment, and pensions for widows and mothers, I for one am ready to support any legislation in that direction. It is necessary also that men should be educated and the right men fitted to the right jobs.

In conclusion, I am going to refer to a matter which has been touched on by some hon. members, notably by those of the city of Toronto. I refer to the alien question. I am sure that even a number of enemy aliens in this country have received less than justice at times. I shall take the liberty of reading a short extract on this question from a Conservative newspaper that supported the Union Government in the last election. It embodies my view:

> Summed up, the matter of the alien citizens stands: We induced them to come here and wield our picks and shovels; we allowed them to live how and where they pleased; we made no attempt to prepare them for the duties and responsibilities of citizenship and since the war, have accentuated rather than relieved the disabilities under which they are labouring.
>
> We in effect say: "You cannot now become a naturalized citizen and where you have been, we suspend your rights, duties and privileges; we pass laws which declare that if you are under 60 years of age you either must work or go to jail; when you are industrious, we regret exempting you from military service and envy the wages you draw. If you show signs of prosperity and live in Toronto you are likely to have your places of business raided and your property destroyed, and take a long chance of being able to collect any damages, because you were born in an alien land.
>
> There is not one alien among a thousand, unless he live in Toronto, who would return of his own accord to Europe. They came to Canada to work, to make a home and rear a family in a land where liberty, justice and opportunity are said to exist and may be shared in by whomsoever will.
>
> There probably is not one alien in ten thousand, who has lived here long enough to get a hair cut, and who having come from an enemy country several years before the war, would knowingly do anything to aid or comfort the enemy.
>
> This paper holds the opinion that every alien who is industrious and law-abiding should be given a square deal and assisted to become a Canadian citizen. The Allies generally have adopted President Wilson's slogan: "Make the world safe for democracy." In its application is it to be confined to Europe or will Canadians take some of their own medicine?
>
> Even the Yanks can set us a good example in the treatment of aliens matter. They are naturalizing them on every hand and opening schools for instruction in English and the inculcation of the principles of American citizenship.

I now pass to another phase of this question. There are men in Canada to-day who are called aliens who, to all intents and purposes, are good citizens, but technically have no country at all. In the county of Waterloo, the northern riding of which I have the honour to represent, and also in Perth, Huron, Renfrew and perhaps elsewhere there are living many people who came from Germany from twenty-five to fifty years ago. Many of them have taken the oath of allegiance and have always regarded themselves as citizens. Unfortunately, however, many of them have not taken out naturalization papers, which it is necessary for them to do in order to become full-fledged British subjects and Canadian citizens. This difficulty has been aggravated, in our riding at all events, by the fact that in past elections neither of the two political parties has challenged the voter on the score of nationality; there was a sort of compact in regard to that. When the war came these people who had lived in Canada many years and considered themselves British subjects found themselves denied the right of protection which citizenship ought to give. The matter was brought up in the House of Commons in 1917 and Sir Robert Borden recognized the justice of their claim for naturalization. On that occasion he stated in the House that an Order in Council had been passed under which these people could be naturalized during the war under certain conditions. I quote from the Order in Council:

> The Minister observes further that many persons of alien enemy origin who came to Canada many years ago, during infancy, and have grown up believing themselves to be British subjects, now that questions of nationality are being carefully scrutinized, find it impossible to show that they have become British subjects although they have voted and held municipal positions for many years. Many others believe that they became British subjects through naturalization of their parents, but they are unable to prove it because the records are not available.

The Prime Minister stated that the Order in Council empowered the Secretary of State to issue naturalization certificates to people who complied with its terms. The election came immediately afterwards and nothing then was done in this matter. Immediately after the election, early in 1918, some ninety-three residents of the city of Kitchener made application for naturalization under the terms of this Order in Council. They presented their case through the proper channels, and in all cases recommendation was made by the local judge that they were worthy of receiving naturalization, but this was refused by the Government at Ottawa.

Mr. MURPHY: The election was over then.

Mr. EULER: Yes, but I should make one exception. Although these people who had been in the country from twenty-five to fifty years and had all voted were denied naturalization, one man received naturalization who was an alien enemy. This man, living in the city of Kitchener, came directly to this country from Germany fifteen years ago, and he applied for and received naturalization on January 12th of last year although he did not come under the terms of the Order in Council at all. He knew he was not a Canadian. There was no possibility of a misconception in his case.

He had not lived here very long. He had had opportunities to become naturalized, but had not taken advantage of them. That man who had been here fifteen years and did not come under the terms of the Order in Council was given naturalization by the Union Government, and all the others, many of whom had lived in Canada 50 years, did not receive it.

An hon. MEMBER: Why?

Mr. EULER: I was just going to mention that. The reason was—that the recommendation made by the one who was responsible stated that he was a good supporter of the Union Government. While this discrimination has been practised against the people of Kitchener, I find in the annual report of the Secretary of State a list of all who were naturalized during the year 1917, and among them there were 471 Austrians, 43 Germans, and 2 Turks. Nobody from the riding I have the honour to represent is included, unless he stated that he had supported the Union Government. Surely these men ought to be given naturalization.

I had not intended to make any personal reference, but a remark made by the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) must be my excuse for the statement I am about to make. In giving the names of members of this House who had sons at the front, he gave my own, and in his remarks he said that he did not know whether Mr. Euler had German blood in his veins or not. Mr. Speaker, I have only contempt for the men who will deny his father, or his racial origin. I want to say that the blood that flows in my veins is exactly the same kind of blood that courses in the veins of every other hon. member in this House. It is not English, it is not French, it is not German; it is Canadian. Now, I want to speak so plainly that there can be no misapprehension. The man who is my father came from Germany at the age of two and a half years, long before Confederation, and has lived in this country for nearly seventy-five years, and, what is much more important, he is to-day just as good a Canadian as is his grandson, who is still carrying arms overseas.

An hon. MEMBER: A volunteer.

Mr. EULER: Yes, he was not conscripted. I make this personal reference only for one reason—to give force to my plea for men, who, I think, have not been given justice such as we are accustomed to. We have here people without a country, and in order to express what I mean with regard to them I will read what I wrote to the Secretary of State in connection with this matter, which never received any consideration at the hands of the Union Government:—

> I would like to ask on behalf of these men careful re-consideration. They are in a most unfortunate position through no fault of their own. To-day with the loyal desire to be technically as well as morally, citizens of Canada they have no country and no legal claim to the protection which citizenship ought to provide. Let the Government make all diligent investigation, before granting naturalization, and they will find that the large majority of these men are thoroughly worthy. Recognition of that fact will make for harmony and for the loyalty and true national feeling which a government should make easy rather than difficult.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): Mr. Speaker, when I decided to intervene in this discussion it was at a very much earlier stage of the debate, and there were many things I had in mind to refer to which have since been dealt with by other speakers. There still remain, however, a few things which I would like to deal with briefly. I was struck with the chorus of approval which met the words of the mover and the seconder of the Address, and it occurred to me when I listened to the high tone of their speeches that the people of

Canada are much more to be congratulated than are these young men themselves. As one who has observed the trend of parliamentary life for the last thirty years or more, formerly in the Press gallery, I recall the nature of the speeches usually delivered by movers and seconders of the Address in the old days. I am obliged to confess that they were characterized by an obsequiousness and laudation of the Government that was almost nauseating. Now, as a result of the abolition in this country of party politics and the bitter partisanship which means division among the people, we hear a chorus of applause when young men like the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) and the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) speak of service to their country and indulge in sentiments honourable alike to themselves, to this House, and to Canada. I repeat, it is a matter for congratulation to the country that we have come to a time when utterances of such character are recognized and applauded as they deserve to be.

I think it is only fair to say that the new sentiment that has arisen in Canada is due to the fact that we have abolished the old partisan lines which divided this country for forty or fifty years. While this change was brought about primarily by the war, it has been made more complete by the coalition of leaders on both sides, representatives of the old Liberal and Conservative parties joining together to accomplish a great object for the country's good. This cannot fail to have an important effect upon the people, and indeed that effect is already apparent. While much criticism has been indulged in at the expense of this Government as to the results of food control and matters of that kind which are not really fundamental, it is my deliberate conviction that the great body of the people have become possessed of the idea that they will have nothing to do with the old partisan ideals, and shibboleths which have been such a curse to the country in the past. I participated in a function in Winnipeg quite recently which was attended by prominent representatives of the old political parties. As I listened to the Tuppers, the Ashdownes, the Isaac Campbells, the Macdonalds, the Bullmans, and the Fowlers, one after the other, expressing great regret for what had occurred in the past and expatiating upon the evils which had come to this country by virtue of the old partisanship, I was obliged to raise my eyes like the patriarch of old and say: "Lord, now lettest thou Thy servant depart in peace, for mine eyes have seen Thy salvation."

That is the spirit of the Canadian people at the present time. Although Union Government cannot go on forever, like Tennyson's brook, one must believe that it is a Government which will live. In my judgment, it will live. I believe that a strong party will be evolved from it which will continue to influence the destinies of the country. The death knell of partisanship as practised by the old parties has been sounded. Partisanship, in my judgment, is as dead as Julius Caesar. We can raise our eyes to heaven and thank God for that.

I have been a student of politics in Canada for the last thirty or forty years, and I have endeavoured to study the two parties. I co-operated with the Liberal party in the old days. I learned my Liberalism at the feet of George Brown, Alexander Mackenzie, Mowat, Blake, and other great Liberal leaders. I also was much impressed by the career of Sir John Thompson, who, although he was not a Liberal, was a great man. As I say, I co-operated with the Liberal party. As the publisher of a newspaper it kept me busy keeping out of the clutches of the law denouncing the old Tory crown and their iniquities in the old days. I was perfectly sincere about it.

I would like to pay tribute to the work of the old Liberals, Baldwin, Lafontaine, Papineau and William Lyon Mackenzie, whose name I always take upon my lips with reverence. We know the fight these men had for responsible government, for the abolition of the clergy reserves, for representation by population, and we know that Lyon Mackenzie was exiled from his country for years and that he spent many weeks with scarcely a bite to eat because he suffered for his principles. We know that when amnesty was proclaimed he crept back to his country a broken old man and was allowed to die in obscurity. When we study the history of our public men and of our politics we must remember the name of William Lyon Mackenzie with reverence. We must understand that we owe a great debt of gratitude to him. The Liberals of the olden days had in their ranks some great men whose patriotism is to be admired.

I had the impression that when their successors in the Liberal party of Canada came into office in 1896 that the ills under which the country was suffering would be cured and that the millennium would be ushered in. I felt that Canada's face would be turned towards paradise and that the long

promised reign of righteousness would be brought into existence. I had learned at the feet of those Liberal statesmen to believe that the tariff was bleeding the people until they were white. Indeed, I had listened to the declarations of all the Liberal leaders on this question in the old days. I had seen the blue blood course through the bald head of Sir Richard Cartwright as I was sitting in the Press gallery listening to his denunciation of a total annual expenditure by the Dominion of $37,000,000 as a shame and a disgrace. He said it meant the ruin of the people. The first year of the so called Liberal Administration the expenditure for civil government was increased to the enormous sum of eighty millions. I had heard the appointment of members of Parliament to office denounced as an outrage. I had heard the Senate cursed from Dan to Beersheba, and we were told that if we put the Liberals in office all these things would be corrected. But they were not. I remember going to one of the leaders of the party who had taught me the principles of Liberalism, and I remember protesting to him with great earnestness as a young man that the policy and platform of the Liberal party should be adhered to. I remember saying to him in my childish way—because I was quite young then—that Providence had raised him up to be a great leader in the Liberal party so that he might have it in his power to do a good turn to the people of Canada and set a new ideal before them. I said to him: I have a desire to assist you in carrying out your programme and doing some good to the people of Canada; if you will do this, you will have my devoted assistance, not only in everything that my paper can do in helping you along the line of lifting the people out of the slough of political despond in which they have been wallowing for all these years, but my personal help also. What do you suppose was the answer to me, and I have often wondered if the same answer had been given to my young friends from Calgary and Fort William, what they would have thought. This leader of the Liberal party looked at me and said: "Bob, you are too good for this world." I never had any idea that I had a passport for Paradise or that I had all the virtues that would put me there by Limited Express but I had the old-fashioned notion that a platform that was made to get in on should be a platfrom that was made to stand on.

Let us just look for a moment at what the promise was in regard to the tariff. My respected friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) quoted it the other night. I shall take the opportunity of repeating it:

> I submit to you that the ideal fiscal system is the British system of free trade.
>
> Let it be well understood that from this moment we have a distinct issue with the party in power. Their ideal is protection; our ideal is free trade.

Under the administration of the Conservative party that sponsored the National Policy, the average tariff was about 35 per cent. Sir Clifford Sifton and other leaders had gone into the West for years and declared to the farmers that if they understood the iniquity of this thing they never would stand it for a moment. They said: Let us have some other policy. Well, Sir, the tariff was revised in 1897 and what do you suppose, Mr. Speaker, was the reduction? I just put it to you. You are a successful and a wise man and I would like to get an expression of opinion from you privately as to what you really thought of it. I am pleased to see the prophet from Brome (Mr. McMaster) in his place and listening to what I am saying. The old Tory tariff was 35 per cent on the average and the total reduction made by the Liberal Government, according to the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) who was the financial critic for the Conservatives at that time, and whose statement I have never heard challenged, was seventy-one one-hundredths of one per cent.

Now it is true—my hon. friend opposite would interrupt me but I will anticipate him—we had also the British preference. I will give the Liberal government all credit for everything they did; we had the British preference, but 71/100 of one per cent was the reduction in the tariff. I think I could have stood it, I think, perhaps, I could have borne with Christian fortitude the situation, only my friends the Liberals expected me to be pleased about it, to giggle, as it were, over the fact that their pledges had been redeemed. I was perfectly willing to bear with equanimity the situation, but I will be hanged if I was able to laugh over it. I did considerable squirming, and when the Opposition introduced their catch-votes, to catch some of us new members, I naturally, was terrifically uneasy, and I was shooting around trying to get my bearings, but old Doctor Landerkin, a fine old chap, would say: "Oh, stand by your party, R. L. stand by your party; this is the usual thing, just vote it down, and never mind what anybody says." But an agricultural implement resolution was brought up, and inasmuch as I had stumped Lisgar on free implements and the

coal oil issue, promising free coal oil, and inasmuch as I had pledged myself to the hilt that if my leader did not cut out every whit of protection from the tariff I would resign, I voted for one of these catch resolutions, and I found myself in a very awkward position. I was practically tabooed. The Whips, Sir, went about and asked my friends—you know I am a sort of companionable fellow and love friends and fellowship—they asked my friends not to be seen talking to me. They said: "We will have to teach this kind of man a lesson." I went to Sir Richard Cartwright, and he said: "Never mind, my boy, you just go ahead; there will be no reading you out of the Liberal party, you can read us all out of the Liberal party if you choose." I mention this for the benefit of my friend the Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder), with whom I expect to deal later on when I get time. Sir Richard said to me: "There will be no reading you out of the Liberal party." Well, I was not read out of the Liberal party, but I was dynamited out of the party. That is about what happened to me. Talk about a separated brother. There is a church expression about withdrawing communion from a brother, that is if you stray, some of the churches will withdraw communion from you. Well, Sir, they certainly withdrew communion from me. My friends were warned not to be seen with me at all, and I found myself in an exceedingly uncomfortable position. The hon. member for Prince (Mr. Read) referred to an un-named man who had been such an evil influence in this country. I would not like to be the man that was referred to in this way, but this is the man who sent his emissary to me to warn me that if I didn't follow the party I could expect no quarter—neither nomination, nor patronage. Thank God, I had the independence to tell him to go to a much warmer place than I would like to mention this afternoon. I did not ask for their patronage, and I did not ask for the nomination. However, I got a nomination which carried me into Parliament the next time. I dislike to refer to these matters, and I shall only do so very briefly. Although I was elected by a large majority in old constituency, and although I took the Old Bible in my hand and swore that my entire expenses in that riding—and it was about a hundred and fifty miles long by fifty or sixty wide—were within $500, I was the only man elected in the Dominion of Canada that was unseated for bribery and corruption. Men who co-operated with me were given jobs, and hired to give testimony that teams had been hired in my election. Of course, it was a bit of a conspiracy to drive out of public life a man who had dared to call a spade, a spade. I go over these particulars because I want to draw a parallel between the old days, when I am told that even caucus was a mutual admiration society. When the ministers came into caucus, I am told, they were applauded, applauded, and applauded, and that caucus largely consisted in applause by obsequious members of the ministers of the Crown.

The scene has changed, the young men who rose to move and second this Address, and gave expression to the highest ideals, are the young men who to-day are applauded in this House, and who will be loudly applauded in the country. I only refer to my own experience to illustrate the change that has taken place. You see you could not grow public men in this country under such a system. Blake, MacKenzie, and Mowat, they were only occasionals, they were not the regular annual product at all. The political soil in Canada made it impossible to grow statesmen here. After the lesson that had been taught R. L. Richardson no one, for a long time, undertook to exhibit much independence in this House. I was the awful example. I would like to add, that while the judges were considering the verdict on the election petition against me, the organ of the man to whom the member for Prince (Mr. Read) referred the other night, announced that one was to be transferred to the Supreme Court in Ottawa, and the other to be made the Chief Justice in Manitoba. The verdict was given against me, Mr. Speaker, and one man was transferred to the Supreme Court of Canada, and the other received the Chief Justiceship of Manitoba. I hope that in the sphere in which they find themselves at this present hour, they will enjoy the reward of their infamy. For it was infamy to drive out of public life a man who desired to do his duty by the people.

I never could conceive, it passes my comprehension, that public men would enter public life for the purpose of making money and graft out of office. Surely the highest recognition that any man can receive, is the reward of a good conscience in having rendered decent and faithful service to his country. I offer no apology for that declaration. It is the only conclusion that any man who has considered the philosophy of life and who has thought over the goal to which we are all hastening, can come to.

Now, let me return to the Liberal platform. I remember, in addition to the tariff how the appointment of members of Parliament to office was denounced. It was one of the iniquities of the old Tory party, and I thought when the Liberals got into office, "Now everything is pure, everything is correct." Would you believe it, Mr. Speaker,—and I am going to ask you to tell me your opinion privately, because I have a high estimate of your character—would you believe it that in eight years—I have the figures here but I will speak subject to correction—the so-called Liberal Government appointed more members of Parliament to office than their predecessors, whom they so roundly denounced, appointed during their entire administration.

Now, I have referred to the public expenditure, and I have referred to the appointment of members of Parliament to office, and I now come to the Senate. The Senate had been cursed by the Liberals in opposition as a body of old women, as a graveyard, as a political excrescence on the body politic, until there seemed to be nothing left to be said against them. Indeed, on the hustings Liberal speakers exhausted themselves in denouncing the Senate. They would have a girl or a woman at the meeting with an accordion and when the speaker came to speak of the Senate she would sing "They are going down the valley." Of course, they were going down the valley; the Senate was to be either abolished or reformed. But the Senate was continued identically along the same lines by the Liberal Government. When our old friend Bob Watson, of ancient memory, used to stalk about the constituencies in the West and tell the people what the Government had done after the Liberals came into office, somebody would put the question to him: "Say, Bob, tell us about the Senate; what did you do with that?" "Oh," says Bob, with his thumbs under his suspenders, "we have reformed the Senate all right; I am in it"—and that was regarded as the reformation of the Senate.

I could go on indefinitely in this vein, but I am sure that I have gone sufficiently far to convince this House and the country that there is a great deal of difference between a party in opposition and a party in power.

Lest my friends on the other side, and particularly the prophet from Brome (Mr. McMaster) might think I am unduly hard and critical and unfair to the Liberals, let me say this: I have come to the deliberate conviction, after thirty-five years' study, that the difference between the two political parties which held sway in this country is the difference between tweedledum and tweedledee. There never was any difference between them, and that is why I want to quarrel publicly with my friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder), who talked about being read out of the Liberal party. My dear sir, there is not any Liberal party. Yes, there is "the" Liberal party, but there is not "a" Liberal party. Mark the distinction. They have the trademark all right, but I have demonstrated to this House what the practices of that party have been. I think that the member for Brome is perfectly sincere—a great many of them are—and honestly thinks that if his party got into office they would reform the tariff; that they would wipe out every vestige of protection. Not so, my good friend. You have associated with you the Clifford Siftons, the L. M. Joneses and the Billy Patersons and a lot of the people who live, move and have their being in protection—and you just try it some day. When I came down here to Parliament after one election, having stumped the country on a coal oil can, I thought that we would get free coal oil. I used to tell the farmers that the ties of bondage were gone, that they would get their agricultural implements free of duty. And do you know what I found? I found that the question was not whether the duty should be wiped off agricultural implements, but how much it should be increased. L. M. Jones—"old slippery L. M." we used to call him out in Manitoba—was the head of the combine in Canada, and he spent almost an entire Sabbath with me pleading with me to agree to have the duty increased. Now, L. M. is gone; he is not here to offer any defence, and I shall not repeat the conversation; I shall let it go with that statement. Well, I forget what was really done with the duty, but it was left practically as it was, and L. M. Jones was singled out for distinction by the Liberal party; he was made a knight, forsooth, a Knight Commander of the Bath, and died as such.

This is a kind of experience meeting Mr. Speaker and I am putting the cards on the table. I do not want any Liberal to be fooled as I was. I want to be the beacon light—not the one that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) referred to—to warn any simpletons who may think that they can get all they want in reference to the tariff from the Liberal party; and that is why I am taking the position that I do this afternoon.

After the failure to revise the tariff in 1896 save to the extent of seventy-one-one hundredths of one per cent, one would have thought that there would have been an outcry from the Atlantic to the Pacific over the apostacy of the Liberal party—it was not "a" Liberal party; it was the Liberal party. Let me tell you, Sir, that only a handful from one end of this country to the other offered any protest. In fact, they continued to worship Baal, the same God that my friend the prophet from Brome referred to the other evening. I am going to take my friend up to Mount Carmel to-night, if he will come with me, and we shall have a good time offering burnt sacrifices there. Well, had there been any repudiation of the course followed at that time there might have been some hope for the Liberal party. Repudiation—after the tariff had been revised? What do you suppose our friend the master of the Administration, Clifford Sifton, did? He went up to my old town of Perth, a place near which I was born more years ago than I care to confess, and he made a speech in the course of which he said:

> The tariff issue has been solved by the Liberal Government. It has been taken out of the list of issues as between the parties, because the present tariff is one which our opponents would not change much if they were in a position to do so.

Seventy-one-one hundredths of one per cent—and the tariff issue had been solved, taken out of the list of issues; no further quarrelling as between the parties on the tariff issue! As I say, one would have expected an outcry from the Atlantic to the Pacific. But I do not recall that my friend the prophet from Brome took the platform and denounced it. I do not recall that any of my friends who sat on the other side offered one word of protest. The idea, Sir, was to "stand pat," if you will allow me to use the language of the street, and to carry out the apostacy; to destroy or bludgeon any one whose voice was raised against it in this country. It is a reflection upon the people of Canada that that policy was largely carried out.

The Liberal party—I speak of what is left of it, because really the Liberal party is over here. How proud I was, as an old Liberal, to listen to the magnificent speech of the President of the Privy Council (Hon. N. W. Rowell) this afternnon. How pleased we all were to listen to the able deliverance of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Hon. J. A. Calder) a few evenings ago. Those of us who came over here for a principle, to which I hope to allude later, feel that we, in duty to ourselves and to our country, must stand for that principle until it is finally carried out. We are all proud to know that men of the type that I have just mentioned, old Liberals, are happy in this camp—not because it is a Tory camp, because it is not a Tory camp. There is really no essential difference fundamentally between men.

I have co-operated with members on both sides of the House, and I find the same kindness, the same generosity, the same views pretty generally when you get close to men, whether on one side or on the other. Therefore the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) may set his mind at rest, because he will never be read out of a Liberal party. The hon. member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) spoke of keeping his Liberal principles in cold storage. I could not understand what he meant, and I will warrant you, Sir, that if he was put to it he could no more tell what Liberal principles are than he could fly to the moon. The trouble is that, so far as I can see, very few have ever stopped to analyse what Liberalism and Liberal principles are. They talk glibly about them, but they never stop to think. If I were asked what Liberalism meant, I would say that it meant freedom in trade, liberty in religion, and equality in civil rights. We all profess that, and inasmuch as the party on the other side, even led by the prophet from Brome (Mr. McMaster) will not be able to carry out the ideas that he has, he may just as well possess his soul in patience, and he will find it far better quietly and conscientiously to support the good things that the party on this side of the House are giving them because if the men on this side are not able, with the combination that I have dsecribed, to manage the affairs of the country at this critical time—and it is a mighty critical time—no other combination in Canada will be able to do so. There is no doubt about that. My hon. friends opposite would not take office if they could get it. They have nobody to go in with them. The light is in the window on this side, and my hon. friends opposite may all have to flock to it after a little.

The war is over. May we hope that for Heaven's sake the racial and religious cry will be dropped for good! I look fondly for the time when the province of Quebec will be represented as it should be in the Government of this country, and we shall not gain anything by calling each other names. Let us, however, be perfectly candid with each other; state the facts exactly as they are, and when we find a combina-

tion of men willing to do their best to administer the affairs of this country at the critical stage that we are now at, let us give them every assistance we can. I have passed the stage when I regard all or most men with suspicion. It is only the odd man who is to be suspected. Most men are, in my judgment, endeavouring to do the best they can under Heaven, and the Lord knows it is a man's job being a minister of the Crown. He can hardly call his soul his own, let alone his time. The marvel is that men choose such slavery, but they seem to do it. The responsibility is on the country to give the men who are willing to serve the country a fair chance. Let us not treat them with suspicion. Let us not misinterpret their motives and suspect unjustly that their motives are corrupt and not decent. It is that sort of thing that keeps good men out of public life. Self-respecting men will not pay the price of the sacrifice of their self-respect in order to enter the public life of this country, and I do not blame them.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield) (resuming): Mr. Speaker, the adjournment at six o'clock gave me an opportunity of glancing over some notes I had made. It is usually my practice to make elaborate notes and then condense them on an envelope, and then forget all about them until I have finished speaking, and I see that I omitted one or two points this afternoon. I have spoken about the partisan soil of Canada being unable to produce statesmen. I dwelt at considerable length on that very important fact, and I want to emphasize it once more. It is my deliberate conviction, born of close observation, that owing to the partisan feeling, the absolutely silly partisan feeling that passes all understanding which has prevailed in this country for the last thirty or forty years, it has been almost impossible to raise a statesman in this country. If one "happened" it was merely the result of fortuitous circumstance, and if such a one attempted to preach the gospel of service to his country and to take high ground generally, he was usually regarded as a crank and a dangerous man, and promptly relegated to oblivion. Take the case of the Hon. Edward Blake who, in my judgment, is the greatest son Canada ever had. He knocked at the door of his country offering his splendid services for a quarter of a century, and yet, notwithstanding his magnificent ability, notwithstanding his Liberalism and desire for service, the deliberate verdict of this country time after time was "Give us rather Barrabas," and this country has had to some extent a Barrabas after Barrabas, figuratively speaking. Consider for a moment the colossal mistakes that have been made in this country—the hundreds of millions, for instance, that have been poured into the lap of railway exploiters, until to-day we have on our hands an appalling mess which, unless we sail very carefully, may drag the country down. I shall not take the time to-night to recount the tremendous mistakes that have been made. One unfortunate thing is that the moment a man gets a position in this country, whether he be a great man or not, the people of this country place a halo about his head and our newspapers break into fulsome adulation. And yet, men are very much alike. With the exception of yourself, Sir, and a few others that I might name, there are really no great men in Canada to-day. Men are just mediocre, and fulsome adulation simply destroys them. It simply raises opposition against them, and encourages those disposed to criticise to criticise too harshly.

Now that I am on my feet I should like to say a word or two to the Canadian people. I should like them to get rid of the idea that two or three or a dozen men embody all the wisdom of the country. Why, in my judgment, the very best men of the country are excluded from office. They would not pay the price, would not consent to the sacrifice of self-respect, in order to attain a position in public life. You, Sir, I suppose, have been a candidate in many elections, and must have some idea of the methods that have been employed in the past. If you have not, I am sure hon. gentlemen opposite have. Who could get an Edward Blake to run around shaking hands with his constituents and singing such songs as "For you I am praying," accompanying himself on the melodeon as certain hon. gentlemen have done who have gained seats in this House in past years. The methods that have had to be employed, and which I assume are employed to some extent to-day, to get a seat in this House are such as would entirely turn the stomach of the average man, and that is why good men have been excluded from the service of their country. Mackenzie, for instance. How sweet the name Mackenzie sounds in every

Liberal's ear! I do not refer to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. His name may sound very sweet in the ears of the average Liberal, but if he ever gets over to this side of the House—which Heaven forfend!—he will probably discover that his name does not sound so sweet to the average Liberal, and particularly so if he shows any tendency to emulate the example of his noble predecessor, the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, and carries his principles into operation. When I came to this Parliament, an unsophisticated young Liberal, brought up at the feet of Hon. George Brown and Alexander Mackenzie, about twenty-two or twenty-three years ago, I held Alexander Mackenzie in the utmost reverence, and yet I learned that Alexander Mackenzie was really side-tracked by the Liberals. The name Mackenzie did not sound so sweet in the ears of Liberals of those days. The slogan among the Liberals when the Government was organized in 1896 and when we met here was, " For Heaven's sake let us not make the mistakes that Mackenzie made." I am not making a political speech, but just giving historical facts. I am spilling the beans right on the table beside the Mace so that all within hearing may understand the facts. The " mistakes " that Mackenzie made—I will put quotation marks on the word mistakes—were that he stood strictly to his principles. Mackenzie believed as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) believes, and as I believe, that a party which goes to the country on a platform is in duty bound—morally bound, bound in every honourable way—to stand by that platform. Mackenzie believed in low tariff, and staked his political existence on low tariff. He was willing to go down to defeat on low tariff. Like that candidate for the Presidency of the United States, he would sooner be right than be Prime Minister. And let me tell my separated brethren on the other side of the House that the chief heritage which the Liberal party—not " a " Liberal party, but " the " Liberal party—enjoys to-day is that which was bequeathed to them by the Hon. Alexander Mackenzie, who stood to his principles. That is their noblest heritage.

Now, a word on the necessity of cultivating the soil that produces statesmen, who are truly servants of the people. For, after all, there is something worth while in being a public man and serving the State. But, if men who attempt to serve the State are ridiculed out of existence, if communion is withdrawn from them, if they are treated as, in the humble instance of myself I described this afternoon, then you will not raise that type of men in the country. Men will not serve the people if they know that they will be politically destroyed for so doing. I remember in my early days reading an essay by a great historian and philosopher. He was describing a hero, a man who had rendered great service to his country, both in the field of war and in the field of politics, for a period of thirty or forty years, and was recognized and acclaimed for what he had accomplished for the country. And the historian, in summing up his life, said: the great achievement—now, mark the words, for this is worth while—the great achievement of that country was to have produced such a hero, and woe to that country that fails to recognize its heroes, for after a time no hero will appear, nay, no hero will even be born. This, in my judgment, indicates the reason why Canada has not produced the type of men it should have produced for the public life of the country. Frequently I have listened to deliverances by able men who have declared that what Canada needs is a leader, a Joshua. [I am looking at my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), though I have not him in mind.] What Canada needs, they tell us, is a Joshua who will take us out of the wilderness and into the promised land. Now, if the philosophers, or so-called philosophers, had stopped to think for a moment they would have known that it is impossible, and has been for thirty years, for Canada to produce a leader, a Joshua. Your public men are no better, and of necessity cannot be better, than the people. That is why it is so desirable to cultivate ideals, and to cultivate especially the ideal of service. That is why I have been glad to say an encouraging word to the two young men, one of whom moved and the other seconded the Address. I said this afternoon, and I repeat, it is a good sign to see member after member on both sides of the House congratulate these young men upon the noble, patriotic sentiments expressed in their speeches. This laudation of ideals augurs well for the future of the country.

In speaking this afternoon, and making a personal reference to the difficulties I encountered as a Liberal who made an attempt, however feeble, to stand by his ideals, I neglected to say what I never had opportunity to say before, but which I am glad to say now. I take advantage of this

opportunity to bear testimony to the kindness that was shown to me by the late Dalton McCarthy, and the late Hon. N. Clarke Wallace, who wrote an open letter on my behalf to the people of Canada. I wanted to pay that tribute, and I think it only right that I should do so.

Let me offer a word of advice to my friends of the so-called Liberal party on the other side. If they seriously think of obtaining office, if they have any serious notion that the people of Canada will be willing to place the administration of public affairs in their hands, I would suggest that they join heartily in assisting the powers that be to carry out all measures that make for the good of the country. The responsibility of citizenship is something, I think, the people of Canada are apt to lose sight of. It is all very well to say that we have a Government, that the Government has the responsibility and must do the work and supply the ideas. As I pointed out before, no government embraces all the wisdom, or even a great portion of the wisdom of the people. The members of the Government do what they can, but think of the collossal tasks that lie before the Administration, think of the dreadful responsibilities that rest, not on the Government but on the people. For, after all, the people must bear the responsibility. There is no use in expecting the Government to do all. Take the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) for instance. I suppose no man in Canada is besieged as he has been and is at this time—all clamouring for the expenditure of money in their several localities. The idea must be given to the people of Canada that they have the responsibility on their shoulders. It is useless to blame the Government if everything is not right; let the people get right themselves, and that will help to make the Government right. With the enormous problems of the returned soldiers and reconstruction to be dealt with, the Government will be absolutely powerless unless it has the sympathy and support of the people in so far as it is doing right. And, of course, it is quite absurd to suppose that the average Government does not want to do right. It may not be composed of the wisest or the greatest men, but these men according to their lights are usually trying to do the best they can, and in that they are entitled to the support and sympathy of the people. Carrying out the simile of the wilderness and the promised land, I would say to hon. gentlemen opposite that if they want to inspire the confidence of the country, they must get in line and assist in the measures that make for the country's good, or if they do not, the fate that overtook the children of Israel will overtake them—yes, and even worse, for not even a Joshua or a Caleb among them will enter the promised land. They will remain in the wilderness until they all die out, and only their successors who learn the lesson of service will be able to enter the promised land and partake of the milk and honey.

This afternoon I discussed to some extent the subject of party. I did not go as fully into the idea as I had intended to and I think it is particularly important in this country, and especially at this juncture, that there shall be a very clear conception on the part of the hon. members of this House and on the part of the people at large in regard to "party." I read an address made by an hon. member of this House recently at a function in Toronto, in reference to party. He evidently had it in his mind that Union Government was not a party and he appealed to history to show that they were sure to degenerate into a faction. My hon. friend entirely misreads history in regard to that. Party came into existence in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. Before that, in the Roman Empire, they had a sort of municipal government, but, inasmuch as it was impossible to take a vote for the entire Roman Empire, and a vote could only be taken in Rome or at some other place, the system fell by the wayside and degenerated into a military dictatorship led by Cæsar. That is why Cæsar was assassinated. Perhaps some of my good friends do not know that but it was because Cæsar lent himself to the idea of a military despotism that he lost his life. Henceforth Cæsarism prevailed and the world lay prostrate at the feet of a military despot. I rather think that Cæsar deserved to lose his life under these circumstances, but I am not going to go over the history of the world from the time of the dissolution of the Roman Empire down to the organization of the British nation.

Party, as I say, came into existence in the reign of Queen Elizabeth. It was the strong, independent spirit of Puritanism standing out in protest against the exercise of the Royal prerogative in matters of Church and State that produced the first party. The development of party government is a very interesting study. Parties were organized for the purpose of accomplishing a reform. The Puritans organized, increased their strength and finally were able to challenge the prerogative of the King. In order to lay my founda-

tion properly I might be permitted to read a sentence or two from Sir Erskine May's Constitutional History of England. Sir Erskine May says:

> Party has guided and controlled and often dominated over the ostensible authorities of the State: It has supported the Crown and aristocracy against the people; it has trampled upon public liberty; it has dethroned and coerced kings, overthrown their ministers in parliament, humbled the nobles, and established popular rights. But it has protected the fabric of the Government from shocks which threatened its very foundations. The annals of party embrace a large portion of the History of England. The parties in which the British people have associated at different times and under various names have represented cardinal principles of Government authority on one side, and popular rights and privileges on the other.
>
> The former principle pressed to extremes would tend to absolutism, the latter to a republic, but controlled within proper limits they are both necessary for the safe working of a balanced constitution.
>
> When parties have lost sight of these principles in pursuit of objects less worthy, they have degenerated into faction.

That is what my hon. friend to whom I referred had in his mind but he lost sight of principles. That applies to the old Liberal party. I think I demonstrated this afternoon to the satisfaction of every person within hearing of my voice that that party was organized upon certain principles, that it adopted a certain platform and that it failed to carry out that platform. If the administration of the Government of the country becomes a case of the "ins" and the "outs," if that is the only issue as between parties then party degenerates, as Sir Erskine May says, into faction. That is not the case with Union Government, founded as this Government has been on a great principle, for the purpose of carrying out a great object, one of the greatest that human history has ever recorded. This is not a faction; it is a party organized for a great purpose. It is not going too far to say that this party which was organized for a purpose has stood loyally by that purpose. It was surely worth while bringing into existence for that purpose.

But something almost as good has been accomplished. Men, hundreds of them, from the different sides of politics, have mingled for the first time with their fellow Canadians on this side of the House and they have learned that after all there are very trifling differences between them. They have learned that there is not as much dividing them as they thought. Let me give an illustration as to parties. What makes a man a Presbyterian? Is it not belief in and practice of the doctrines of the Westminster Confession? What makes a man an Anglican? Is it not belief in and practice of the doctrines of the Thirty Nine Articles? What makes a man a Roman Catholic? Is it not belief in and practice of the doctrines and tenets of the Roman Catholic church? If a man calls himself a Roman Catholic and yet believes in the Thirty Nine Articles, or the doctrine of the Presbyterian church, is he a Roman Catholic? Certainly not. Therefore I contend that when a man calls himself a Liberal, and if the platform of Liberalism is free trade and if that man practises protection to the hilt, appoints Bob Watson to the Senate, and appoints more members of Parliament to office than his predecessors ever thought of doing, he is not a Liberal at all. He may think he is but thinking that he is does not alter the case. He is what he does and what he practises. Is the point clear, Mr. Speaker? If it is not I have abundance of other evidence.

I have always contended that one of the very worst features in our system of Government is that the followers of the Government are bound by some act of the Government. For instance, the Government introduce say, a Daylight Saving Bill. I hope to the Lord they will not introduce it again this year because we members representing rural constituencies feel that our political lives are at stake if we support daylight saving. And yet, unless we vote for the Government, the Government fails.

Now that is one of the most vicious features of our party Government. I like very much better the French system, and I am going to appeal to the Acting Prime Minister, and to his colleagues, to see if it would not be possible to introduce the French system into this House. As I understand it, all measures introduced into the French Chambre des Communes are thrown open for action on the part of the members regardless of party. How absurd has been the spectacle in Canada for the last forty or fifty years—ever since I can remember, ever since Confederation—of a Parliament of about three hundred supposedly sensible men sitting some to the right and some to the left of the Speaker, and yet in the case of every measure that has been introduced in this House, with rare exceptions, for forty or fifty years, if it was introduced by the Government, the men to the right of the Speaker have voted yea, and the men to the left of the Speaker have voted nay, utterly regardless of the merits of the Bill, and utterly regardless

of the effects of the Bill upon their constituencies. It passes comprehension that such a system should be continued. It may be said that we follow precedent, but what do we need to care about precedent? In God's name, let us get on with the business of the country, and do that business as it should be done, regardless of party. Under the French system, when a Bill is introduced the members vote for it according to their best judgment. It may be introduced by the Government, it might be introduced by any particular member, or any particular party in the Chambre des Communes. The measure is discussed on its merits, and even if introduced by the Government, if the majority of the Chamber think it should not become law, the majority vote against it and it falls. The existence of the Government is hinged upon a vote of confidence, or a vote of want of confidence. The Government might introduce what they thought an important measure, and be defeated root and branch, the members exercising their God-given intelligence. Why, if the majority of that House think that that Government, generally speaking, is the best Government for France, somebody submits a vote of confidence in it, and if the motion carries the Government remains in office. There, it is on the Government's general policy, and on the Government's service for the State, that its existence hinges. In our country it is entirely different. Surely, we could break away from precedent and adopt the French system, which I feel sure would be a good thing for the Dominion of Canada.

Now the British system of party government—and it is a fine tribute to the old British race—developed over a thousand years, evolved out of great hardship, great worries and great troubles, but the party system has been deliberately adopted by all free peoples over the earth. So much for the British system. If we follow the British ideals and use parties for the purpose of accomplishing great reforms, then we are following along the right line. Let us glance at the agitation for the abolition of the Corn laws fifty or sixty years ago. John Bright, Richard Cobden, and other able men, whose hearts beat in unison and sympathy for the people, realized that protection was an evil in the land. Hundreds, and thousands, nay, tens of thousands, were almost starving for the want of something to eat, and these great men—men whose hearts beat for the people—saw that in order to work a reform, it was desirable, nay necessary, to get rid of protection. They began their agitation in the House. They secured recruits in the House and out of it, and they worked along for years propagating their theories and pointing out to the people of Great Britain a remedy for the evils that existed, until finally they succeeded in persuading the people and organizing a party in the House of Commons that resulted in the abolition of the Corn laws. That was a great triumph, a great achievement for party! That is what party should be used for, and that should be its only purpose. To merely call ourselves parties, and divide into two factions will never help the country, and, as I pointed out several times, it has resulted in almost destroying our public life. We want to get away from factions, we want to form an idea of what the country's interests are, we want to devote ourselves to the service of the country and carry out what the country needs. In a word, let us serve the country and not serve party.

I want to refer briefly to the speech of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell). I have already alluded to the task which he has in hand at the present time. He has spoken with great frankness, and there has been very little criticism of his statements. Occasionally you hear the speech referred to as a pessimistic statement, but I say all honour to the responsible minister of the Crown who tells Parliament, and through Parliament the people of the country, exactly what the position of affairs is. He tells us that we will probably be faced with a deficit—after providing for pensions, for the carrying on of the affairs of the country, and paying the interest on the war debt—of one hundred millions dollars, —and yet the clamour for public works, and the clamour for expenditures goes on apace. Members of this House, and the people of this country, are faced with a serious situation. It is not fair, Sir, to badger our ministers for lavish expenditures, perhaps unreasonable expenditures, without considering from what source the money is to come. The Dominion has great natural resources, but the prospect of realizing on them is rather limited as we see them at present. Will the Dominion be able to meet that vast expenditure? There is no use blaming the Government. The Government did not bring on the war, and only incidentally incurred the necessary expenditure. The country clamoured for the sending of our soldiers to the front; we all held up our hands for it, and are grateful for the deeds of heroism that our soldiers have achieved and for the glory they have reflected on this Dominion. But the Government are not specially re-

sponsible; they are charged with the function of trying to provide the necessary means to provide the necessary money. But this Parliament and the people of this country have the responsibility. The words of the Minister of Public Works should sink deep into the hearts of the Canadian people, and they should not divest themselves, as indeed they cannot divest themselves—of responsibility in connection with the management of our public affairs. I was struck very recently with an expression used by an ex-minister of the Crown. In talking with me he said that thrift has apparently become a vice or a crime in the country. The people seem to have the idea that the golden stream should pour not only from the spigot, but from the bunghole as well. Is thrift a crime?

Let us look at the developments in connection with the Printing Bureau. As chairman of the Debates Committee it has been my duty to visit the Printing Bureau on different occasions, and I came to the conviction that of all the patronage cesspools out of Hades, the Printing Bureau was the worst. It so sickened me that I thought: how can Canada ever succeed if that sort of thing goes on? Perhaps I will be pardoned for saying that last session I went to the Prime Minister and told him about the state of affairs at the Bureau. He was pretty busy at the time, but he gave me a moment or two, and I said to him: "If you, Sir Robert, will place me in charge of the Printing Bureau for one year and give me a free hand, I will promise to cut the expenditure in two and I shall not charge the country one farthing for my services." Sir Robert did not give me a direct answer; he asked me to confer with another member of the Cabinet. Of course, I did not do so, but I thought it was a rare opportunity for a reformer—I call myself a reformer—just to give one object lesson as to what could be done at the Printing Bureau. The mess has been exposed, and a sickening mess it is. I do not blame the present Government, although they have been in office over a year and might have taken some radical action to cure the evil. But it has been the result of the political partisan system practised by both parties for the last twenty-five or thirty years, and both are responsible.

Now, what has happened in the Printing Bureau has, in my judgment, happened before and is happening, though perhaps not to the same disgusting extent, all over the Civil Service of the country. I have not time to tell all the things that have come under my observation; I should not like to tire the House by relating all these particular cases. But it is my deliberate judgment that from the Atlantic to the Pacific things exist in the public service of Canada, and have existed under all Governments for thirty, forty, or fifty years that are a disgrace to the country and that, if not corrected, will sap the life-blood of the country. You cannot allow a cancer or sore like that to exist on the body politic for an indefinite time and expect that body politic to be healthy or to survive. Unless it is cured, it will eat the vitals of the country ultimately, as the cancer will eat the body of the man who contracts it. Would to Heaven that this Government would let me name one commission. I am not very favourable to commissions. We have had a great many of them, but I should like to be able to name one commission that would go from the Atlantic to the Pacific and carve this cancer out. Let us get rid of the barnacles, the thousands who have fastened themselves on the body politic and are eating its vitals out. We had better put our cards on the table in reference to this Civil Service. The Printing Bureau is not the only place; let us clean the whole thing out from stem to gudgeon. It is a big task, a tremendous task; it will require men of firmness, men of courage, men careful of the public interest. Such men are to be found in this country, and if they were given a fair opportunity I believe that this Civil Service could be cleaned up. And the time to do that is when the Union Government is in office; when the Liberals of this country have united with the Conservatives for the purpose of grappling with the vast problems that confront Canada at the present time. That is the only time in which this work can be properly and effectively done, and in God's name, let it be done, Mr. Speaker.

Let me give you a little instance of what I found when I was a member of the Debates Committee twenty odd years ago. We discovered that a number of the translators were drawing large pay and were farming the jobs out to girls at one-fourth or one-fifth the amount they were receiving from the country. I had a notion, in my own foolish little way, that when a thing like that was discovered it could be corrected, and I moved that these men be dismissed. Remember, I was a supporter—at least I thought I was—of the Liberal Government. I moved that these men be dismissed. What do you suppose happened? The Chairman, who came from the province of Quebec—I shall not mention his name—refused to put

the motion, and when I insisted, he left the chair and left the room. I said: "Well what are we going to do, boys?" John V. Ellis, a fine old Liberal from Saint John, was a member of that committee, and I moved that he take the chair. But, you know, Mr. Ellis was an older and perhaps wiser man than I in his day and generation; Mr. Ellis did not want to run up against any snag about any patronage business because he might be called down. I did not think of being called down; I did not know enough. I have learned something since then. If I never make another speech in this House I propose to make it to-night and to tell the facts exactly as I know them. It is a fine thing, Mr. Speaker, just once in your life-time to stand up and have your say, anyway.

So Mr. Ellis would not take the chair. Then I looked around and I saw that fine old fellow, Jim Somerville, a Scotchman, who would, I thought, like Wallace, stand to the death. So I moved old Jim into the chair. Do you suppose Jim would take the chair? Not—if you will pardon my adopting the parlance of the street—"not on your tin-type." Jim also was too wise in his day and generation. Jim knew how many beans made five. Jim probably had in contemplation his patronage; all these things were in jeopardy—although poor "R. L." did not understand it at that time; it was a case of fools rushing in where angels like Jim Somerville and John Ellis feared to tread. So when Jim would not take the chair I said to the committee: "Well, if somebody will nominate me, I will take the chair." So my old friend, Nicholas Flood Davin, who loved a scrap and who thought that the boys on the Government side were fighting, moved me to the chair and I took it and had the motion put and carried. But Lord, whatever became of the translators I cannot tell. I do not think they were fired at all. But I was fired. That, Mr. Speaker, is what happened to little Willie. Do you suppose that I ever got the chairmanship of that committee back? No, sir. I have it now, but the committee never meets. I was just reflecting upon how the law of compensation comes in. I was fired, blown, dynamited out of the chair. Billy Gibson, that amiable old whip, went about and said: "You cannot afford to appoint a traitor like that chairman of a committee." So I was not appointed; I was left at home. Although I was too much disgusted to follow it up very closely, I believe that the translators remained in office and drew their stipends just the same, while the girls went on doing their work for one-quarter the money that was paid to the translators.

So much for my little escapade or pilgrimage into patronage. If we try now to work it on that basis, we shall never succeed. We must go at this thing with an axe. The Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), a fine old Liberal, and the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), who was also a Liberal by the way—these men know or ought to know something about the principles of Liberalism. Let them set the pace, and they will, I warrant you, Sir, find a united party behind them to get rid of this parasitic business of patronage. It is a dreadful business in this country and we want to wipe it out. If the Government will but set the pace, I am satisfied they will find the House very ready to second their efforts.

I have some other points yet, although I trust I am not wearying the House. I have to take my hon. friend the prophet from Brome (Mr. McMaster) up to Mount Carmel. Before I do so, I should like to refer to my visit to the old land, and to the battlefields of France and Flanders. I have rarely been able to speak without emotion when I refer to the things that I have witnessed on the battlefields of France and Flanders. When I think of the heroism of our boys on the battlefields and remember the task they accomplished and recall the fact, as it was stated to me, that they did about one-quarter of the actual fighting on the battle front, I have no words in which to express my personal gratitude to those brave sons who have saved liberty for me. I suppose most of those boys had read the history of their mother land. They had no doubt read the history of the preservation of liberty and freedom under the British flag. They no doubt know, as we know, that for centuries the blood of our ancestors flowed in rivers in order that the people of Britain should enjoy freedom in the land. Through the veins of the 60,000 boys, no, of the 500,000 who went to the rescue of liberty and freedom in the old land, flows the same British blood. You cannot make any mistake about it. The Britisher knows how to fight; he knows how to die; but he never yet has learned the idea of yielding. That is something the British subject never can do.

I was struck with the heroism of our women, the daughters of this land who by the thousand went to the front, who nursed the boys through their time of trouble, sorrow and peril. I walked through the hospitals, past miles of white cots. Some-

times I paused to speak to these poor broken fellows—and some of them were woefully broken. I watched these angels of mercy, these Florence Nightingales by the thousand, as they nursed the boys and raised their heads and tenderly tried to distract their attention in order that the silver cord might not be broken. I felt that the days of our heroism and chivalry had not passed away. We have and have had
9 p.m. thousands of Florence Nightingales on these fields. I could not —I have no language in which to pay sufficient and adequate tribute to these noble women, noble beyond compare. A sad business it was passing down these lines. Sometimes my heart was too full to stop and speak a kind word to these broken brothers. But I said: If I live to get back to Canada, I would let Parliament know something of the heroism and devotion of these sons and brothers and sisters of ours at the front.

I should like to take time to tell of the heroism of that great and glorious country, old France. We can well afford to take off our hats to dear old France, France that has stood nobly for a brand of liberty equal to anything cherished by the British race. As we passed through cities like Amiens—driving swiftly in our automobiles lest we should catch the shells that were dropping near,—we could see the pallid, hungry looking faces of the old men and old women of France as they gazed out through the gratings of the cellars with appealing faces to us as much as to say: In God's name, when is this fury to cease? In France there is scarcely a home that has not been desolated, scarcely a home that is not in mourning. I do not recall that we met a single man of military age who was not wearing the historic military uniform of France. All honour to France. We passed over acres and acres of graveyards. Why, on Vimy Ridge alone 100,000 Frenchmen lie buried; what a fight for the liberty of the world?

As we visited Verdun, that wonderful place that was bombarded month after month by the brutal army of the Hun Crown Prince, it is just as if the destroying angel had passed over that once beautiful district and had blasted it beyond recognition. You would see here and there a solitary rampike of some tree lifting its pathetic peak fifteen or twenty feet towards Heaven as if in protest, battered beyond description, the roots torn out all over. The whole country for fifteen miles looks as if it were the face of a smallpox patient magnified a million times. But there the French stood, and month after month said: "They shall not pass." I have sometimes wondered if there was any Canadian that so far forgot his duty to the old land, his duty to the traditions of his home and of his country, who failed to read and study those awful sacrifices: Blood, blood, blood, in all directions. These are the men who have saved the liberty of the world. All honour to them. Surely no representative man in this country,—surely not any man in this country will fail to remember with gratitude and devotion the service that has been rendered by those who have saved the human race from the degradation of the Hun.

I looked over those acres of crosses, and it was a melancholy sight. But never mind, those boys have passed hence and will enjoy a reward that is worth while. For, after all, it is not the money that we gain in this world that counts; it is not the honour or the knighthoods, the lords this and lords that, that matter. The only thing in life that counts is service—service to your country. It will never be asked of us how much money we made in the world or what titles we enjoyed. What will be required of us is an account of the service we have rendered, and if, like those tens and hundreds of thousands who lie lowly in France we have done our duty it will be said of us, as it surely will be said of them, "Well done, good and faithful servant, enter thou into the joy of thy Lord." I pay this tribute because I felt I could not return to this Parliament without giving my fellow members some idea of the sacrifices that have been made in our behalf in the old land.

Let me pass on to speak for a moment of the work that our Prime Minister has performed overseas. Some hon. members opposite have been disposed to criticise Sir Robert Borden for going overseas. They have asked, why is he not here? Now, I am not going to impute motives or say unkind things. Perhaps these hon. members honestly believe he should be here. I want to tell them—I am not a partisan and have no axe to grind in the public life of this country—that as a member of the Press party that went overseas to witness the effort of Great Britain in the war, I watched our Prime Minister very carefully, and it is my deliberate judgment that he rendered valuable service to the Dominion of Canada while he was overseas.

About one year ago a very critical situation existed at the front. The fifth army had gone to pieces, and if I am betraying no secret and am not deemed to be speaking unwisely, I should like to repeat a state-

ment that I received from high quarters to the effect that France, even heroic France, was ready to quit. It looked at one time as if the channel ports and Paris were gone. The statesmen of Great Britain were considering very seriously what to do. I am not saying that they thought of striking their colours or proposing peace, but the situation was undoubtedly grave and the public men of Great Britain were in a very serious mood. I have this to say: In my judgment no man from the Overseas Dominions exercised such a powerful influence as did the Prime Minister of this country in bucking up, to use a street term, the British Government. I heard Sir Robert Borden speak at the great Mansion House dinner and he was the leading figure there, and there were many great figures present. Sir Robert Borden, in season and out of season, exercised a very important influence in the counsels of the British nation in regard to the war. I hold no brief for him, but I think it is only just that I should pay him this tribute.

I am sure the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) made it abundantly clear in his speech this afternoon that it was the duty of Sir Robert Borden to be present at the Peace Conference. If he were not there we should certainly hear the cry from the other side of the House: Why is the Prime Minister not in France looking after our interests? Sometimes this criticism reminds me of the old couplet:—

> You shall and you shan't, you will and you won't,
> You will be damned if you do, and be damned if you don't.

So, no matter what position Sir Robert Borden took, there would sure to be criticism. After all, the creation of the Imperial Cabinet is simply carrying out the same idea as the League of Nations, to which we look for the solution of so many problems.

And now I am going to invite my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) to come up to Mount Carmel with me. I rather like the hon. member. He has a frank, open face and a generous way with him. He speaks his mind loudly and bluntly. I have had the pleasure of his acquaintance for many years, and I certainly should not like to say anything to offend him, and I am sure I shall not. Some day he may be Finance Minister in some government or other, but it must be a long way off, for I cannot see it yet with a telescope. But when that day comes I shall be delighted to extend congratulations to him. In his speech the other evening he said:

[Mr. Richardson.]

> I say to my separated brethren: Go to the Acting-Prime Minister, who is also the Finance Minister, place the Hansard containing my few humble remarks before him and say to him: Now, Sir, are you willing to go as far as the Grits will go? Then govern yourselves accordingly.

You would think from that statement that the hon. member could do exactly what he liked with the party over there. Perhaps he thinks he could. Perhaps he thinks his party sound on the tariff question. But just let him try the experiment as I did twenty years ago, and he will find how mistaken he is. The "L. M. Jones's," the "Billy Pattersons" and all the manufacturers from Dan to Beersheba who have been identified with their party will have something to say when he starts anything of that kind. If the hon. member was able to organize an efficient government based upon the ideal of free trade which would wipe out the element of protection from the tariff and include in its platform all the reforms which the Liberal party advocated twenty years ago—if he could organize such a government as that I would follow him and be delighted to do so, but I know positively that he cannot make good in any such attempt, because there are just as many, or almost as many, protectionists in the rank and file of the Liberal party as in the rank and file of the other party. I am not even sure that his leader would follow him on a free trade platform; I do not know just what his position is with regard to the tariff, and I am just drawing a bow at a venture. Is the hon. member for Brome satisfied that the great majority of his friends on the other side of the House would follow him on such a platform? If he is not, he must agree to the inutility of any members on this side identifying themselves with him or accepting his challenge. If you review the fiscal history of this country—I reiterate the statement of my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark)—the impartial historian will find, and will say, that in actual reductions in the tariff—apart from preference and reciprocity which, no doubt my hon. friend will shoot at me in a minute if I do not anticipate him—the reductions made under Conservative rule have been greater than those made by the other side. They brought down the duty on agricultural implements from 35 per cent to, I think, 17½ per cent, and made other reductions as well. It would not be wise, in my judgment, for us to follow the lure of the light in the shack window on the other side, and leave the friends here, because we believe, most of us, that we can so appeal to this Union Government that we shall get, perhaps, a

larger measure of fiscal justice—I speak as one from the West—than we could hope for if the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) were installed as Prime Minister of this country. My hon. friend went on:

> Do you remember that old story in ancient writ of how the prophets of Baal and Elijah worked together on Mount Carmel? You remember how Elijah said, "If Baal be the Lord, serve him, and if Jehovah be the Lord, serve him." If your principles are for liberty and low tariff you know on which side of the House you should sit. If protection and high tariff be your god, then stay where you are.

This is throwing down a challenge with a vengeance. The hon. gentleman quotes that beautiful story that is told in the first book of Kings, of Elijah the Tishbite. Now, Elijah was a hairy man, and if my hon. friend from Brome wishes to imitate him, when he marches to Mount Carmel with me, he had better let his whiskers grow, and also the hair on his head, and he had better gird up his loins. Elijah asked the momentous question which the prophet of Brome asks, "How long halt ye between two opinions? If the Lord be God follow Him; but if Baal, then follow him." On Mount Carmel if the hon. gentleman would imitate Elijah he must build an altar. Elijah built his altar of twelve stones, representing the twelve tribes of Israel. I would suggest that my hon. friend take twelve representatives from the old Liberal party—twelve disciples as it were—and of these build his altar. I would suggest these names: George P. Graham, Israel Tarte, Clifford Sifton, Billy Patterson, Billy Gibson, Bob Watson, Jim Sutherland, Senator Edwards, Dr. Landerkin, Jim McMullen, Jim Somerville, and—yes, I think Aleck Smith might be thrown in there.

Mr. McMASTER: A great number of these gentlemen are dead, while others are supporting Union Government.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That cuts no ice with the prophet; as the late John Henry Pope would have said, "There hain't nothin' to it." I think it would be a pity to omit dear old Aleck Smith. He has stood true to the party through good and evil report, and I think he ought to have a place among those stones. After Elijah had built the altar, he dug trenches into which his servants poured four barrels of water. I would suggest to my hon. friend the prophet from Brome that instead of pouring water over these old-timers, he pour kerosine, for without that I cannot conceive of any fire from Heaven or any place else that would burn that crowd. Then, as to the burnt offering, our friend the prophet from Brome, with his loins girded and his whiskers any old length, must be careful about the selection. Elijah selected a bullock, I would suggest that the hon. gentleman drop the last three letters of the word "bullock." Also, as to how the animal should be slaughtered, I think that in view of the machine gun practice of many of these hon. gentlemen in the constituencies for the last twenty-five years, they should shoot the animal. And after these details are attended to it will be interesting to stand by and observe which god he will invoke to get his sacrifice consumed. Will he call upon Jehovah whom he would regard as the god of free-trade, or upon Baal, the reputed god of protection? He will be obliged to gash his flesh much worse than did the prophets of Baal, and cry much louder than they, in order to be heard. And is there not a danger, if he calls on the god of free trade, that he will be reminded of the 1893 platform and the seventy-one-one-hundredths of one per cent? Then, of course, whether or not he is answered by fire he is up against the proposition of imitating the example of Elijah and taking the four hundred and fifty prophets of Baal and slaughtering them. In order to secure that number he will have to strike without discrimination. He will have to have recourse to both parties, and probably he will find that when he has slaughtered all the prophets of Baal on his own side he has hardly a sufficient number left for a quorum in caucus. Then after the slaughter, he must in imitation of the prophet retire to the wilderness and sit down under a juniper tree and ask the Lord to take away his life, as he, only he, is left of all Israel who have not bowed the knee to Baal. But against this I think I hear the stentorian voice of the stalwart member for Red Deer declaring that not seven thousand only, but seventy times seven thousand free traders stand fast to free trade in this country, and I think I hear him suggesting also to my hon. friend from Brome to have recourse to the only acceptable sacrifice, a broken and a contrite heart.

I want to say a few words in regard to the tariff. It is bound to loom up at the present session. When the Union Government was organized there seemed to be an understanding that the tariff would not be discussed at least for a short time. At the present session it is not unlikely that the tariff will be discussed. It is a live issue. In order that this country and its industries may succeed, it is desirable that

there should be stability in regard to the tariff. I represent a rural constituency in the West. Let me say to this House that the West is in desperate earnest in regard to the tariff. In the old days when the National Policy was formulated there was practically no West and no population in that country. There is now a large population in Western Canada and the people there feel that they have carried the burden as long as they feel they can afford to carry it. They feel that they must have relief and that they must be placed in as good a position as the farmers of the Western States in order that the country may succeed.

Let me say to you, Sir, and to the members of the Government, that there are no politics in the West. The West is not playing politics. I find that my old Tory friends in the West, now that partisanship has been set aside, are heartily in favour of low tariff. In the old days, because of party feeling, they co-operated with their party, but now that there is no longer party Government, but Union Government, they say: We are with you; take the tariff off. The West is united. I was delighted to hear the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe), for whom I have very great respect, tell this House the other evening that the province of Quebec is low tariff, or is willing to join in any effort to reduce the tariff. He spoke of Toronto as being the home of protection. I was wondering if Montreal is not almost as bad in that respect. I do not know what the feeling in Quebec is. I take it for granted that the hon. gentleman would not misinform the House—I am quite sure he would not knowingly do so—and that when he stated, as he did the other night, that there is a large section of the people in Quebec in favour of low tariff he believed it to be the fact.

In the three western provinces there is absolute unanimity in regard to lowering the tariff. Let me say in all seriousness to my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister that I hope he will give earnest consideration to this question. I appeal to him—he is an old Liberal. The right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) is an old Liberal; they at least have no prejudice against low tariff. They, and the Government, are in a position to solve this very important problem, or to help to solve it, perhaps at the present time or in the near future. Let me tell the Acting Prime Minister, the Government, and this House that the people of the West are not playing politics. They care absolutely nothing about politics. They are heart sick of partisanship but they are resolved on one thing and that is that the tariff must come down. Members who represent the West in this House, mostly behind the Union Government, I think I can fairly say, are reasonable men. They are not going to put a pistol at the head of the Government or at the head of the leader of the Government and say: "Stand and Deliver." If I interpret the feelings of my colleagues from the West accurately, and I think I do, individually and collectively, rather than do that they would prefer to efface themselves and retire from Parliament. We from the West are so obsessed with the problems that face this Union Government, with the colossal task that is before them in connection with reconstruction, that we would go a long way not to embarrass the Government, but on the contrary we would desire to assist the Government. But, the members from the West have not the say. I tell the Acting Prime Minister that I think he can deal on favourable and just grounds with the representatives from the West. But if the Government does not deal with the representatives from the West, who are reasonable, and who realize the gravity of the problem, then the Government must deal with the people of the West and the people of the West are agreed as one man and they are in no very friendly mood at the present time. They think that they have been made a football of between the parties for all these years and, if the resolutions they have passed and their deliberations indicate what their mind is, they purpose having justice.

In the name of Union, in the name of the unity of the country, I appeal to my hon. friend the acting leader of the Government and to the members of the Government, to weigh this matter seriously, to weigh it gravely in order to avert trouble and what may prove a division in the country, and to bring about a reconciliation as between the various elements in the country.

I said this afternoon, and I want to reiterate it here that the time has come when the people of this country, the different races and elements, must forget their differences. The war is over. I do not suppose it will ever be necessary again to resort to conscription. Perhaps happily there may be no great questions which will in the future divide the peoples of the country. I have every respect for the great province of Quebec. I know something of the French Canadian people, something of their kindness of heart, their chivalry, their magnanimity, and I believe now that the

clouds are disappearing an effort ought to be made to unite all the people. The great province of Quebec ought to be represented and speedily in the Government of this country. I hope the time is not far distant when our good friends from Quebec will see the reasonableness of the situation and realize the logic of events. Let them yield a point and let the people on this side yield a point in order that harmony and real union may prevail, and so that we may be able in this country to build up a great people.

We have wonderful, magnificent resources. All we have to do is to tickle the soil and tap those resources in order to make this country what it should be, the home of a united and happy people. Let the clouds roll by, let us have union, and if the Government is able to meet the wishes of the West, or reasonably so, on this tariff question, it will go a long way towards cementing East and West.

In conclusion I wish to say that it is my desire, as I believe it is the desire of the people of Canada, to see a great party built up in this country that will serve the public. The people are sick of the partisan cries and the partisan shibboleths. Let us go in for Service from now on. Surely a party like this, which was founded for the purpose of carrying on a great work, founded on a great principle, and sanctified, as one hon. member said the other day, by the blood of sixty thousand of the noblest sons of the Dominion, must and should develop into an agency which will be able to guard and protect the best interests of Canada.

Mr. F. J. PELLETIER (Matane) (translation): Mr. Speaker, when we were apprised of the fact that the most complete and most glorious victory had brought to the Allies the assurance of a peace founded on justice and right, our hearts were filled with deep joy and we said to ourselves that the session which was about to open would rank among the brightest and the most fruitful. Unfortunately, as hon. members have already remarked, in spite of universal jubilation, it was amidst most profound mourning and most sincere grief that this House did open, this year, just after the disappearance of one of the most brilliant men who ever were within these precincts. The voice of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, a voice so eloquent, has been silenced forever, and it seems as though the walls of this House were yet resounding with its accents, so closely was the life of that man identified with the life of the country.

However, notwithstanding the fact that our chief is no more and that, as a consequence of his sudden demise, our organization has been perturbed, it is by no means our intention to lose our interest in the affairs of the country; on the contrary, we shall follow the example of that illustrious man, trying to make up, to the full extent of our limited possibilities, for the great worth which he represented and to which the whole country did such a telling hommage on the occasion of his demise; we shall try, in every possible way, to help the work of reconstruction which now lies at our door after the four years of warfare just elapsed, and we shall do so by our most earnest co-operation and our most practical suggestions, so that the Government may fulfil, if they wish so to do, the arduous task incumbent upon them, under the circumstances.

The measures outlined in the Speech from the Throne, this year, are numerous, but if they are to be realized to any advantage, they must be considered in their true light and be rightly interpreted, whatever the preferences of the majority and the settled views of certain elements.

Be the good will of the Governement as it may, Mr. Speaker, all their efforts will be useless if they remain blind to the real conditions under which the country is now labouring and if they fancy that they can mould public opinion as they like, independently of the mighty currents apparent in every country since the evolutions, not to say the revolutions, which have taken place almost everywhere.

Conditions in the old countries of Europe are now being completely upset. A new power has asserted itself, and that power which has overturned everything in certain countries will soon make its influence felt in Canada. It would be an irretrievable mistake to believe that it may be possible to stop this rising tide, to dam this rushing stream. What we want is to guide this new power, to subdue it, to make it instrumental in doing great work for the reconstruction of the country and in view of the transition from war conditions to peace conditions.

This new power is that of the immense army of workmen and of the select battalion of farmers. Those two classes, upon which the prosperity and the future of every country are presumed to rest, realize the importance of the part they are now playing, and they have resolved on asserting their rights and enforcing respect of such rights.

In certain countries, Mr. Speaker, efforts were made to crush this new-born power, with the result that the masses revolted and that all barriers were overthrown. All kinds of unsound doctrines were instilled in the minds of the people by unscrupulous agitators, with the result that the advent of the working class was that of anarchy and disorganization.

It is not to be feared that the new countries of America, should we remain in different, may suffer in the same way? Is it not to be feared, that, through our carelessness, the labouring classes, whether they belong to industry or to agriculture, may become the prey of dangerous agitators? It is with a view to avoiding such misfortune, that I would like the Government of this country to become particularly interested in the condition of the working classes. Owing to certain influences well known to us all and which the Government did not try to do away with, the cost of staple goods in Canada has increased beyond proportion. True it is that the salaries of the workingmen have increased also, but this increase is far from representing a due compensation for the voluntary or arbitrary increase in the cost of living. Previous to the war, $7 was enough to keep a family during a week. In January, 1919, the same family of five was obliged to spend, for the same length of time, the sum of $14.87, which meant an increase of one hundred per cent. Surely, people working on munitions earned very high salaries, but the manufacturing of munitions has stopped and there is, so far, no indication of a decrease in the cost of life in the near future. The situation is yet a serious one, nay, is getting to be more and more disquieting, for a great many people are looking for work, and in some cases, there is a tendency to a decrease in salaries. Therefore, the Government must look into that problem with no delay and not so much with a view to securing higher salaries for the workingmen as to making sure that a decrease in the cost of life will be brought about. The buying power of a dollar, to-day, is reduced to such an extent, that nobody will even think of saving under circumstances where this could be done heretofore. It is absolutely necessary that conditions should change before it is too late.

The hon. gentlemen who moved the Address said: "To-day, the cloud has lifted and we stand on the threshold of an assured and, I believe, a lasting era of peace. Our great epoch of struggle and sacrifice is ended." Those words are true in so far as they concern external peace, but one has not the same certainty of internal peace when one hears the ominous rumblings, here and in other countries of the world.

My hon. friend says further: "The people of Canada may, now that the tremendous burden of effort and sacrifice, imposed on them by the war, has been removed, pause to review with pride the excellent record which they have made under the leadership of the Prime Minister and his cabinet."

Beyond doubt the people of Canada may look with pride to the great things that have been accomplished. I am sure they have already done so, but they will not pause for all that. Those who have amassed millions of dollars during the war, those who have doubled and tripled their already large holdings, can pause and look back on what has been done, but the workingman, the father of a large family who has to wait for the weekly or monthly pay to buy bread and shoes for his children has no time to pause.

If the Prime Minister and his cabinet are really anxious to give the people time to pause and review in their mind the glorious pages that have been added to the history of our country, the economic condition must be changed; there must be an end to those groping and tentative methods and the country should be given constructive legislation.

By all means let the Government do something to bring down the high cost of living. If nothing is done in that direction, the peace that will be signed shortly in Paris will mean nothing for Canada, for war between classes will have started and no one can predict where it will stop.

What is going on in other countries does not justify us in being optimists. What is happening in the great cities; the bolshevic and socialistic disturbances that we hear of, when the censor abstains interfering with the newspapers, does not convey any great hope for the future.

How can the Government lower the cost of living? First by not allowing the unscrupulous middleman to carry on his speculations in regard to all the necessities of life.

Three years ago, the Canadian people should have been protected against those vampires. The only means to that end is to impose a very heavy tax on all profits over a reasonable percentage. Those who are convicted of extravagance and hoarding should be severely dealt with. A maximum price should be put on every necessary

article, determined by the cost of production, and not by the fancy of those who have secured a monopoly of the goods.

We are lavishing praises on the soldiers returning from the front and we say that nothing is too good for them. Those praises are certainly well deserved, for our men fought heroically and have made the sacrifice of their lives. But they will not live on praise and eulogy. They cannot be cajoled by such interested flattery.

Let us not forget that these men are returning from a part of the world where a dangerous wind is blowing and that they will not be satisfied with being directed like blind men or coddled like children. Let us remember that in Russia it is the soldiers, the working men and the farmers who have taken the reins. I do not see why the soldiers, the working men and the farmers of Canada could not play the same trick on our Government.

The Government have given notice of special legislation for the settlement of the returned soldiers on lands, to promote agriculture. The Government have also in mind the construction of magnificent public roads and are taking steps to attract a very large immigration into this country.

Every one of these propositions is commendable and has some good points. However, they should be approached and dealt with in a practical way. The surest way to improve the economic conditions in this country is to develop and encourage agriculture by a wise policy of colonization.

However, the idea of reserving the crown lands for the soldiers, and excluding all other settlers by rules and regulations as ridiculous as they are tyrannical is a double mistake.

Experience has taught us that the settling of soldiers on agricultural lands is an unproductive and hurtful experiment. In many cases, the returned soldiers, lacking training and experience, will take up lands as compensation for the sacrifices they have made, but the lands will not be put under cultivation, or at least the production will be far below what it would be under good management.

The duty of the hour is to put under cultivation, by all conceivable means, the largest area possible; it is to call on every one to take a hand in promoting colonization.

Let a keen spirit of rivalry be stimulated throughout the country; let inducements and appeals be multiplied so as to guide as many recruits as possibe towards the new lands. Thus only can it be hoped that the surplus population of country places will be diverted to the new regions, instead of increasing the army of unemployed in the cities, and that the labourers who deserted the farms will be encouraged to resume that eminently beneficent calling.

Let the soldiers be treated with a great deal of kindness, well and good; but be it remembered that the remainder of the nation that toiled and suffered, that laboured and paid during the whole war, also deserved well of the country. Moreover, the national interest requires it and it is needed to ensure peace in the future.

Let large sums be spent in order to lay out roads, well and good; but the construction of highways for the motor cars of those who have reaped millions of dollars during the war must not alone be thought of. Let an attempt be made in order to give an easy access to the lands intended for settlement; finally, let new roads that will induce settlers to take up the new lands be opened.

On the other hand, let us not rely too much upon immigration during the years to follow the signing of the peace treaty. Every country on earth will need its manual labour and shall have an excess population to feed. The only proof of it is that England is pleased to send to Canada thousands of women who are no more of any use to her and whom they cause the Canadian soldiers to marry. Already 50,000 of those women have entered our country and others will come to Canada.

As for men, we cannot depend upon their coming soon. There are too many gaps to fill in Europe to be in a hurry to let go healthy men fit for production. If we need men, let us keep those we have already and put a stop to that stupid agitation whose result would be to turn out of the country people who have been lured by inducements of all kinds and whose only fault is to have been born in one country rather than in another.

Instead of turning them out, let us teach them to love Canada and to look upon it as the finest, the most hospitable, the freest and most generous country on earth. He who loves a country is loyal to it, and people who have been here since many years, even if they were born in countries which have become hostile, would not be long impervious to that beneficent influence.

Let us begin by expunging from our statute books the War-time Elections Act, that legislative blunder whose only use was to foster distrust and dissatisfaction among

thousands of people who had been granted British citizenship and never did anything to deserve such a downfall.

After all, Mr. Speaker, if it is our wish that Canada pass succesfully through that transitional period between war and peace, if it is our wish that all the good purposes of the Government, all their good measures be efficiently carried out, let us try to put into practice those noble utterances of the hon. member from Thunder Bay and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) delivered in this House the other day: "I am deeply convinced that the establishment of a real entente cordiale in this country should be the desire of all true lovers of Canada. The man, Sir, whether he be a French-speaking Canadian or an English-speaking Canadian, whether he be a Catholic or a Protestant, who wilfully fosters antagonism of race and creed in this country is neither a true friend nor a loyal citizen of the land we love."

Those are words that should ring into the ears of all those who had a hand in a criminal and condemned policy, in a policy that is very aptly described in a pamphlet which the Government had brought in for their electoral campaign, and which is entitled: "Language oppression in the German Empire;" but influential members of the ministry prevented its distribution because it expounded a principle which was a menace to some provincial governments.

Those are words which I take as my own for they express the most intimate conviction of every hon. member of the House, and the Government may rely upon our entire co-operation in all measures they take to establish such an entente cordiale. Besides, that is the foundation of the prosperity and power of our magnificent country, and it should be the first thought of all rulers.

Mr. PELLETIER (Continuing in English): If I may be allowed, Mr. Speaker, to say a few words in English, there are a few points that I wish to take up.

The member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) says that he does not believe in following leaders or parties. I wonder what happened to him at the last session of Parliament when he offered a motion by way of amendment to the resolution proposed with regard to titles, suggesting that no titles of any class or kind should be granted to domiciled Canadians—and then refused to vote for it. The hon. member subsequently stated:

> When I proposed this amendment I had no conception that it was a question which in any way might precipitate a crisis in the country.

[Mr. Pelletier.]

> I had no conception that the Prime Minister of this country would stake the existence of the Government on this issue. I was elected as a supporter of the Union Government, and I would much prefer to resign my seat here to-night than to jeopardize the existence of the Government. In my parliamentary experience in the old days I understood that when a private member introduced a motion, members of the House on both sides were perfectly free to vote for or against it, according to how it appealed to them.

Mr. Speaker, when a member makes a motion or offers an amendment and has not the courage to vote for his own motion, what can we expect?

The hon. gentleman stated that he did not believe in following leaders or parties. He said further that he thought he was too good to be in this world after a conversation he had had with a political leader of his. If he is too good to live in this world, he is very unfortunate. According to his own statement this evening, the Liberal party has withdrawn communion from him. It would appear that the few remarks made by the Prime Minister prior to the taking of the vote on the question of titles resulted in the courage of his convictions being taken away from the member for Springfield.

The member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said on Thursday evening last in the course of his remarks that defaulters under the Military Service Act should not be sent to prison, or words to that effect. Let me say, Mr. Speaker, that in many cases the fact that boys did not report for duty was due to their receiving their notices after the day they were summoned to report. In other cases, sons of farmers were under the impression that they were exempt from military service for a certain time and continued their labour on the farm, thus helping the country by producing and helping to feed our soldiers and those at home. And I, Mr. Speaker, like the member for Frontenac, do not believe in imposing heavy fines on such men. In many cases the fine cannot be paid, and the defaulter must take the jail path, which is not a royal one by any means. I believe this policy to be a grave mistake, because these defaulters have shown no criminal instinct, and by sending them to jail you may make criminals of them, even though they be honest men, and blot their careers forever. I demand an amnesty for the young man who was on the farm and was a good soldier in producing and helping to feed the Allies, but who did not understand the law that even lawyers did not understand. If you punish any one, punish the profiteers, whose only ambition was to accumulate wealth and who did not care a continental how long

the war lasted or how much blood was shed so long as they filled their coffers at the cost of the poorer classes, who will have to pay a tax for years to come.

The member for Frontenac also said that the personalities of Macdonald and Laurier suppressed individuality, and that from now on the men who sit in this House will express their individual opinions. The hon. gentleman said that that would be a good thing for the Dominion. Mr. Speaker, such may have been the case in the Tory ranks, but with us it is quite different. The proof is that those who left the ranks of Liberalism to join the Unionists were left free by Sir Wilfrid Laurier to act as their conscience dictated, and they have done as they pleased.

Nearly all my hon. friends on the other side of the House spoke about the dim light in the window. The member for Frontenac claims that so far as the Liberal party is concerned, this light is flickering away. Mr. Speaker, if our light is flickering away, may I ask what has become of the Tory light which has disappeared entirely, never to show up again? No doubt it died out or was submerged in the three elements that the member for Dorchester spoke of last Thursday evening. But our light will come up brighter than ever, because true patriotism and the real interest of our country can be found only in Liberalism.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (East York): Mr. Speaker, I wish to congratulate the hon. member for East Calgary (Mr. Redman) who moved the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I wish to congratulate the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) who seconded the Address. I am sure we appreciate the efforts of those young men, who, responding so nobly to the call of the Empire, went forward to the front and did their part and returned to this country with great honour. The people of this country showed their appreciation of the splendid work of those young men by electing them to this House of Commons, thus giving them an opportunity of showing that they were equal to the occasion as representatives of the people of this Dominion in this House, as young Canadians who would assist in making the laws and in inaugurating great reforms in this country. Therefore, when the people of this country show their appreciation in that way, we must acknowledge that they deserve the showing of that appreciation.

We should feel that a compliment was paid to Canada by the calling of Sir Robert Borden to England for the purpose of assisting in the settlement of the terms of peace at the conclusion of the greatest war in the history of the world. We are proud to have such an eminent statesman assisting in that settlement.

I wish to congratulate the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) on his splendid leadership of this House during the absence of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). We know that the Acting Prime Minister has exceptional ability. He has shown that he possesses it, and we feel that it is the duty of hon. members to render whatever assistance they can to him in order to encourage him in the success which he has made of that leadership.

There are many matters of great importance to be brought before the House during this session. We know that last year the Government had a great deal of responsibility. We know that their physical powers were put to the test by the many duties they had to perform. We know that many Orders in Council were passed and that many commissions were appointed to carry on the great work of this country. We also know that when the members were called to this House at the last session, they felt that there was very little for them to do; that at this period under war conditions it was perhaps necessary that many Orders in Council should be passed and that many commissions should be appointed. Some hon. members, however, thought that as Parliament was in session, some of the responsibility should be placed upon the representatives of the people and some of the work performed by them, and that fewer Orders in Council should be passed and fewer commissions appointed. Now that the war is over, and now that the members——

M. DEMERS: Mr. Speaker, I draw your attention to the fact that we have not a quorum.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member has drawn my attention to the fact that there is not a quorum present.

And a count having been taken, it was found that a quorum was not in the Chamber.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is not a quorum present. This House stands adjourned until to-morrow afternoon at two o'clock.

Accordingly, the House adjourned at 10.10 p.m.

Wednesday, March 12, 1919,

The House met at Two o'clock.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

SPECIAL ORDER LAPSED—MOTION FOR ITS REINSTATEMENT.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, owing to the want of a quorum in the House last evening the debate on the special Order of the Day which was then under discussion has lapsed, and it becomes necessary to restore it to the Order Paper by motion. Therefore, I beg to move, seconded by Mr. Carvell:

That the special Order of the Day for resuming the adjourned debate on the motion of Mr. Redman for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General, in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, having lapsed by reason of the House having been declared adjourned for want of a quorum on the 11th instant, when the said order was under consideration, be revived and placed on the Order Paper for consideration this day.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): Mr. Speaker, under the ruling of your honour of 3rd of July———

Mr. SPEAKER: I presume the hon. member rises to discuss the point of order.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: The motion itself is not debatable.

Mr. McKENZIE: I know that your honour has ruled that this motion is not debatable, but I presume the acting leader of the Government is moving under Order No. 41,—that is, that a motion without notice can be introduced by the unanimous leave of the House As I understand that, Mr. Speaker, it means that the Acting Prime Minister, or any person moving as he is moving, must move for leave to make a motion by unanimous consent of the House. If Order No. 41 does not mean that, I do not understand that it has any meaning at all. If an hon. member makes a motion that requires unanimity of the House, he must first obtain the consent of the House.

I further wish to say that the Order of the Day fixed by rule 25 of the Rules and Proceedings governing this House has set for to-day a certain procedure; and before the hon. Acting Prime Minister can move his motion he should move the suspension of Rule No. 25, so as to give him the right of way to make this motion. Unless some provision is made for it, we must go through the whole procedure before we reach the Order of the Day with respect to which this motion comes into effect. These are my objections. I am not taking objection to the main motion, but merely to the way in which it is moved. I will not discuss the motion, but I am sorry that as one of the fruits of continuous Orders in Council, hon. gentlemen supporting the Government do not think it necessary to be in the House.

[The Deputy Speaker.]

Mr. SPEAKER: Whatever weight may be attached to the point raised by the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie), that point is one which was settled when a decision was given under similar circumstances two years ago. It so happened that the present incumbent of the Chair rendered that decision; nevertheless it is binding until the House sees fit to alter his judgment on the matter. It only remains for me to follow that decision, which was that it was competent for the motion to be submitted and, if agreed to, that a debate which has lapsed by reason of lack of a quorum may be restored in all respects to the position which it occupied prior to its lapse.

Upon the second point raised by the leader of the Opposition, I would refer him to the fact that at the opening of the session on the 20th day of February, there was passed a motion by which it was ordered that the speech of His Excellency the Governor General should be taken into consideration the following Tuesday; this Order to have precedence over all other business except the introduction of Bills. If the motion which is now submitted by the acting leader of the Government carries, my judgment is that it places the debate in precisely the same position as if it had not lapsed. That the motion is quite in order, and if it be adopted by the House we shall proceed with the adjourned debate as the first Order of the Day.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

The Civil Service List.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are proceeded with, and in view of the interference with the printing of Parliament caused by the strike at the Printing Bureau, I desire to ask the Government what progress has been made towards a settlement of the strike, and, pending a settlement, what arrangements have been made for the printing of the daily Hansard, the Votes and Proceedings, and the Orders of the Day.

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: The situation is not altered to any extent from what it was when I outlined the position of affairs about three days ago. It was pointed out by me then that at least until the end of the present fiscal year the pressmen who have struck will be in as favourable a position, or in a better position than those occupying similar positions outside, and therefore, in our opinion, there was no reason for them to strike. There are a large number of others who are still employed at the Bureau but who, of necessity, if the presses stop for any length of time, cannot go on working. In view of a condition of that kind arising and also in view of the fact that undoubtedly the cost of the operation of the Bureau and the production of Government printing is abnormally high, the Government would have to consider the question of the advisability of closing the Bureau. However, I am not discussing that at the present moment. Personally, I would like to see the work carried on under such conditions as to justify the continued operation of the Bureau not only on behalf of the people who are employed but on behalf of the whole of the people of this country. Meanwhile we are carrying on, and we hope that a more favourable condition of affairs may be reached.

Mr. MURPHY: The Minister has not answered the second part of the question: What arrangements have been made for printing the daily Hansard, Votes and Proceedings, and Orders of the Day?

Mr. BURRELL: A limited number of the Hansards are being reported, printed, or mimeographed, in this House, and some other necessary papers involving, of course, matters of great importance to the soldiers, as well as some matters concerning the House, are being printed in the Militia Department.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CAHILL: Have the Government actually taken possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway?

Hon. Mr. REID: The Government have not taken possession. As receiver I took possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific on Monday morning at one o'clock.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East), for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Tuesday, March 11.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (East York): Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. Does the hon. member for East York rise to speak on the debate?

Mr. FOSTER: Yes.

Mr. SPEAKER: Under the rules—and I am guided in that respect by a decision given in the British House of Commons under precisely similar circumstances—the debate not having been adjourned but having lapsed, and the hon. member having spoken, he is debarred from speaking further. That is the interpretation of the Rule which I am compelled to take. It works a very great hardship on the hon. member for East York (Mr. Foster) under the circumstances and I am quite prepared to submit to the judgment of the House as to whether the House should nevertheless consent to his continuing the debate. If there is unanimous consent the hon. gentleman may proceed.

And the House having consented:

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Mr. Speaker, I thank the House for permitting me to continue the debate. When the House adjourned last night I had not quite finished my last sentence, and for the benefit of Hansard I would like to complete it. Now that the war is over, members should take the full responsibility. That completes the sentence. Canada should be more careful about the class of immigration coming into this country in the future. We know that in the past hundreds of immigration agents were sent all over Europe and we spent hundreds of thousands of dollars for the purpose of drumming up and sending forward immigrants to this country. We know that these agents were drawing a substantial remuneration for the work which they were doing and they were anxious to make an elaborate showing. They were not particular as to the class of people they were encouraging to come to Canada. For that reason, instead of securing the better class, these agents paid more attention to quantity than to the quality of the people that they sent to this country. As you know, many thousands presented themselves at the borders of the United States, were rejected, made the short circuit, and landed in Canada. Many of our institutions were filled to overflowing with an undesirable class of people who were physically

and mentally only fit to be placed in institutions which have to be maintained at tremendous expense to this country. These people should never have been permitted to come into Canada.

Surely, in the future, a different policy will be adopted and we should aim at quality rather than quantity in order to secure a better class of immigrants. We should not only be concerned with encouraging immigration into this country; we should be equally concerned with maintaining a check upon that immigration. We cannot help what has happened in the past but the future is before us and that is what we are interested in now. There should be a method of registration. All immigrants coming into Canada from European countries should be registered. They should be kept track of for a certain period, possibly two or three years, and if, at the end of that time they have not become naturalized or become Canadians and British subjects, they should be deported to the country from which they came. That appears to me to be the only way to accomplish what we desire. If we do that we will build up the country with a better class of people and that should be our object rather than to have large numbers who will not be quite so desirable. By a system of registration and keeping track of immigrants for a reasonable time we will know whether they are desirable or not and if they fail to become naturalized we can deal with them.

The experience that we have had in the last four or five years with that class of people who did not become naturalized, who were aliens, foreigners to this country, has not been a happy or a profitable one. I made the statement on the floor of this House last session, that there were thousands of foreigners throughout the Dominion who were taking the places of our own boys who had responded to the call of the Empire. These men were occupying positions in which they were drawing large sums of money for wages, amounting on the average from five to ten dollars a day, and running each month to hundreds of thousands of dollars, perhaps even millions. They were becoming wealthy at the expense of our own boys who had left the country for overseas service, and I suggested that there should be a commission, or a committee, appointed to go into the matter and ascertain the actual number of these people, their method of living, and the amounts they are earning. A war tax might then be levied on these foreigners who are earning such large sums of money, and whose method of living was such that they saved almost all they earned. I think I recited, on the occasion referred to, two or three cases that we knew of in the city of Toronto, cases where men were brought into the hospital. Of these men one carried $3,000 in a belt, another had $2,500, and a third had $900. It seems to me that the present time is opportune for the carrying out of my suggestion. These foreigners, just as soon as conditions have changed in Canada, will disappear almost over-night, each one carrying with him virtually a bank, carrying money that we have received no benefit whatever from in the way of a revenue. I also said last session that we should have levied a war tax on these foreigners, the revenue from which might be applied to alleviating the condition of the orphans or widows of our deceased soldiers. Had my suggestion been carried out it would have brought in an immense revenue to the country, and would have materially lightened the burden to be borne by our own people. To-day we read in the newspapers that some ten thousand of these foreigners wish to return to some foreign country, and that five thousand others are seeking to be transported to the country from which they came. There are thousands of them going back to their native land where they will be able on Canadian money to live in comfort for the rest of their days. They are carrying millions of good money from Canada which will go to enrich other countries, and we shall derive no benefit from it whatever. So I say, our experience in the past suggests that we should adopt a different policy for the future.

In a few days legislation will be submitted to this House having for its object the expenditure of some $20,000,000 for the construction and improvement of highways. In this connection I wish to congratulate the province of Ontario for the measures it is taking to create public works to afford work for the unemployed, and I shall submit a few figures which I think go to show that Ontario at least is alert to the present situation. In the province of Ontario there are thirty-seven counties, of which thirty-six have established county road systems. These systems comprise a total mileage of 9,400. If to these figures be added the proposed mileage of the provincial system, amounting to 600, it will give a total of 10,000 miles of improved roadways. The expenditures for the year on the county road system will exceed $3,000,000, whereas the provincial system involves an expenditure on roads of approximately $2,000,000. The province of Ontario is arranging to provide this large expenditure for the purpose of

giving work to the unemployed, and that work is to be carried on during the coming year. I think also that Quebec is undertaking a good roads system, and Manitoba also; I have no doubt but that the various other provinces will undertake similar outlays, and perhaps to a larger extent, which, coupled with the outlay proposed by the Dominion authorities, will result in a very large expenditure. While the province of Ontario is undertaking to expend upon roads the large amount mentioned, we have had in that province some experience of road and highway building which has not been altogether satisfactory. I have some figures with me, and contrasting the original estimate with the total expenditure for carrying out the work, there still remains a good deal to be learned in the matter of road building. Furthermore, from what I have heard with respect to the construction of the Toronto-Hamilton highway, a great deal of money expended on that enterprise was virtually wasted. I do not consider that we got full value for the money expended on that highway, nor do I believe the quality of the highway is what it should have been, and it lacks the width that is demanded in a stretch of roadway where tremendous traffic is developing for pleasure and for commercial purposes, and where the amount of tonnage transported will be very large indeed. So great indeed is the traffic which passes over this highway that I venture to say, from the nature of its construction in a very short time this roadway will have so deteriorated that it will perhaps have to be rebuilt in a more substantial way, and with greater width. The mileage is thirty-seven, and the original estimate of the cost for a roadway of sixteen feet width was some $340,000. The estimate for a roadway at eighteen feet width was $400,000. That is, after having decided to build a sixteen foot roadway the authorities discovered that it was entirely too narrow and too dangerous, and they enlarged the width to eighteen feet, which means an expenditure of approximately $400,000. The total cost of the highway, exclusive of the bridges, will be about $1,190,000. The total cost including the bridges will be $1,251,000. But I saw a few days ago where the chairman of the commission having charge of the work stated that the total expenditure when the highway is completed would be $1,480,000. So that although the original estimate for this work was $340,000, to entirely complete it will mean an outlay of a million and a half of dollars. Now there has been a great deal of complaint in connection with this work, and grievances have arisen. When the original estimate of cost was advanced to $400,000, and then exceeded, various municipalities complained. They objected to the further increased expenditure, but the commission applied for the necessary sanction to the Provincial Legislature. I may say that a member of the Legislature is chairman of the commission, and after the highway was started he insisted that the work should be completed at any cost. This gentleman forced upon the various interested municipalities that increased expenditure, and yet, notwithstanding that augmented outlay we have not got value for such large expenditure, neither is the road a suitable one for a thoroughfare with such heavy traffic. Therefore, when this Government proposes to hand over to the various provinces the sum of $20,000,000, I do not think it is showing good judgment. Nevertheless we appreciate the object in undertaking the expenditure of such a large sum in a worthy cause. We know that at this time there are many returned soldiers in Canada, and many other unemployed persons throughout Canada, and I congratulate the Government on undertaking this expenditure to provide work for those who now need it.

I do not think it is good judgment to hand to the various provinces this $20,000,000 that is to be expended in the next five years. This Government should lay down a policy of building a great transcontinental highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific, costing possibly a couple of hundred million dollars and adopt and carry out its own system of building it. What does the handing over of this large expenditure to the various provinces mean? The patronage system still prevails in the provinces, and there is danger that we shall not get good value for the amount which is to be expended. Then, if the roads are constructed by the various provinces, the responsibility for anything which may be faulty or subject to criticism will rest upon this Government, which is furnishing $20,000,000 for this purpose, and, I suppose, will continue to furnish further sums. I do not think we should place on one engineer the responsibility of representing this Government on the various commissions appointed by the provinces in connection with the construction of these highways. I doubt whether that one person could cope with the situation in the various provinces and with the influences that may be brought to bear upon

the spending of this money. I submit that this Government should themselves undertake to expend this money, and should themselves assume all responsibility in that connection.

There is quite a difference between a transcontinental highway and the rural highway or a township or county road. I do not doubt that the idea of building a transcontinental highway is a capital one. It will link up all the principal manufacturing towns throughout the Dominion, develop a new transportation system and create a settlement along this highway that should be very beneficial to the development of the country. It is another method of development. We have our transcontinental steam railways; we are now electrifying many railway lines, and we should construct a highway for motors, commercial and pleasure. But that would be an entirely different road from that which has been built by the provinces or from that which would be generally used by the provinces. We should not be in too big a hurry to hand this money over to the provinces. The Government would be well advised in following my suggestion that they themselves take the full responsibility for the construction of such a highway.

This expenditure of $20,000,000 is proposed, first, to assist the unemployed returned soldier, and, second, to assist the unemployed generally. How will that work out? First, we call upon the returned soldier who is unemployed and we say to him: "Here is construction work; here is employment for you." But this work—perhaps seventy per cent of it—is pick and shovel work, and the soldier will likely say: "I am not used to pick and shovel work, and I do not propose to take up that kind of work for a living." I think that the majority of the soldiers will decline to do that kind of work.

Then, in the towns and cities, there are thousands of men who are unemployed. You say to them: "Here is an expenditure of millions; by applying you can get employment." What will the answer be? I am inclined to think that the unemployed man in the city will say: "My family is in the city; all my interests are there; I do not desire to go ten, fifteen, twenty, or fifty miles from my home to do pick and shovel work." I think, therefore, he will decline to become a pick and shovel man.

Now, the next class you will draw from—and this is serious as I see it—is that of the men in the villages who are labourers or the men on the farm who work from ten to twelve hours a day, possibly getting $2.50 a day. The latter will say to his associates: "I think we had better give up this work on the farm; it is heavy work; the hours are long and the pay small. We can go to the highways commission and get $3.50 to $4 a day, and work only eight hours each day." Now, in this way you are drawing upon those who are engaged upon production, which is serious. We all know the difficulties that have been experienced in the last four or five years in connection with production on the farms. If therefore, in carrying out this scheme you draw from that section of the community, instead of working a benefit to our country in the way of production of foodstuffs, we shall be injuring it. You may be able to check that up by close inquiry and registration; but will the commission be so particular as that? Or will they circulate this money irrespective of the community that they draw from the necessary labour? We want to give employment to the unemployed; we want to circulate this money, but we do not want to draw from these various classes that I have mentioned, to the disadvantage of the Dominion. If we cannot succeed in building these highways without drawing upon rural communities in the employment of labour, then it is my view that we should not go on with that expenditure.

The Government should be congratulated for offering to the provinces $25,000,000 for the purpose of securing better housing conditions in the large cities, and incidentally reducing unemployment. Many houses in the large cities are not as sanitary and up-to-date as they should be. Toronto has had some experience in housing matters, some houses having been built by a company, but I would say that the undertaking was a failure.

I understand that a commission of the best business men in Toronto has been appointed, composed of men in whom we have every confidence, and who would not go into this if they did not think it would be a success. The difference between the two plans would be this: About ten years ago, when there was a house famine, an agitation was started that the city should go into the housing business. The city decided that if a company was formed, they would guarantee bonds to the extent of $1,000,000 for the housing company, and they would give fifteen per cent of that, or $150,000. The company was accordingly organized, got its charter and went into the housing business. The method of building, however, was not modern, nor was it in the interest of the housing of many people. They took two pieces of ground, with a total area

almost as great as the block on which this building stands. These parcels of land are located in two different parts of the city. Instead of the new method that is proposed, the old company endeavoured to see how many houses they could get on a certain piece of ground irrespective of conditions. The result was that terraces of houses numbering from five, ten, fifteen, up to fifty were erected, and at the rear of each house there was a space of some fifteen feet, just sufficient for a revolving clothesline. This space was all open; there was no privacy. The result was that on wash-days the children playing around would run up against the clothes and there would be trouble. This occurred on many occasions. In front, there were nice lawns, which gave the houses a good appearance. In these houses there were three, five or six rooms on each floor, with three families in each house. The Housing Company completed the houses, and there has been a demand for them at good rentals. But it is stated that last year there was a loss to the management of over $4,000, and this has occurred at a period when rents are up sky-high. If that is the condition now, what is it going to be in the future? This Housing Company have, as I understand from the report in the press, decided to hand the management over to some loan company or collecting agency. I think the company is trying to get out from under. That is the past experience of Toronto in regard to housing.

I like the ideas of the new commission better. They purpose building houses worth about $2,500 or $3,000. They purpose having a standard width of twenty or twenty-five feet, with a depth of eighty to one hundred, or perhaps 110 feet, with the lots properly divided from each other so as to ensure privacy. The houses are to have from four to six rooms. That idea is, I think, all right. The houses are to be either detached or semi-detached. Each family will have an opportunity to have their own yard, so that their children will have a private yard to play in, and with a rear lot of a fair size there will be opportunity for gardening, which will prove an advantage to this class of people. This class of house will, as the result of experience of the old system, be found to be more suitable for the working people. I see, however, one danger even at this time of erecting that class of house. As we know, things to-day are abnormal. Supposing, as is proposed, a house is built worth $3,000, including the lot. When things become normal in two or three years from now, labour and material will be somewhat more moderate, and there is a danger of such a house depreciating in value to the extent of from $300 to $500. These houses are to be sold to the working people, so that a workingman who has bought one of these houses may find that his investment has shrunk from three to five hundred dollars, and he will become dissatisfied. If he has to leave the city and go to some other place to work, and finds it necessary either to sell or rent, and if he discovers that instead of three thousand dollars he can get only $2,500, or if he has to accept a low rental, he will become dissatisfied and may throw up the deal. The danger is, therefore, that an unpleasant feeling may be created, and that would not be desirable. The principle, however, that the commission is working on as to the class of house and also in regard to expenditure in order to give work to a large number of people, is all very good, but there is, as I have explained, the danger of dissatisfaction afterwards.

This Government has offered money for housing to the provincial governments, and they in turn have offered it to the various municipalities. Neither the Dominion Government nor any of the provincial governments is taking any risk of loss in doing this. That risk falls upon the municipalities. They have to guarantee the provincial governments and the provincial government has, in turn, to guarantee the Dominion. Therefore, if there is any loss, it will fall on the municipalities, and the result might be serious. I do not know, therefore, that at this particular time the municipalities should rush into erecting more houses.

Another matter that I have no doubt will be before the House in a few days is the temperance question. We should, in my opinion, continue for another year the Temperance Act that was passed as a war measure, and then, as this is a large and important question, a referendum should be submitted to the people of this Dominion. When one mixes amongst the people in order to find out their views, one is convinced that this is a big question, and if it is settled by the people, the people should be satisfied and we should legislate accordingly. I believe this Government did the right thing in having that Act put through. I, as a citizen of Toronto, congratulate the provincial government on their War Measures Act, although they have got into bad odour for putting it through. But nevertheless I think they were right and they will come out right in the end. What would have been the position in Toronto if that Act

had not been put through? Every member here, I believe, knows the experience we had with the riot that occurred during the latter part of last year.

I am sure that if the saloons had been open, conditions would have been very much worse. As it was, there were several broken heads, and there are claims against the city amounting to from $50,000 to $80,000 for property destroyed. I think the provincial government did the right thing at the right time, and I hope the legislation will be continued, notwithstanding the fact that many people will say that the provincial government acted in an autocratic manner in putting this legislation on the statute-book. I have had considerable experience as a retailer, and I have seen considerable of the evil effects of drinking. It is not the drinker himself but his wife and children who suffer the most. I am prepared to hold up both hands in favour of temperance legislation, both provincial and Dominion.

Since last session there has been quite a restless feeling among the employees of the outside Civil Service. Last session I received many letters from employees of different branches of the Civil Service asking for consideration of their case, as owing to the high cost of living many found it difficult to make ends meet. We felt last session that the Government would relieve this condition, but they did not, and the result was that a strike took place in Toronto. A large deputation came to Ottawa to interview the Government, and I must express my appreciation of the interest taken in the matter by the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) who accompanied the delegation. The delegation had two or three conferences with the Government and went home with the feeling that something would be done. But relief has not been afforded up to this day, and a spirit of restlessness continues to prevail among many thousand employees of the Government. It may not be necessary to give the men all that they are asking, but something must be done, or we shall have a bigger strike still, not only in Toronto but throughout the Dominion, and a bigger deputation coming to Ottawa, accompanied perhaps by many members of Parliament. The Government should not wait to be forced. I cannot understand their failing to see that the men have a grievance which should be remedied, and I trust the Government will at once take action to satisfy the men.

The postmasters of the substations in Toronto have also a grievance, and the same remark applies to Montreal, Winnipeg and Hamilton. A deputation representing the substation postmasters waited upon me just before I left for Ottawa. They state that the maximum salary paid at present is $200 per year, and to reach this, the office must furnish a revenue of not less than $5,000 yearly. This amount is raised altogether from the sale of stamps. I will quote from their petition to the Deputy Postmaster General:

3 p.m.

> In view of the great increase in the cost of living, advancing rents, and higher pay for help of any description, your petitioners respectfully ask that the maximum salary paid be $400 yearly to officers producing a revenue of $5,000 or more, and to smaller revenue-producing officers in proportion. All commissions to remain the same as at present, excepting postage stamps, which will be increased to 2 per cent and that itinerant vendors' licenses be discontinued.

These itinerant vendors sell a great number of stamps, to the disadvantage of the small vendor who is put to large expense and receives such a small return. This is a matter that the Government should deal with. Two or three people should not be allowed to get the cream of the business, but that has been the case for years and years. The subpostmasters of Toronto feel that in view of the high rents and high cost of heat and light to-day they should receive higher remuneration. They have told me that if the Government does not afford them some relief they will be obliged to give up these substations. If they do that, more clerks will have to be employed to handle the work, and the cost will be greater than at present. So I think it is in the interests of the Government itself to try and meet the demand of these people.

There has been considerable discussion of the Civil Service Commission, which has been described as a very iniquitous body. The hon. member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) and the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) have already spoken on this subject, and I think before the debate closes we shall hear more about the Civil Service Commission from other hon. gentlemen. Where there is so much smoke I think there must be a little fire, although I must admit that the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) put up a very good defence.

There are rumours, and the public verily believe these rumours, and the only way in which they can be satisfied is to have an investigation. The hon. member for West Toronto and the hon. member for Frontenac have made certain statements. We have heard the reply to these statements. The public have read both the statements and the reply; they have read

the charge and the defence, yet they are not satisfied. They are of the opinion that there is an object on each side. On the one hand they believe there is an object in the charge which has been made, while also they see an object behind the defence, and, they think there is some truth in the charges. This opinion is not confined to one hon. member, nor do I think it will have been confined to four or five before the debate closes, from what I have heard; and I do say that the matter should be investigated and even if the hon. member for West Toronto does not formulate his charges and ask for an investigation, I think the Government will be justified in the circumstances in having an investigation in order to satisfy the people that this commission is doing its work, that it may have made some slight mistakes, but not such mistakes as have been charged against it.

Now, I gave expression in this House last session as to the manner in which I thought this Civil Service Commission might operate. I said at that time that I was opposed to the patronage system as being antiquated, and that we should get away from that. Hon. members do not want to be bothered with patronage. I said, if the Civil Service Commission is going to work out to the satisfaction of the people generally and to hon. members, it will be a godsend. But, I said, I thought there was a danger in the commission undertaking that work, in this way: There is a commission of three; there is a secretary, and there are deputy heads throughout the Civil Service. I was suspicious that the commission would not undertake all the responsibility; that some of it would be shifted to the secretary, who in turn would shift it to some of the deputies, and between the secretary and the deputies the whole matter would work to the advantage of some, and instead of being patronage to large numbers it would be patronage to a favoured few. That is about what I said last session, and judging by the statements made in this House it seems that that is the way in which matters have turned out. I said then that if that was the way in which it would operate I would not be satisfied with the Civil Service Commission; and I am not satisfied now, notwithstanding the defence put up so far. I shall not be satisfied until this matter has been investigated from A to Z. After that has been done, and it has been shown clearly that there is no justification for the statements that have been made, then I will be disposed to feel that the Civil Service Commission is the proper means of administering the affairs of which it has charge. I think, therefore, that as the matter stands the Government should have an investigation, whether the hon. member (Mr. Hocken) desires it or not.

Another matter mentioned in the speech from the Throne is Women's Franchise. I agree with the suggestion that something should be done in the way of giving the franchise to the women of Canada. It has been stated on the floor of the House that the women of Canada have done a great deal towards the successful conclusion of the war; and I concur in the opinion that has been here expressed that we should recognize the part they have played in the struggle. I believe that from their own standpoint the women have done as much to win the war as the men. We know the nature of the work they have done, we are aware of the response which was made by the young women who were prepared to go forward and render every help in any direction in which they were desired to assist. They were prepared to become chauffeurs, to drive automobiles, transportation trucks and other vehicles, to assist in Red Cross work and to do many other things without which we could not have successfully carried on the war. They responded to the call from the farms, and we had farmerettes by the thousand in the Dominion, and credit is due them for the greater production which followed. If they have proven their case—as I think they have—that they were in every way equal to the occasion in every endeavour, then I think the least we can do in recognition of the noble part they have played in the war is to extend the franchise to the women of this country.

It was said by one hon. member on the other side of the House last year, when we were discussing this subject, that perhaps it might apply to one or two provinces, but that he did not think it would be found to be generally applicable. He was of the opinion that the women should be educated; that it was necessary to educate them before they could be capable of properly exercising the franchise. Well, I think we had some experience at the last election of the qualifications of the women of this country as voters. We do not need to educate them further. In my riding they voted by hundreds, and I never heard of a spoiled ballot, or of any confusion in any respect. In fact, I would pronounce them better voters than many of the men, and I think they should be congratulated on

the admirable way in which they exercised the franchise, which was limited at that time. Now, I think we should extend the right to vote to the women throughout the Dominion.

Another matter that may come before the House and in connection with which there has been considerable agitation in the Dominion is the question of the aliens in this country who were disfranchised under the War-time Elections Act. It has been said by many outside of the House that the franchise should be restored to these people. I do not see it in that way. I feel they were disfranchised properly. They were aliens, doing everything they could to create disturbance in their sections of the Dominion, and I am of opinion that they should continue to be disfranchised until such time as they become good Canadians, good British subjects who are prepared to be loyal citizens, satisfied to comply with the laws of the country. Then we might extend the franchise to them, but not before. For these reasons I am not in favour of restoring to them the right to vote. I am prepared to continue for a time the present status of these people and those who may come into the Dominion; because it is only fair in the interests of our own Canadians that this should be so. Why, especially in ridings which they control, should they have as much say as those of our own people who have made such sacrifices to save the Empire, while the aliens, on the other hand, did all in their power to disrupt Canada and cause, if they could, the downfall of the Empire? I repeat, it is in the best interests of Canada that the alien should continue disfranchised.

Then there is one other matter—although in this I think I may be treading on thin ice—in which I think there should be some change. We have a Senate, the members of which are appointed by the Governor General. Their appointments are for life. Apparently, notwithstanding the fact that they are appointed to the Senate, they are eligible for positions in the Government. We have senators who are at the head of very responsible departments and from my experience last session I think it is desirable that the heads of these departments should have places on the floor of this House. Instead of the head of the department being here to answer questions, his secretary, or some officer, or another minister, is charged with that duty. I believe that the three gentlemen whom I have particularly in mind at the present moment are well qualified to discharge the duties of the positions that they occupy, and that they have the respect of the people of this country, but I do not think it is proper that men should be placed in these responsible positions who are not directly responsible to the people. Why should we have a Minister of Labour who is a member of the Senate and who is not permitted to be in this House to answer the questions that may be asked and which can only be satisfactorily answered by the head of the department? The Postmaster General is also a member of the Senate. A third member of the Government who is a member of the Senate is Sir James Lougheed. Surely a selection could be made of gentlemen who are direct representatives of the people and who would be on the floor of this House to defend their departments and to answer questions. I have no doubt that the Government felt—I do not know for what reason—that it was desirable that these gentlemen should be called upon to perform these very responsible duties. But, I would say that their selection is a slight on the members of this House. It would almost indicate that we in this House have not the ability to perform these duties. It would appear as if this Government were under a special obligation to some members of the Senate and they are discharging this obligation by giving them these responsible positions. I feel that the method of representation should be changed. If they desire to select a member of the Senate as a member of the Government he should resign, go to a constituency, appeal to the people and come back as the representative of the people to the responsible position to which he has been assigned, and he should have a place on the floor of this House so that he could answer directly the questions of members which cannot be satisfactorily answered by deputies and secretaries.

Mr. EDMOND SAVARD (Chicoutimi and Saguenay) (translation): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House, I feel the need of all your forbearance toward a representative of the people whose sole ambition is to discharge what he deems to be his duty.

It is not, however my intention to overtax your kind disposition, Mr. Speaker, because I consider that all the questions that have allready been dealt with, have been discussed exhaustively and with more ability than I could hope to bestow on the subject myself. Furthermore, I consider that it would be sheer temerity on my part, at this phase of the debate, to make a long speech on the Address. I shall therefore confine my remarks to a few observations

in accord with the dominant feelings of the people that I have the honour to represent in this House. Before going any further, allow me, Sir, to follow the example of the hon. gentlemen who have preceded me, and to add my humble quota of homage and praise to the tributes paid for more than two weeks, to the memory of the man who has occupied, and will continue to occupy such a large place in the hearts of the Canadians, and more particularly, of the French Canadians.

I have no hesitation in saying that nowhere Sir Wilfrid Laurier was more loved, more revered than in the vast regions of Lake St. John, and Chicoutimi and Saguenay; to prove that assertion, suffice it to say that it is largely, very largely—to the prestige of the illustrious dead that I owe my election with more than 1,000 majority I think I can say with the utmost confidence that nowhere our great compatriot will be more sincerely mourned because we feel that by his death we have lost a great benefactor, and that the country has lost the greatest of its citizens.

He is dead, but our hearts will continue to cherish his memory and the history of his life will always be a high example for the coming generations.

Now, Sir, allow me to join the hon. gentlemen who have taken part in the debate and to offer my congratulations to the proposer and seconder of the Address in answer to the speech from the Throne and, who have so ably acquitted themselves. I think it infortunate, however, that the Government has departed from the old established rule—the unbroken rule, I think—of having one of the two speeches in French.

On the present occasion, more than on any other, the custom should have been adhered to, because the French Canadians, like the English Canadians, are coming home from the battlefields after a glorious victory.

However, I think that I find a reason which would seemingly justify them to a certain extent; it is that the present Government is a war government that is rather crippled—their big guns not being in their proper places. They thought it proper and necessary to place in the limelight, to uphold their ground, gallant men who gained distinction on the battlefield and who surely have it at heart to maintain their reputation in this House and it seems to me that on that score the Government could not have made a better choice.

Now, Sir, let me state that I have the honour of representing one of the large—if not the largest—but surely one of the most interesting counties in the country. With few exceptions its inhabitants are French Canadians, and I would even venture to say that in this respect it occupies the foremost place among the counties throughout Canada, and that is probably one of the reasons why I regret my inability to express myself in the language of the majority, which fact naturally and almost invariably drives out almost every hon. member on the other side of the House. I do not intend to find fault with them on that score because if we were in the same circumstances, if we could not understand them, we might possibly do likewise; but all the same this much I am sure of, we would see that our duty was done and that the business of this House was not suspended.

Let us say here that we are as proud of being French Canadians as citizens of other nationalities are proud of the race to which they belong.

Why would we not be proud of being French Canadians when we can claim to be the progeny of those haughty Gauls who for so long resisted Cæsar and his all but insuperable legions? Why would we not be proud of being French Canadians when we know ourselves to be the offspring of that heroic France who for ten centuries waged war throughout the earth, almost always victoriously, for the sake of justice, civilization and freedom, and who for over four years, in a struggle unexampled in the annals of mankind, startled the world by opposing German barbarity? Finally, we are proud of being the descendants of the first inhabitants, the early settlers of this country. Our ancestors fought along while under the flag of France but, Sir, when that flag had to re-cross the seas, defeated but still radiant with honour and glory, does not history teach us that they served their new country with the same prowess and the same devotion?

Mr. Speaker, I do not intend—besides I lack the ability—to give a lecture on history, but I am pleased to recollect that at the last session an hon. member on the other side of the House, undoubtedly wearied by the unceasing reproaches heaped ever and anon upon the French Canadian race, recalled to his friends the part played by the French Canadians in our annals; he recalled the years 1775 and 1812. I am also pleased to remember that many other members on the other side, those whose reputation as French-haters is best known throughout the country, stated that there was no better, no more valorous soldiers on the

battlefields than the French Canadian soldier. Such a testimony from the mouth of our worst enemies can only delight us, as it can be but the voicing of a signal truth.

Mr. Speaker, had it been possible, had we not wanted to remain French Canadians, had we lost our senses to the extent of agreeing to sacrifice the work of many centuries of painful efforts, you would now all be convinced that the blood which flows through the veins of the soldier of the glorious 22nd is the same blood which flows through the veins of the French Canadian lads.

But we are reproached with having failed in the accomplishment of our duty during the war which has just been brought to an end. Why such a reproach when we are well satisfied that the Government left no stone unturned in order to prevent the French Canadians from enlisting? We are entirely satisfied, and I say it with the utmost frankness, that the Govenment would have been pleased and would have preferred it if French Canadians had taken a different stand, so as to enable them to stir racial prejudices. I do not wish to review the circumstances of the whole organization at the beginning of the war.

The facts were already stated during the last session, and I shall be content with placing before this House and the country what occurred in my own county at the time and what were the results. An officer was sent to Chicoutimi to secure volunteers and opened an office there. In Chicoutimi as everywhere else, I regret to say, there are men either lazy or idle, very few, but still there are some, and in the best families you will often find all kinds of individuals. Well, those who would not work, the lazy ones, were unfortunately the first to enlist. Some highly respectable young men belonging to good families, would have liked to serve, but knowing as they did that they would be compelled to live for a certain length of time in company with this sort of people, they hung back. Therefore the people of Chicoutimi who were anxious to see the county do, not its duty, for we did not consider it compulsory, but its share as the other sections of the country, in recruiting the largest possible number of young men, started an agitation with a view to securing from the Government permission to have the recruiting done by the 18th regiment of Chicoutimi and by the officers of that regiment who were well acquainted with all the youth of that country around Chicoutimi and Lake St. John. Mr. Girard, former member for the constituency, was requested to apply to the military authorities on behalf of the citizens. But that was during the election of Dorchester, in which Mr. Girard was taking an active part. At any rate, four or five weeks elapsed or perhaps more, before Mr. Girard acknowledged receipt of the request. And we heard no more about it. Recruiting proceeded as usual; however, we were surprised to see how many young men from the parishes in the counties of Chicoutimi, Lake St. John and Saguenay, were enlisting under most unfortunate circumstances. To day a great number of them are resting for ever in French ground. Therefore I say that we have done our duty and more than our duty.

Now allow me, Sir, to refer to the Military Service Act. We had every reason to be opposed to that law. I do not intend to enumerate them all, and as everybody knows, when the Act became law we submitted to it and, with very few exceptions, all those who were called reported for duty. I sincerely declare, Sir, that I personally do not know a single young man who did not report immediately in conformity with the requirements of the Military Service Act. In our part of the country there are no unemployed, and as the Act provided for exemptions, most of our young men were temporarily exempted.

Later on the exemptions were nullified either by an Order in Council or by decisions of Hon. Justice Duff, and then the young men were called upon to report. The people of Chicoutimi-Saguenay were in a very awkward position. As I have already stated, there are no unemployed in that county. It was established to the satisfaction of the Courts—and Hon. Judge Duplessis could confirm what I say—that we were and are still lacking at least 30 or 35 per cent of the necessary labour to carry on our industries. The situation was a difficult one.

You remember, Mr. Speaker, that last spring, the hon. Minister of Agriculture called a conference of the Ministers of Agriculture of the various Provinces in Ottawa, in order to find means of increasing the production, and you also know that a subsidy was given to the Provinces for that purpose. I have much pleasure in saying that the Province of Quebec was the only one who not only reached its quota but exceeded it by several thousand acres, and I take pride in stating that the county of Lake St. John was leading all the counties of that province.

Were we to lose the benefit of the work done at the request of the Minister of Agriculture? Were we to let the crops rot, abandon the land, without a whisper, without even endeavouring to secure a leave of absence or an exemption to help saving the crops? That is what was done, and, personally, for several months, I travelled from Chicoutimi to Quebec with conscripts, helping them as much as I could and I never did anything but advise them to comply with the law, even if it were a bad one. All those who were able to leave their property and their crops for two or three days without any fear of these crops being destroyed, went to Quebec to report.

We have at Chicoutimi one of the largest pulp factories in the world. We have in the person of its manager one of the foremost financiers of the country, a gentleman whose patriotism is above suspicion. Could he close the doors of his factory and thereby bring ruin, desolation and poverty to a great number of families, without at least taking the precautions necessary to make sure of having enough labour to keep his industry from falling through? That is what was done. Mr. Dubuc and myself both did all we could to prevent the farms from being abandoned, the crops going to waste and the factories closed.

Towards the end of September the military authorities or the Government believing that there were a number of draft evaders in the Chicoutimi and Lake St. John region sent a regiment of 300 men, 200 horses and 3 machine guns, together with a great number of exploiters, for rounding up the defaulters. They spent two months at Chicoutimi. What was the result? Nothing at all. I believe I am within the mark in stating that they did not apprehend more than fifty men, at least twenty of whom were arrested on the trains when they were on their way to report, young farmers who were going in to the registrar's office because they had been promised that if they reported they would receive generous treatment and would be accorded the privileges granted those who reported on time. These young men had left their farms at the first possible opportunity so as to come in and report. They were apprehended, they were brought to Quebec, and some of the youths are to-day in Siberia where they were sent against their will and in spite of the pleas entered on their behalf by their families and by the most influential residents of the district. A certain number of the others died of Influenza; finally those who remained were set at liberty and found their way back to Chicoutimi.

This expedition, which cost thousands of dollars a day during two months, got nowhere, as far as results are concerned. The expense was altogether out of the ordinary and I intend, at some part of the session, demanding an accounting of this outlay in order to show the country the way this money was spent.

Mr. Speaker, like everybody else, we are appalled at the excessive cost of living and we blame this Government's maladministration. We are well aware that when a war is on the cost of living must necessarily increase but not out of all proportion; and we find the cause of the trouble in the pilfering of the public Treasury through scandalous contracts, like those already denounced in this House, awarded to insatiable profiteers against whom the Government has not cared to proceed. When we ponder on the colossal fortunes that certain friends of the Government have built up in the course of the war, we cannot very well feel astonished at the increased cost of living. If we are to believe the ex-Minister of Militia, one of these gentry alone made over 200 millions. This gives us an idea how a certain group is willing to throw everything into the maw of the golden calf. It is true that he who made these fantastical profits made use of the animal which fattens the quickest. Can you imagine anybody making profits like that without causing the people to suffer?

Now, Mr. Speaker, will you allow me to say a word on the subject of Woman Suffrage which the Government intends to put on the statutes. I say that if women must vote with their husbands this will evidently increase the number of votes. On the other hand they will have to frequent public meetings and clubs, and follow the newspapers, so as to form their opinions independently of their husbands; I claim that such a law is one of the most immoral enactments that the Government could be guilty of; for all your fine talk to the contrary notwithstanding woman was never created for that purpose and such a law diverts her from the beautiful role to which she was destined by the Creator, the role of loving helpmate and fond parent ready for any and every sacrifice to ensure the happiness of her husband and her children. This is a monstrous blunder and we protest against it.

Moreover, the women are asking for no such thing, especially in my county where the families are so large. You will allow me to inform you, Sir, that the average in

my riding, and I glory in the fact, the average family boasts of from eight to ten children. You often meet with families of 12, 15 and 18 children and only a short time back a woman gave birth to her 23rd child, and 18 of her chidren are still living. I can go still further: in the neighbouring parish, that of the former member for Chicoutimi, Saint-Gédéon du Lac Saint-Jean, one woman has brought into this world 26 children. Do you believe, Sir, that in the circumstances, a woman has any time to meddle in politics? I take it, the simple mention of that fact is sufficient to show the absurdity of the Government's proposal.

Allow me, Mr. Speaker, to say a word about patronage. I can prove that certain political influences are still at work in the matter of appointments, especially as regards postmasters.

In the parish of Saint-Gédéon du Lac Saint-Jean, the parish which has the honour of being the home of the former member (Mr. Girard), the postmaster gave up his position last Spring. Immediately a petition signed by three-quarters of the ratepayers was sent to the Postmaster General asking that a certain citizen be appointed to succeed the retiring postmaster. The petition was forwarded to the Postmaster General through me, and as the position in question does not command a high salary, I was under the impression that the appointments were still made by the Department. A few days later I was informed that the post-office had been moved to the house of Mr. Girard's son, Mr. Eméride Girard. Then I received a new petition signed by a great many more people and asking the Postmaster General to appoint anybody in the parish except Mr. Eméride Girard; no name was put forth for appointment. I forwarded this second petition to the Postmaster General; listen to the reply:

Ottawa, July 18, 1918.

Dear Sir,

I am instructed to acknowledge your favour of the 14th inst. enclosing a petition signed by the prominent citizens of St. Gédéon (Mr. J. E. Ludger Fortin) and by a great number of the taxpayers, protesting against the appointment of Mr. Eméride Girard to the position of postmaster at St. Gédéon Station and asking that Mr. Joseph Morissette be appointed in his stead; your letter also expressed the hope that the petitioners' request would be granted.

In reply I must inform you that no appointment has been made as yet to this postmastership, the matter still being in the hands of the Civil Service Commission; but since the retiring postmaster (Mr. Arthur Couture) had to be replaced by the 1st of July we allowed him to move the post-office temporarily to the premises of his next-door neighbour, Mr. Eméride Girard.

I may add that a copy of your letter, as also a copy of the petition submitted, will be sent to the Civil Service Commission which is now in charge of all these appointments.

Very truly yours,

Robert Fowler,
Assistant Deputy Minister.

Mr. E. Savard, M.P.,
Chicoutimi, P.Q.

With their petitions before the Postmaster General and the Civil Service Commission the citizens of Saint-Gédéon naturally believed that their wishes would be respected and that the only individual they objected to would not be appointed. It was not, Sir, on account of Mr. Eméride Girard being the son of the former member that the people of Saint-Gédéon were opposed to his appointment, but solely because they knew he was not qualified for the position although the postmastership in those small municipalities does not require a great amount of learning. Anyway, he was the only citizen whose appointment would be frowned on by everybody in the district; consequently we had a right to expect that he would not be appointed. Well, in spite of all our petitions and in spite of all we could do, Mr. Girard was named postmaster, and not, mind you, by the Civil Service Commission but by the assistant inspector at Quebec, Mr. Larue. Mr. Larue himself told me of it; and he informed me that he had made this appointment some time in October and that he had never been apprised of the petition that the citizens of Saint-Gédéon had sent to Ottawa.

How did that happen, Mr. Speaker? What influence is behind Mr. Girard's appointment to the postmastership of Saint-Gédéon? The appointment was not made by the Postmaster General who has left all these affairs in the hands of the Civil Service Commission; and the Civil Service Commission did not have anything to do with it, according to Mr. Larue himself who made the appointment.

I claim that patronage is still as rampant as ever and that the influence of Mr. Girard, the former member for Chicoutimi, is directly responsible for the appointment of his son to the postmastership at Saint-Gédéon.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words about our returned soldiers. Everybody is agreed that these men must be treated in the very best way. Is that being done? I claim it is not, Sir.

I have not a great many of them in my riding, but I wish to mention the case of a young sub-lieutenant named Lachance who was invalided home from the firing-line over a year ago and who since then has tried in

vain to obtain a Government position. I myself wrote in his favour to the Civil Service Commission; he received an application blank which he filled in and returned; and that is the last he has heard of it.

At all events I hope the Government will see to it that these brave men are properly treated; it is certainly due them.

Now, if our returned soldiers deserve a good treatment, those who are here should not suffer hardship at the hands of the Government.

All during last Winter the people along the north shore of the St. Lawrence, from Tadoussac to the confines of Labrador were without communication with the outside world, and I claim that this was due to unjust treatment on the part of the Government. For a number of years the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier had granted a yearly subsidy of some thousands of dollars for the service between Tadoussac and St. Catherine's Bay. It is the only line of communication open between these people of the Saguenay and the rest of the country.

Last year the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir G. Foster) withdrew this subsidy. Since last Summer I have done my best to obtain from the Government the money necessary for a boat to continue this service, but all my efforts brought nothing; meanwhile I had recourse to the hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier because I understood how urgent it was for these worthy people along the north shore to have some means of communication with the rest of the country.

Sir Wilfrid Laurier gave me a letter which I am about to read, in English, and I pray you Mr. Speaker, to be indulgent towards my pronunciation. This letter was addressed to the Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce because the Minister has left for Europe with the Prime Minister:

Ottawa Nov. 12th 1918.

My dear O'Hara,

Dr. Savard, M.P., for Chicoutimi & Saguenay informs me that he is here to obtain the continuation of a subsidy for a ferry crossing of the Saguenay river between Ste-Catherine and Tadoussac.

This subsidy was granted by the late government some twelve years ago and perhaps more.

I understand that it is now proposed to drop it. It is certainly most unfortunate.

I am well acquainted with the locality and the reason for which I pressed upon Sir Richard who was then Minister of Trade and Commerce, was that in winter the people on both sides of the Saguenay are absolutely shut off from civilization. This is particularly hard upon the people of Tadoussac, which is a place of some considerable importance. In winter they are without any kind of steam communication either by rail or vessel, except by this ferry.

I do not know who is your minister in the absence of Sir George Foster. I would ask you to place these facts before him.

Your sincerely
Wilfrid Laurier.

Now, here is the Deputy Minister's reply:

Ottawa, Nov., 15th 1918.

St. Catherine's Bay and Tadoussac.

Dear Mr. Savard,

I beg to state that I to-day brought the matter of the St. Catherine's Bay and Tadoussac service to the attention of the Honourable A. K. Maclean, Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he is of the opinion that he cannot recommend this vote in view of the stand taken by Sir George Foster in the matter.

Yours faithfully,
F. C. T. O'Hara,
Deputy Minister.

As you see, the acting minister, in the absence of the Minister of Trade and Commerce, refused to do justice to a region which comprises all the people from Tadoussac to Labrador, where there are a considerable number of parishes. The only communication they had with the outside world in winter was to receive their mail every three, four, five, six, seven or eight days.

A short while ago I received a letter from Tadoussac which said:

For the last eight days we have received no mail from Quebec. The last newspapers to hand are dated the 12th, and to-day is the 19th. We shall get them when Providence wishes us to. That is the way we are being treated.

There is a contract awarded for carrying the mails between St. Siméon, in Charlevoix county, and Tadoussac, but the mails are only brought through when the thing is possible—their delivery is not compulsory —that is, when the river can be crossed in a canoe or a dory, in very calm weather, for, as you know, during the Winter it is very difficult to make this trip in a small boat.

Well, I feel bound to register a protest against the unjust treatment meted out to these worthy people of the north shore.

Now, Mr. Speaker, before I close my remarks, I wish to ask the Government if it is their intention to encourage agriculture. If so, they could do no better than to provide for an experimental farm in the region of Lake St. John, rightly called "the granary of Quebec."

We have already round Lake St. John about thirty of the most thriving parishes of which nobody can get an idea without visiting them. We could establish as many more of those parishes along the valley of Lake St. John and I am perfecty satisfied that an experimental farm there would be of great benefit for the farmers.

With regard to the appointment of post-

masters, here is a letter of the secretary, Mr. Foran:

Ottawa, Nov., 6th, 1918.

Sir,—I am to acknowledge receipt of your letter of the 14th October in reference to the Postmastership of Chicoutimi Ouest, Que., and I am directed to say that the following procedure is adopted in the appointment of postmasters. If the salary of the post office is in excess of $1,000 the position is locally advertised and the application referred to the post office inspector of the district for his rating. The Civil Service Commission then takes final action on same. Should, however, the position be of a salary less than $1,000 the matter is referred to the Post Office Inspector for his recommendation as to the most suitable party to appoint.

The Post Office Inspector has, as yet, made no recommendation in this connection.

Your truly,

W. Foran,
Secretary.

Therefore if I understand rightly, the appointments of the postmasters are not always made by the Civil Service Commission, but are referred to the Post Office Inspector, as in the case of St. Gedeon. I think it is a bad system of patronage and I hope that in the future that method will be modified.

Mr. FRANK BAINARD STACEY (Westminster District): Mr. Speaker, I rise to support the motion so ably introduced by the two gentlemen who have deservedly received the congratulations of this House. And first of all, Sir, on my own behalf, and also on behalf of the constituency which I represent, I wish to pay our humble tribute to the memory of the great Canadian whose chair in this House is empty, but whose influence and example will not soon pass away. As I speak, Sir, I am thinking of a little town on the north shore of the mighty Fraser river, nearly three thousand miles from this Chamber, composed very largely of men and women who are proud to call themselves compatriots of the late great French-Canadian statesman. His portrait is in their public halls, and in their private homes. Though remote from the place of their birth they fondly cherish the memory of his lofty idealism, his matchless diction, his peerless presence and his personal charm. Very many of them were his political supporters, all were his personal admirers. I would be unworthy of my position as a representative of the French-Canadian settlement in my own constituency, as well as of other English-speaking Liberals, if I did not at least attempt to voice their sentiments upon this occasion, and to express them in the presence of their brothers and friends.

[Mr. Savard.]

I wish also to congratulate the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) upon a matter for which he has received divergent kinds of criticism from members of this House: I have in mind his reference to Liberal Unionists on the occasion of his first speech during this session. In that address he gave what I am willing to admit, and believe, was intended, as a courteous intimation to former Liberals now on this side of the House, that there is an open door should they desire to return to their former political friends. I am disposed to treat such an intimation in the same manner in which I assume it was given, and as a private member on this side of the House will take advantage of the opportunity thus afforded of expressing my views on the general question of parties, and the relation of individuals and individual members thereto.

I cannot, under present conditions, endorse the view sometimes set forth that we can or could get along without parties. Citizens holding somewhat similar views on any question may constitute a party and together work for the accomplishment of a definite result. The party is the means of accomplishing this end. Many people, Sir, in this country believe that in Canadian politics the party has hitherto been given an exaggerated and exalted importance, superior even to that of the end aimed at. Political parties rest, orginally at least, on some great principle or policy, and when honest men differ as to the application or interpretation of those principles, there is likely to be a division in the party. For example, my interpretation of the principles of Liberalism as applied to Canadian patriotism led me to advocate publicly in my own town selective conscription two years before it became a vital issue in this House, and my neighbour, a staunch Conservative, so interpreted the principles and policy of his political faith that he reached the same conclusion. So we came together on what appeared to us to be a question of supreme and paramount importance. Here, to my mind, is the true philosophy of the election of 1917. A great majority of the people of Canada believed that the end was greater than the means; that the salvation of the country was of more importance than the perpetuation of any individual party. Sir, men may exhaust the adjectives in the English and French languages to condemn the provisions of the War-time Elections Act. It may have been good or it may have been evil; that I am not discussing, but I do believe that such denunciations amount to nothing. It is simply a case of shouting

to keep one's courage up. The people of Canada spoke on a great issue, and they spoke with no uncertain voice.

Now, concerning the future. Time was when politicians conjured with a name; time is when men are moved by great facts and principles. I most heartily endorse the remarks made by the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) yesterday with respect to the independence of all members of the House of Commons. I go one step further and say that whatever other members may do, I believe it to be my duty to maintain clear, satisfactory relations between myself and my constituents on any measure which may come before this House. Nowadays, confidence in the policy of the Government as a whole should not be expected to necessitate the destruction of selfhood or independence on matters concerning which there is legitimate ground for difference of opinion. I hold myself free to withdraw from any party or any association of men when I am convinced in my own mind that by so doing I can better serve my country and so satisfy my own conscience, and I do not intend, either now or at any time, to lend myself to the support of any measure which I cannot honestly and conscientiously accept as in the best interests of my constituency and of my country. This may probably be regarded by many, perhaps on both sides of the House, as poor politics, but fortunately, Mr. Speaker, I have neither a political past to shield nor a political future to ensure. In my judgment, it is not the cry or slogan of Liberalism, or, for that matter, of Unionism, which will win when the people of the country are appealed to at the next election. I am satisfied that the people of Canada will bring both sides of this House to the three-fold acid test of their past, their personnel, and their programme.

I desire to offer a few remarks concerning two or three matters referred to in the speech from the Throne which have received but slight attention. First of all, I should like to direct the attention of the Union Government to the advisability of making some special provision in the Land Settlement Act that will meet certain conditions which I shall take the liberty of describing. I commend the policy of inducing as many as possible of our returned men to labour or work on the land. That is certainly most desirable and commendable. But, so far as the announced policy of the Government is concerned, I am not aware that any special provision is made for the future of men who may desire to enter upon agricultural life on a smaller scale than is provided for in the terms which make for their future on the prairies. I come from a section of British Columbia where a large number of men gain a living on small farms; they are very frequently called "small farmers." Large numbers of men were recruited for the Canadian forces from the Fraser valley in the early and later stages of the war. That district was drawn upon for the 104th New Westminster, the 29th, the 47th, the 131st, the Forestry Battalion, and others. Very many of these men are coming back to their native province desirous of entering upon life in a new relation; some of them wish to resume positions they held before as farmers on a small scale. It is well known that in British Columbia, particularly in the Fraser valley, there is ample opportunity for men who desire to engage in the production of fruit, in the growing of vegetables for the market, in the raising of poultry and in the carrying on of other small industries which constitute a very profitable livelihood for any who give attention to them. I know that there is a large number of men who are looking for such a home and such a life. I do not suggest for one moment that these opportunities should be given only to residents of my own province. From all parts of the Dominion men will, I presume, seek the very best that Canada has to offer on the small farm proposition, and if they do so, they will naturally turn their eyes and their steps towards British Columbia, and in particular, the far-famed Fraser valley. That will be a matter almost of necessity, and our hope is that as a result of legislation which this Parliament will enact, ample provision will be made for the future of those men. You may, Sir, ask me: Is land available? Can men secure ten or twenty acres in that country? I do not hesitate to say that ten or twenty acres can be procured and are capable of producing as extensive and satisfactory financial results as a quarter-section of land in the Prairie Provinces. Owing to the former land policies of Governments, which policies I am not now disposed to discuss, the unfortunate fact is that there are in places large blocks of land which are held sometimes by corporations, sometimes by associations of men not so registered. But there is a considerable quantity of land now available, unoccupied, unused, which can be secured. It may be asked: Will not that land be held at a prohibitive price? Is it not likely that the owners will hold up the Government or anybody else seeking to secure land for this purpose? That is possible, but I do not think it is probable in view of the relief which the

Government has. I do not believe it is a right principle, and it is much less a proper national policy, for permission to be given to great corporations to hold large blocks of land in the hope that some neighbours or some enterprising men who may come into the community will develop and improve the land and so enhance to an unnatural value their own corporate holdings. When you go to these corporations and ask them to put a price upon their land, I would suggest that this proviso be made, namely, that the price which they shall place upon their land, the price at which they hold it, shall be the price which will determine the basis of their taxation for time to come, so that they will bear their full share of financial responsibility in the community. At this period, we should say to the people who are holding valuable land in this country: You must either work or pay. I recognize the right which men holding land have to their so-called vested interests, but it is not in the interest of our country at the present time to permit vast areas of arable land to remain untilled, while the value thereof is enhanced by hard working men who in adjoining districts do their duty as citizens.

There is in our province another source of supply from which the Government may draw. A year ago I took the opportunity of calling the attention of the House to the fact that in my constituency there was a considerable number of Indian Reserves and that possibly these might in places furnish suitable homes for settlers, whether returned soldiers or other white men, in the future. In order to set this matter clearly before the House, let me say that between the town of Hope and the western end of my constituency, an area covering some seventy-five miles in length by thirty or forty miles in width, there are some fourteen bands of Indians. These are placed on seventy-two reserves, according to the last returns a total population of 1,216 people. The land reserved for these bands of Indians comprises 19,247 acres. I do not think that, so far, any exception can be taken to the extent of the reserves for these natives. This country has always sought to deal justly by the Indian, the native of this country, and my suggestion to the Government is in no wise intended to prove unfair or disadvantageous or unjust to the Indians. There is, however, one other reserve within the bounds of my constituency, in the very heart of the Fraser valley, through which the Canadian Pacific passes, between the stations of Ruby Creek and Agassiz. This island is known as Seabird Island and contains some 4,500 acres of what I do not hesitate to call the very choicest land in the province of British Columbia. That may seem a strong statement, but I think investigation and reports will prove its accuracy. On that island there are reported to be 121 Indians all told, who cultivate a total of 132.5 acres, leaving considerably over 4,000 acres of land untouched. I am of the opinion that not only is that a national loss from the standpoint of production, but it is a bad education for the native. It is not good policy that he should be permitted to hold the view that all that land is at his disposal, when it is not in any sense of the word contributing to his sustenance. It is not cultivated ground. He does not cultivate it. The finest land in the valley is still untouched. I hope the department or the Government will take into consideration the advisability of making such provision as they can for returned men to enter at least upon this island. If they do not desire to enter upon it, then I would say: Open it up for the entry of white people. Let the land be used so that it may be a source of production to the people of this country and especially to British Columbia. This is in no sense of the term a reflection upon the labour or interest or the future of the Indians. We must look after them, but I claim that this is not at all inimical to their interest, future or welfare.

I want also to draw the attention of the Government very earnestly to a sympathetic consideration of a matter that is akin to that which was presented by the hon. member for East York (Mr. Foster) this afternoon. I shall not attempt to refer to anything to which he drew the attention of the House further than to remark that my subject has reference to the same department, and I shall put it very briefly.

We have in our country rural mail carriers and rural postmasters who are very much underpaid. These men are doing the business of the country, so far as their duties require and the stipulations of the Government demand, and they are doing it faithfully and to the satisfaction of the department, or they would not be retained. But their remuneration is altogether inadequate to the services rendered, and I am speaking now with sole reference to the two classes I have mentioned. The resort of other labourers in such a situation is not within the range of their activity; they cannot strike; they must continue, and do continue, their labours. I almost hesitate to state to this House the financial con-

dition in which some of these men are placed. It would appear to be almost a reflection upon our honour and sense of fair play, but that I may not speak altogether in the abstract, let me cite one or two cases. I happen to know, Sir, that there are men in the employ of the Government engaged as mail carriers who are in receipt of the—I cannot find an adjective to describe it, and so will say, in receipt of the wage of from fifty cents to one dollar per day for the support of themselves and their families. In other words, the whole of the income they receive from the Government, with the exception of this small pittance, is required for the upkeep of their outfit. No wonder they ask, and beg, and plead, for consideration. I have drawn the attention of the Postmaster General to this matter, and the answer I received was regular, of course, and quite correct. He stated that it was not within the power of the department to grant increases during the continuance of a contract. Of course, that is true. But, Sir, it is within the power of the department, I suppose, to make the necessary recommendation which will ensure to these men ordinary common justice and fair play, and I do sincerely hope that such measures will be taken at an early date as will give to these men who are doing their duty faithfully and well, proper remuneration. True it is that a contract is a contract. But let me say by way of explanation that this particular contract was undertaken two or three years ago when the cost not only of living but of all supplies was very much lower than it is to-day. The increased cost of supplies for the upkeep of their team and outfit has resulted in leaving only the small pittance I have mentioned for the support of these men and their families.

I listened with a very great deal of interest the other day to the address of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe). If I understood him correctly, and I would not willingly misrepresent or misinterpret anything he said, he said in substance, when speaking of some amendments to the British North America Act, that as that Act was agreed to by the four original provinces individually, it would remain for the said four provinces to bring about any amendment to the Act. I may be wrong in my interpretation, and I sincerely hope I am, for I cannot believe that that position is correct. The hon. gentleman is learned in the law, while I am but a workingman, but I cannot help feeling that that position is unjust. It is not morally right, and how can it ultimately be legally right? Has not this House something to say regarding the amendments which may later be placed before the country for consideration? Is it not impossible to suppose that the provinces which were not then born should be ignored when we come to consider amendments to that Act? It is well known that there is a growing and ever deepening conviction throughout this country that the time is not far distant when certain amendments to that Act must be brought before the people for consideration. We all know, for instance, that there is a growing feeling in the minds of Canadian citizens that all legislation should be passed by a responsible chamber. We cannot shut our eyes to that fact, and when an irresponsible chamber delivers itself in the manner in which our friends did towards the close of last session, rendering inoperative what I considered to be some of the most important items of legislation passed by this House affecting the moral and social welfare of our citizens, that does not tend to deepen the affection in which it is held by the people of Canada. And so, when the question of amendments is considered, and I hope it soon will be considered, I trust that my hon. friend will be found to be wrong, or, rather, I would hope that I have misunderstood him and that he also will admit that this House, which represents provinces not then in existence, will have something to say regarding the said amendments.

Hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House have referred, during the course of this debate, to the question of national unity. Indeed, some had the temerity to introduce that phrase during the stormy times of last session. That, Sir, is a great idea. It is so great, in my opinion, that it requires some special consideration. You cannot mention the phrase without the question arising in every earnest and thoughtful mind: What does national unity mean, and how can it be brought about? What are the successive steps by which such a goal may be approached and ultimately reached? This opens up a very inviting field which I shall not presume to enter at the present time, but I do make bold to say that by a process of elimination we may at least approach an answer to our question. It goes without saying that national unity cannot be a unity of race; that need not be argued. Nor can it be a unity of religion, for all Protestants are not agreed in their religious views, and I am told that even all Roman Catholics are not agreed in their religious concep-

tions. I know not as to the truth of that, but certainly national unity cannot mean religious unity. I suppose it needs no argument to maintain the position that national unity cannot mean language unity.

There will be two languages spoken in Canada, at least for some time to come. Can we expect national unity on political questions? That does not seem very probable within the near future. Then what is left? Wherein may we look for national unity? That, to my mind, is a very serious and a very important question. If we cannot find it within the realm of the religious, of the political, or of the racial, where shall we find it? There is only one other realm, it seems to me, in which we can find it. I believe that our national unity will ultimately be found in our national objective, and I contend that this country at the present time has no national objective. Our fathers founded this federation fifty years ago, with marvellous foresight they built for the future. During the first half century of Confederation we were engrossed with things material, necessarily and properly so, in the building up of the country, in the development of our industry, and in the bringing of settlers to this land. We were engrossed with the material, which to a certain extent was praiseworthy. Then came the war, which did more than anything else—and I do not hesitate in saying it—to unite the peoples of Canada. It did more towards that end, I believe, than any other single event in our national history. Where, then, can we find such a national objective, as will make real the ideal that is before us? In my opinion, Sir, it can be found, and must be found in the realm of the ethical. Different races, different religions, different political views, even different languages may find in a common ethical objective a bond of unity that will embrace in its manifold ramifications the other divergencies which I have enumerated; and I believe, Mr. Speaker, that such a bond of unity can be found in the ethical.

If I were an artist and had the ability, I would paint a national escutcheon for the peoples of the provinces of this Dominion, from sea to sea, something after this fashion: I would paint the word "Truth," and beside it the word "Honour," and in the background I would in some manner suggest the idea of toleration; and with that before the people, I believe we should have the possibility of national unity that would be the salvation of Canada and the making of a great Canadian nation and Canadian people—a possibility that does not otherwise seem in sight. What do I mean, Sir, by truth? Why, that suggests, indeed it compels, the very thought of education. Truth is knowledge; it bears the sign "we must know." And I would go so far as to hope that every child born in this Dominion would have a good common school education, without an exception. This, I submit, should be a part of our national provision for the future; and in the matter of education there looms up in the distance, ultimately, not only the possibility but the necessity of a great national university.

I am in full accord with that sentence uttered only recently, I think, by Principal McKay of the University of Saskatchewan,, when he said in substance that the greatest mistake the British nation ever made was that of allowing Germany to assume the role of the schoolmaster of the world. I believe he was correct. Germany was looking for truth, but she lacked honour, and the one is as essential as the other to true nationhood. We must have for the future of our country, Sir, the highest possible educational advantages for those who can reach them; and by the use of the word "can" I do not mean mere monetary ability; I mean mental capacity and moral calibre adequate to fit them for the great work that lies before them. I maintain that this Dominion should make it possible for every youth who has the character to attain the very highest position in the realm of service for the country that is obtainable anywhere; and we can do that—not perhaps in the near future, but in the distant future at any rate—through a great national post-graduate university. Why should we not be able to supply in Canada all that our land needs for its development materially, ethically or educationally? Associated with this thought is the idea of honour. If we could by any means adopt that two-fold principle of truth coupled with honour, the charges that we have listened to, and the accusations that we have heard against the manhood of our country, would very largely disappear. These things are the children of dishonour; and so long as dishonour rather than honour prevails, we shall have trouble—trouble in the House, and trouble everywhere.

The universal consensus of opinion is that we need a higher type of manhood and a nobler type of womanhood. With all deference to the womanhood of our country, I think—and undoubtedly they will be the first to endorse my opinion—that we need on the whole, even in Canada, a still nobler type of womanhood. Therefore, back of all

this, and with it and around it, if we could only acquire the spirit of toleration, I believe, Sir, we would have a nation that would, in the days to come, be the largest, the grandest and the best memorial that could possibly be erected to those who have lived and died for all that is worth while in life.

This, I think, is at least worthy of the consideration of those who are dealing with national problems and national questions, and I hope, Sir, that to as large an extent as possible, we may be able, in our intercourse as provinces and as citizens, to keep the idea before us of a national unity that will allow of certain divergencies of opinion, greater liberty of thought and greater freedom of action in matters racial, religious, political, and otherwise. So long as we have before us a high ideal of national truth and honour, in an atmosphere of toleration, this is possible.

Mr. J. E. FONTAINE (Hull) (translation): Mr. Speaker, I rise at this moment because I think it is the duty of every member of this House—whether he be the most humble or the most eloquent—to give his opinion upon the serious and unusual conditions prevailing in our country. Indeed, since the beginning of the war, in order to maintain the Canadian army, the Government have heaped a debt amounting to two billions. All our industries which for the last four years were turning out munitions are at a standstill since the signing of the armistice. All our national progress is paralyzed, and to fulfil our obligations the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) issues loans within our bonds and thrusts upon us all kinds and manner of taxes. Mr. Speaker, we have now good reasons to regret all useless expenditures and all the follies, to say the least, which the Government indulged in or allowed during the war.

I still remember the reports of investigations held in the department of Militia then headed by the hon. member from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) showing that enormous sums were needlessy spent.

Now, Sir, let me state that every citizen of this country was willing to do his bit in order to win the war and to crush forever German militarism. I still remember the language of our lamented and revered leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, who, speaking on behalf of the opposition, said that we should be ready to made any sacrifice and that Canada should contribute her share for the sake of humanity and civilization. However, that did not mean the enrichment of friends of the Government nor that leave should be given manufacturers to reap profits of one or two hundred per cent, as it has been laid at the doors of the Massey-Harris Company, the William Davies Packing Company and many others which I do not recall. It did not mean that companies would be permitted to become organised without any stock to get in millions, like the International Arms and Fuses Company, the Ammunition American Company. It did not mean either that speculators and combines would be allowed to lay their hands upon all the food in the country and to exact excessive prices from the consumers.

You are going to ask me, Sir, of what use is it to recall so many things of the past which can only stir up still more the indignation of the people against the Government. If I do so, it is in order to fix responsibilities so that, when history is written, it may be known who are the best friends of the country and of the people. Now, what do the Government suggest and intend to do in order to improve the situation? We have lately heard the speech from the Throne. What is there in it? Mere words, nebulous schemes, nothing practical. We are told of a new franchise. I hope, Sir, that as soon as possible will be expunged from our statute books that dishonest War-time Elections Act which enabled the Union Government to retain power against the will of the people. I appeal to the Liberal Unionists—if however their alliance with the Conservatives did not deprive them of the sense of honour and fair play—and I trust that the new Act will be more just and fair and will not permit a recurrence of the abuses which were committed at the last elections.

There is no mention in the Governor General's Speech of the repeal of the dangerous War Time Elections Act, which gives the Government the authority of governing this country by means of Orders in Council and allows them to censor all newspapers. Mr. Speaker, let us take care, we must not wait too long, because the people are tired of being governed by Orders in Council. They are waking up and the press and the public bodies are asking that the government by the people be restored. The trades unions are agitating. I have here with me a resolution adopted unanimously by the labour union of the City of Hull, asking me to do my utmost to have that kaiser-like legislation repealed.

They talk about re-construction and demobilization. The latter, as I understand it,

includes the repatriation of all these gallant soldiers who won great fame on the battlefield and who offered so generously their services for the defence of Democracy. It includes also the duty of the Government to facilitate the re-establishment into civil life of all the able bodied men, either by granting them special conditions or settling them on the land, or securing work for them to earn a living, or by paying proper pensions in the case of invalided soldiers. But the war ended three months age and about 100,000 returned men, from overseas and here, were discharged. What was done in their behalf? What did they get? Nothing.

In our city of Hull, we have a great many returned soldiers, and not a day passes by without some of them coming to me to complain about the way in which they are treated by the Government. Do you want me to cite a case, Mr. Speaker? There is a letter which I have just received from a soldier by the name of Joseph Rochon, who is at present in the military hospital at St. Anne de Bellevue after serving three years in the trenches. This man who is suffering from deafness and nervous disease, as a result of wounds, is offered $5 a month as a pension. Is it not a shame? I know some others who made several attempts and applied for work, but never got satisfaction.

I consider that the country owes a debt to these brave men and I say that it is the duty of this Government to do all in their power to give them justice.

While I am speaking on this subject, I wish to present a request to the Government, namely that legislation be passed at this session granting a general amnesty to the Military Service Act defaulters. The war is over. The enemy surrendered unconditionally. Therefore why should the Government act so unmercifully with the young men who, for different reasons, did not see fit to report? Is it to secure a few cents or dollars from them or to send them to jail? What is the use? Does not the country need the activity of all its sons at the present time? I say, Mr. Speaker, that is persecution, and in view of the great victory that we have won, the Government ought to prove magnanimous and pardon them all.

Now, what is the Government doing for reconstruction? First, they will not deal with the question of tariff, because we are in a period of reconstruction. But they are not in earnest; they are not sincere, and the real motive Mr. Speaker is because the Liberals on the other side of this House, who have always favoured a reduction in the tariff would be ashamed to follow the tariff and protectionist element who for the time being rule the Government, these Liberals, in order not to lose their portfolios and their opportunities and to avoid crossing over into the cold regions of the Opposition, trample under foot their principles and sing in chorus with the Prime Minister: "Leave the tariff aside, this is a period of reconstruction."

However, is it not by revising the tariff and by a better distribution of the taxes that we shall develop reconstruction? Is it not by putting down there tariff walls and letting in free the natural products, agricultural implements and so forth, that we shall reduce the cost of living and encourage agriculture which is the foundation and the basis element of our wealth?

So true is it, that, contrarily to the hon. ministers who are always eager to retain their portfolios, all the farmers of this country demand a reduction in the tariff.

Sir, at a meeting of the Farmers' Association in the Western provinces,—exactly that part of the country to which the hon. minister of Colonization and Immigration (Mr. Calder) comes from, though he says that this is not the time to deal with the tariff—resolutions were adopted, earnestly demanding the immediate revival of the reciprocity policy adopted by the Laurier administration under the very auspices of the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne (Mr. Fielding) who now sits in this House. The farmers of Ontario, of that province which proved so wild with respect to the tariff, held a meeting where they adopted a resolution similar to that which was adopted in the West. So sincere are they, so serious are they also in their request, that, at three by-elections for Ontario—provincial elections—where they had candidates of their own choice, they defeated the Hearst administration, and one may say, with no intention in the least to stand as a prophet, that it was the Union Government which they were aiming at.

Sir, I have no hesitation in saying that the majority of the members of this House may continue to support the Government as long as they like, but that the people is not with them. Listening to the speech delivered by the hon. minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) I was struck with the appeal which he made to the manufacturers, at least a hundred of whom, did he say, have become millionaires during the war. He asked them to keep employing the workingmen. I am very much afraid that his appeal will not be heard in the town where I live, an industrial town where so

many men are out of work since the war is over, and where it is rumoured that the salaries may be reduced by 10 per cent. A prospective strike is the subject of conversation, the workingmen are dissatisfied, and I say that they are right in this; they have been hoodwinked in every way, for four years past, they have borne the burden of the war during that time, because, after all, it is the workingmen, it is the people who pays. Therefore, let the Government make a law which may give justice to everybody, let them do away, once for all, with that policy of protection the only result of which is to enrich but one class; let them also protect the workingman, so that he may be able to live appropriately; let them fix a minimum with respect to his salary, let them create pensions for old age, because I say, Mr. Speaker, that when a workingman has spent the best of his life to enrich the capitalist—in many cases at starvation wages—he has the right to expect that the State will take care of him in his old age, so that he will not be dependent upon his family or obliged to end his days in the poor house. Let the Government grant him a life annuity in his old age and better protection against accidents and in case of unemployment. What I want is an act of justice, and were my request complied with, the important question of capital and labour would be settled forever.

I have been struck also with another part of the speech delivered by the hon. member of Public Works, where it is stated that all the revenue is absorbed by the expenses incurred on account of the war; and that one hundred millions more are wanted in order that the works which are most necessary in the country may be carried on. The hon. minister asks us where that money could be found. If I may be permitted to make a suggestion I shall first advise him to have the manufacturers surrender to the Government one half of the hundred million profits they have realized during the war. In fact, it is a shame to see that while the small industries and even the workingmen are being taxed, people like Mr. Flavelle and others are permitted to accumulate fortunes. Let us cut down the number of the ministers. We have about twenty of them. I believe that, with a better distribution of the work, ten would be quite sufficient. Let us do away with all the Commissions which have been appointed and the incumbents of which are granted salaries equal to those of hon. ministers; let us practice economy, and let us be satisfied that, by such means, we shall be in pocket many millions.

Sir, before I resume my seat I would like, as did the hon. members who preceded me to congratulate the mover and the seconder of the Address in answer to the speech from the Throne, for the able manner in which they have discharged their duty; but I do not wish to congratulate the Government for having departed from the old custom prevailing in this House and which consisted in having the address seconded in French. It seems to me that it would have been easy enough to find, among the hon. members sitting to your right, a gentleman who was conversant with the beautiful French language, and if no such scholar could have been found, then a well gifted gentleman might have been selected among them and set to the task of learning French.

How I deplore and regret the disappearance of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier! He was a great statesman, he was for the liberal party a great chieftain, he was the idol of his compatriots and was for me, personally, a great friend or rather a great protector. As a public man, I shall strive to conform to his wise teachings and to adopt this motto which was his own: "First a Canadian, always a Canadian."

Mr. WILLIAM GARLAND McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Mr. Speaker, I esteem it a great privilege to be permitted to say a few words in this debate. The speech from the Throne, to my mind, is one of the most important items in the parliamentary programme and, in my humble opinion, requires and demands the earnest and serious consideration of the House. It is no less than a message from His Majesty the King delivered to us his loyal subjects by His Excellency the Governor General and as such is not to be lightly regarded.

Previous to the war there were those among us who did not hesitate to suggest, somewhat surreptitiously perhaps, that in these enlightened times necessity no longer existed for having a king at the head of our empire and that the office of governor general should be abolished. This struck direcly at the root and foundation of our form of national government and if continued to its logical conclusion could only have one result, the disruption of the British Empire. There were others who openly urged that Canada should become a self-contained nation on more or less republican lines. Some very distinguished gentlemen, I believe, even devoted a great deal of time to writing and distributing pamphlets set-

ting out their convictions and arguments that Canada had never received any benefit from Great Britain, but, on the contrary had suffered greatly by loss of territory and otherwise through the carelessness and inefficiency of her statesmen and diplomats.

It is with feelings of extreme consternation that we must now contemplate what would have happened to the whole civilized world if these pernicious doctrines had become consummated facts. If Canada had withdrawn from the Empire who can say that her example might not have been followed by other colonies? If our form of Government had been changed and if the British Empire had gone to pieces, is there any sane person who would have the temerity or hardihood to suggest that it would have been found possible to stop the terrible Hun in his ruthless and unchristian attempt to conquer the world? Thank God the true situation has been clearly demonstrated and the stability, foundation and principles of our form of Government have been firmly established.

The Empire has stood the test of the greatest war of history and has come through triumphantly, stronger and greater than ever. Long live the King! God bless him! Under him and his advisers, the great and powerful British Empire was able at a moment's notice to fly to the assistance of courageous little Belgium and of noble France both of which were being ravished and destroyed by the inhuman foe. Under him the silent British navy cleared the seas of enemy ships and shipping and made the transportation of troops and foodstuffs possible. Under him the nation was able to materially assist our valient allies in bringing the Bosche to his knees. The world is safe once more. It is with feelings of intense pride and admiration that we must contemplate His Majesty's personal record during the war as well as the record of the whole royal family. They placed the cause of freedom and humanity before everything else and nobly did they play their part.

As Canadians we may be doubly proud that His Royal Highness the Prince of Wales attached himself to the Canadian army and shared with them the hardships and dangers of the fight. I am told that he endeared himself to the Canadian troops all of whom will agree that he is what soldiers call a good head. Perhaps I might also be permitted to suggest that even the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) will agree that the whole British aristocracy, with all their titles and other encumbrances, did magnificent work and that we as Canadians must make our acknowledgments to them.

It is hardly necessary for me to say that Canada has been singularly fortunate in the high standard of the men who have been sent to us in the capacity of Governors General. In the case of the present incumbent the high traditions of the office have been maintained.

The speech from the Throne on this occasion will live long in Canadian history if for no other reason than that it contains a well deserved acknowledgment of the splendid conduct of the soldiers of Canada. Every Canadian must have a personal sense of pride when he reads the reference to our Canadian soldiers:

> In the notable victories leading to the glorious issue accomplished by the arms of the Allies, none of the forces engaged bore a more valorous or heroic part than those of Canada, whose achievements throughout the entire war have won imperishable renown for their country. It is most gratifying to be able to state that, in the final and decisive stages of the mighty struggle, our divisions in the field were maintained at over strength, and equipped in the highest degree with all the requirements of modern warfare.

I would call particular attention to the final sentence of this paragraph:

> The appreciation and gratitude of the nation cannot be too earnestly and sincerely expressed to the gallant members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, whose sacrifices, sufferings and heroism have played so effectual a part in vindicating the cause of world liberty and civilization.

Personally, I feel that the problems affecting our returned soldiers, their dependents and the dependents of those who will not return, should receive our first consideration. However, with the kind indulgence of the House, I will refer to that subject later on.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of my constituents, I would like to add my tribute to the memory of the late, lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier. So much has been said, and so well said, in this connection that I feel that in anything I might say I could add nothing to our veneration for the memory of this wonderful man. In British Columbia the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier was held in high esteem by both Liberals and the old time Conservatives. His memory will always be kept green, and I believe for all time to come he will be considered as having been one of our greatest Canadians.

I would also like to be permitted to add my congratulations to the mover and seconder of the Address in reply to the Speech. I think it was singularly fortunate and appropriate that the mover and seconder should both be returned soldiers,

men who had taken a part, and had done their share in defending the liberty of the world. I congratulate these hon. gentlemen on the manner in which they performed their duty in this House, and I believe that it is in strict accordance with the work they did overseas.

I would also like to add my congratulations to those already extended to the new Leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie). He has some qualifications which appeal to me, viz: He is a Presbyterian, he is Scotch, and he is a lawyer, surely a combination which cannot be surpassed; and I hope that the future will show for him a record which will stand side by side with the record made by his illustrious predecessor.

I sincerely regret that there has been some criticism from the hon. gentlemen on the Opposition benches, as to the absence of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) at the Peace Conference. I have been wondering why these hon. gentlemen should worry so much that the Premier is away at this particular time. I have been wondering if perhaps they think that the majority on this side of the House is not large enough, or perhaps whether they have been thinking that the Prime Minister and his absent colleagues might be induced to follow the "light in the window," which no one else on this side of the House has yet been able to perceive. I would like to ask seriously if these hon. gentlemen really think that Canada should not be represented at the Peace Conference, and should not be represented there by the Prime Minister? Why should not the Premier be absent from this House when he has such a splendid substitute to leave in his place? I remember when I first saw Sir Thomas White. It was at Osgoode Hall in Toronto in 1899 and 1900. He was then the Big Boy of the School, Gold Medallist, prize debater, and so forth. I am glad to see him once more as the Big Boy of this school of statesmen. We must all appreciate the splendid record the Acting Prime Minister made as Finance Minister during the war. He had big problems to solve, he had big work to carry out, and he was big enough to do that work in a manner satisfactory to the great majority of Canadians.

Leaving out of consideration the many other matters in which Canada is interested at the Peace Conference, if the Prime Minister and his colleagues who are attending that Conference can assist in having the Kaiser brought to justice for his many crimes against humanity, their time will not be wasted. The Kaiser should not be allowed to escape. History will no doubt record that he was responsible for this terrible war. He was responsible for the violation of Belgium, the poison gas, the mustard gas, the liquid fire, and all other fiendish devices of hell; the crucifixion of Canadian soldiers, the air raids and the unnecessary deaths of so many defenceless women and children, and the wanton destruction of property, the sinking of the Lusitania, the murder of Nurse Cavell and Captain Fryatt, the ruthless submarine warfare, with the murderous shelling of lifeboats; and everything that is low, mean, contemptible, barbarous, inhuman and cowardly in modern warfare. The Kaiser should be brought to justice, he should have a fair trial—no doubt he will get a fair trial—and if it is shown conclusively that he personally was in any way responsible for any of the terrible crimes mentioned, he should be punished as he deserves. There are other fiends and arch-criminals among his advisers who should also be prosecuted.

I am not one, Mr. Speaker, who thinks that the ministers of the Crown should spend all their time in Ottawa. As a matter of fact I believe that their departmental duties should be lessened to such an extent that they will be able to pay frequent visits to other parts of this great Dominion. The people of British Columbia appreciated the visit of the Cabinet Ministers last fall. It put the ministers in touch with conditions in British Columbia, and let the people see and hear them, and I can say, Mr. Speaker, that they made a good impression upon the people of that province. We had the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell), the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder), the Minister of Militia and Defence (Maj. Gen. Mewburn), the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen), the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid), and the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White). The latter paid his visit during the Victory Loan campaign. Possibly the most important from the standpoint of my constituency was the visit of the Minister of Public Works. Previous to his visit to my constituency that hon. gentleman did not have a very clear idea of the conditions there, such as a man must get by actually being on the scene.

The first time I met the Minister of Public Works was in Ottawa during the early part of the last session of Parliament. I went to see him about some further improve-

ments in the channel of the Fraser river. He said to me: "Now, look here, McQuarrie, there is no use in your talking to me about trying to make a ship channel on the Fraser river. You cannot do it; it is impossible; there are too many things to contend with, and I do not propose to spend very much money on it." I said to him: "Mr. Carvell, have you been on the Fraser river?" He said: "Yes, I have been at New Westminster and I have seen the Fraser river, but I must say that I have not actually taken a trip down the Fraser river from New Westminster to the gulf." I said: "Will you promise me that when you visit British Columbia you will come to New Westminster and spend some time on the Fraser river?" He said that he would, and I said that I was satisfied. I remarked further: "Mr. Carvell, after you have seen what kind of river we have out there and what the conditions are, if you repeat your assertion that you do not care to spend any money on trying to improve that ship channel, I shall have nothing further to say; but I have too much respect for your judgment to think that you will take that stand."

Now, we were fortunate in having the Minister of Public Works spend a considerable time on the Fraser river. He is a man who wants to see for himself. You may lay engineers' reports and all that kind of thing before him, but he wants to see for himself what you have and to find out whether the goods are there or not. That is the kind of man we like; that is the kind of man we want to have visit us. Although his time was rather limited, the minister spent two days and a half on the Fraser river. We have quite a big river there; those of you who have not been out there do not understand what a great river it is. The Fraser is one of the greatest rivers in Canada; it is one of the greatest rivers in the world. It has two branches, one running to the west, which is called the North Arm, and the other to the south, which is called the main channel, the latter being the larger.

The minister spent a half day on the North Arm, and was able to see the conditions there. If we are going to have any considerable industrial advancement in British Columbia, it must be on the Fraser river. The peninsula on which Vancouver, New Westminster and the intervening municipalities are situated is practically identical with New York City so far as its geographical situation is concerned. There the great industries are on an island, which is similar to what we have, and there is the flat land along the river, which is the proper land for industrial sites.

The minister spent a whole day on the main channel. We took him up to one of the largest and most up-to-date saw mills in the world, that of the Western Canada Lumber Company. We took him down the river and showed him sawmill after sawmill, industry after industry, and we showed him the dredges at work at the mouth of the river. The river at New Westminster is something like three-quarters of a mile wide; the distance from New Westminster to the gulf is something like eighteen miles. There is deep water, forty or fifty feet, right at the docks at New Westminster. There is deep water all the way down, a good channel until you get to the sand bars at the mouth of the river.

The minister spent another day going through the upper reaches of the Fraser river. We were able also to give the minister certain information. We were able to tell him that on the Fraser river there were still remaining something like eight billion feet of timber belonging to the Provincial Government and something more than eight billion feet of merchantable timber belonging to the Dominion Government, and that if the present stumpage rate was continued the Dominion Government would receive from that timber in stumpage no less than $4,000,000. We were able to tell him that we had saw mills on the Fraser river, at and near New Westminster, with a capacity of 500,000,000 feet. We were able to tell him that we had shingle mills on the Fraser river close to New Westminster turning out 300,000,000 shingles a year. We were able to show him that something like 8,000 men were employed in these industries, and that indirectly the whole population of that district was affected. We were able to tell him that there was an investment in mills and timber of something like $100,000,000, and we were able to show him that we did business with the whole world. We ship lumber all over the world, Mr. Speaker.

Our ships are already plying between Canada and many foreign countries, but unfortunately because of the lack of sufficient depth in the channel at the present time, we are unable to accommodate the larger class of ships which wish to do business with us. We have at present a depth of some twenty-four feet, but we want to get a depth of thirty feet. We explained all these matters to the Minister of Public Works and at a little meeting that we had afterwards with him, he stated that he had been mistaken about the Fraser river. He was a big enough man to admit that

the information which he had had was not altogether correct; that he had had an idea that the Fraser river was a very turbulent stream; that it was very difficult of navigation; that there were all kinds of difficulties to be contended with, and that from an engineering standpoint, successful navigation of the Fraser river was impossible of accomplishment. He told us also that he had had an idea that we were trying to build up a port in New Westminster to compete with the port of Vancouver which was a port of sufficient capacity to look after all the shipping that we might ever expect to have on that part of the Pacific. There is a splendid harbour at Vancouver. Everything that the Minister of Public Works said about it is quite true. At the meeting to which I refer, he said: "Gentlemen, I find that you do not wish to build up a port to compete with Vancouver. What you wish is to have a channel out to the sea which will enable you to send out to the world the products which you manufacture. You are entitled to that, and I am going to do everything I can to assist you to get it."

The problem is, to a layman, not a very difficult one, but I must say that, unfortunately, there has in the past been a great deal of bungling and a great deal of money thrown away in connection with the work on the Fraser river. We do not like that. It does not do us any good. It does not bring the results that we want. We want a channel and at present we have not a channel. The reason is that the whole proposition has not been undertaken intelligently. To my mind, the present Minister of Public Works is the first one who has viewed the situation in an intelligent manner. We have been fighting for years to get an engineer on that work who will do nothing but look after the dredging of that channel, who will have entire charge and authority to see that the work is done properly. Formerly, it had been done under the control of the department and there had been some supervision, but no properly qualified man was on deck all the time to see that the work was carried out in an intelligent manner. We put this situation up to the Minister of Public Works and an engineer was put in charge of the work. My information is that during the last year more and better work has been done than in any previous five years. We found that the department had been endeavouring to keep dredged a circuitous channel, one that was full of turns and curves, so that when you dug it out in one place it would fill up in another and you could never, in the world, expect to have a proper channel. We explained to the Minister of Public Works what we wanted; we said that we wanted to get a straight channel out to the sea, so that the current of the river would wash out the sand and silt which is deposited from above and thus keep itself more or less clear. We showed him our plans. He said: "That appeals to me; I am going to try it out." He is trying out this plan and I have no doubt that, under the guidance of the Minister of Public Works, we are going to have a channel down to the sea of sufficient depth to look after our requirements. I think that is what we are entitled to have. If Canada is going to be built up, she must be built up by her commerce and her industries and we, on the Pacific coast, expect to share in the advancement in those respects which is bound to come to Canada.

We had also, as I said, a visit from the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid). We in New Westminster are interested in railways as well as in other matters. We also had visiting us the managing director, the assistant managing director, and, I think, pretty nearly all the directors of the Canadian Northern Railway. They saw for themselves what the conditions were and they ascertained what our requirements from the Canadian Northern were. The original plans of the Canadian Northern Railway contemplated the construction of the main line through New Westminster to Vancouver. This company, which has at the present time a railroad of about 3,000 miles in length, is in this unfortunate position, that for the last twelve miles of that distance it has to run over the tracks of a foreign railway. Such a thing is a disgrace to Canada. If we are going to construct a railroad 3,000 miles in length, surely we can finish up the last twelve miles of it so as to have our own tracks. The city of New Westminster, in accordance with an arrangement with the Canadian Northern Railway Company, who were then in control of the road, made an expenditure of $500,000 in widening Front street which is close to the river, for the purpose of allowing the Canadian Northern to run through the city. The Canadian Northern purchased lands in New Westminster and contiguous thereto on which they spent something like $2,000,000. Those lands were purchased for the purpose of running the line through New Westminster to Vancouver. I have had the matter up with the minister and also with the managing director and his assistant,

and I believe it is the intention, as soon as the necessary finances are available, to carry out the original plan.

I wish to congratulate the Government and the Minister of Railways and Canals upon their selection of the men to take charge of the Canadian National railways. In the West, both Mr. Hanna and Mr. MacLeod are very well thought of. We think they are very big men and quite capable of taking charge of a big proposition like this. They have the respect of the community, and I think they will get results. The men who took over the control of the Canadian Northern railway for the Government had a very big problem on their hands, because the Canadian Northern had a bad reputation,—a very bad reputation in British Columbia. There we have close to us the famous townsite of Port Mann, and I can say without fear of contradiction that Port Mann was one of the biggest steals ever perpetrated in the history of Canada. It is a disgrace to Canada that any one, to use a Western phrase, should be allowed to pull off a thing like that and get away with it. Port Mann did more than anything else to give the Canadian Northern a bad name. The road had also a bad reputation with the banks. I know as a matter of fact, that the banks refused to do business with any one who was looking to the Canadian Northern for payment. I am reminded of a conversation I had on my way to Ottawa last session with two business men of British Columbia, one a banker, and the other a millman. They said: "Now that the Government has taken over the Canadian Northern, it is a strange thing that they do not do something to put it on a proper financial basis. Do you know that one of the largest banks in Canada has refused to advance money to any one on the strength of a contract with the Canadian Northern?" They gave me particulars, and the first man I met in Ottawa happened to be Mr. Hanna. I said to him: "This is a nice kind of railroad you are trying to run. It appears to be discredited with the banking institutions of this country." And I told him of the conversation I had had on the train. He asked if he was at liberty to use that information, and I said, "Yes, I will give you the names of the gentlemen and all details." He said, "All right. There is going to be some fur flying in a very few minutes," and he set off down the street. I am glad to say that under the present management the financial reputation of the Canadian Northern has been very much enhanced. There is a great future for this road. I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Thursday, March 13, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PENSIONS COMMITTEE.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Speaker, with the consent of the House, I desire to move that the names of Messrs. Bonnell, Brien, Fontaine, Lang, McGibbon (Muskoka), and Savard, be added to the Special Committee on Pensions and Pension Regulations and all matters appertaining thereto.

Motion agreed to.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. CASGRAIN: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to ask when we will again have the printed copies of the Debates of the House?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: At present the copies being supplied to members are mimeographed because the Government has been unable to have Hansard printed. As soon as the conditions change so that we are in a position to print the Hansards, they will be printed and distributed.

Mr. CASGRAIN: When do you expect that will be?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am unable to say.

RIOTS AT KINMEL CAMP.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES: Has the Government received any further details of the rising at Kinmel Park in Wales?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is no further official report.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The telegraph wires must be down.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East) for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session, resumed from Wednesday, March 12.

Mr. WILLIAM G. McQUARRIE (New Westminster) (resuming): Mr. Speaker, I

was saying when the House adjourned yesterday, that there was a great future before the Canadian National railways if properly managed. The transcontinental line running through the West, formerly the Canadian Northern railway, is a very important one from our standpoint, and I believe that that railway is going to become a great asset for Canada. With railways the most remunerative part of the business should be the haulage of freight, and in this connection, the railroad having the best grades has a great advantage. I believe I am correct in saying that the Canadian Northern Railway transcontinental line has better grades than any other transcontinental railway in the whole of America. The following comparison with the Canadian Pacific railway exemplifies this situation very clearly: The Canadian Pacific can only haul a train of sixteen cars from Vancouver to Calgary through the mountains, whereas the Canadian Northern can haul, with one engine, fifty cars fully loaded, from Vancouver to Quebec. When the grain of Alberta and Saskatchewan flows westward this will be an important factor in the success of the Canadian Northern. A very considerable portion of the grain from these provinces is bound to go out through the Pacific.

In considering the transportation of grain, or any other product for that matter, where rail and water are both to be utilized, an important feature to be taken into account is to get the shortest rail haul to satisfactory water transportation. This will be accomplished by using the Fraser river route. We expect some day to see grain elevators on the Fraser river. We have miles and miles of excellent sites for elevators from Port Coquitlam to the gulf and when the Minister of Public Works completes the channel of the Fraser river there will be a sufficient depth of water for great freighters to dock at any of these sites.

We have four important railway lines running into New Westminster now—the Canadian Northern, Canadian Pacific, the Great Northern and the Northern Pacific. The Canadian Pacific has already intimated that it will, when the proper times comes, build elevators at Port Coquitlam and use the Fraser river route thereby cutting down its rail haul about 25 miles. It has acquired a lot of land at Port Coquitlam and will have lots of room to handle the cars without congestion. The Canadian Northern also owns a lot of property at, and in the vicinity of, New Westminster. Why not follow the lead of the Canadian Pacific and use the Fraser river route for the vast quantity of grain that is bound to be hauled? Perhaps we might even get in ahead of the Canadian Pacific and establish our elevators first. I would advise the management of this railway to consider the advisibility of building elevators on the Fraser river without delay and let others do the following. If the Canadian Northern carries out its original plan of building its line from New Westminster to Vancouver it will save the $2,000,000 it has invested in New Westminster and vicinity. It will also get the business at North Arm, Lulu Island, Burnaby and South Vancouver. Many additional miles of splendid industrial sites will be opened up and much good will result to the whole country.

I think the new management will make good. When the Government took over the line, the Canadian Northern was trying to do business without equipment and without credit. Contracts of the Canadian Northern were not recognized by the banks as security for advances. Since coming under Government control all that has been changed. One hundred and fifty engines and 16,000 cars have been added to the equipment and financial aid has placed the Canadian Northern in this position: (1) No shortage of cars; (2) no shortage of power; (3) trains running on time; (4) the public looking to do business with the Canadian Northern instead of the Canadian Northern running after the public; (5) good credit.

When the minister was out in New Westminster, we pointed out to him, among other things, the necessity of having a British Columbia man on the Canadian Northern directorate and I believe that this will have his favourable consideration. Personally, I think that every province should be represented on the Board of the Canadian National Railways.

The minister had quite a busy time in British Columbia, and we consider that he is the right man in the right place. I would also like to pay my respects to the deputy minister: he is a good man and doing good work. The other Cabinet Ministers were also very busy during their visit to British Columbia. They discussed many matters with the members of Parliament for the province, met many delegations and addressed a number of public meetings. We were glad to have them with us, and we only hope they will come again soon and that other members of the Cabinet will visit British Columbia. There is one minister, Mr. Speaker, who did not come to British Columbia, although he received a very pressing invitation to do so. I refer

to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries, and I am very sorry indeed that he did not find it convenient to come to our province. All the signs point to trouble in connection with the British Columbia fisheries. In connection with those fisheries we have had Royal Commissions, we have had International Commissions, we have had investigations of all kinds; but the situation does not appear to have yet been cleared up. Great dissatisfaction exists not only in connection with the Fraser river fisheries, but also as regards the whole of the fisheries of British Columbia, and I tell you, Mr. Speaker, that the fisheries of that province amount to something. The industry is a very important one. Unfortunately on the Fraser river there has been a falling off for some time in the pack of salmon. I have here a few figures, giving the packs for several years on the Fraser river, which, with the permission of the House I shall read. The Fraser river total last year was 206,003 cases, and compares with former years as follows:

	Cases.
1917	377,988
1916	106,440
1915	289,199
1914	328,390
1913	732,059
1912	173,921
1911	301,344
1910	223,148
1909	567,203
1908	89,184
1907	163,116
1906	240,486
1905	877,136
1904	128,903
1903	237,125
1902	327,095
1901	990,252
1900	316,522
1899	510,383
1898	256,101
1897	860,459
1896	356,984

It will be seen that the 1918 pack, while not the smallest, is below the normal. These figures, however, do not show the decline in the sockeye pack, which is the best fish for canning, the total being increased by the fact that there was much more canning of other varieties than there was when the sockeye was plentiful. The varieties packed in the Fraser River District were:

	Cases.
Sockeye	16,849
Red Springs	15,192
White and Pink Springs	24,853
Chums	86,215
Pinks	18,388
Cohoes	40,111
Blue Backs and Steel Heads	4,395

[Mr. McQuarrie.]

Now it is alarming to see the depletion in such an important industry as the salmon, and I think it would be a good thing for the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to give a matter of that kind very serious consideration.

There is another factor in connection with the fisheries of British Columbia, which to my mind requires and demands the attention of the minister, and that is the fact that the great majority of fishing licenses in British Columbia are issued to Japanese, and the great part of the remaining licenses are issued to other foreigners—Austrians, Greeks, Norwegians, Swedes, and so forth. Now I have here some figures which I will give in that connection. This is a letter which I received from one of the fishery officials and is dated 6th of January, 1919:

> It is quite true that so far as gill net fishing is concerned, the Japanese hold the majority of licenses. For instance on the Fraser River, during the season just closed there were 473 whites, 86 Indians, and 1,023 Japanese. In 1917 834 whites, 272 Indians, and 1,521 Japanese. In 1916, 605 whites, 198 Indians, and 1,437 Japanese. In the northern part of the province, where in 1918, 2,216 gill net licenses were issued, 1,211 were of Japanese nationality. In salmon fishing the Japanese are restricted to gill net licenses, and there is not a salmon drag, or purse-seine license issued to any one of this nationality. It is quite true that some of the white licensees employ Japanese to operate their seining licenses, but this is a matter over which the department has absolutely no control. True also, certain Japanese acted as buyers of salmon on the Fraser River for American firms, and this, of course, we cannot control.

Now, I have nothing to say against the Japanese, but I do not think it is a proper condition when we find that the majority of the licenses are being issued to men from a foreign country. Perhaps this may not appeal to hon. gentlemen as being a serious matter, but I wish to assure them that it is a very important matter, from the standpoint of British Columbia at least. When you consider the fact that in a normal year the pay-roll to the fishermen on the Fraser river only is something like a million dollars and when you see the greater part of that million dollars going to foreigners, you must realize that something should be done to remedy that state of affairs.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Could they not get white men to take their places?

Mr. McQUARRIE: That is the unfortunate part of it; the white man cannot compete with the Oriental in fishing, because these two classes of people do not live in the same way. The Japanese can live much more cheaply than the white man. The

Japanese is a good fisherman, and we have plenty of white men who are good fishermen, but they cannot compete with the Japanese. I have watched this situation for something like thirty years. I have seen the Japanese menace to the fisheries increase from year to year until now these people have the monopoly of that natural resource. I remember the time when a good run of fish meant prosperity to that district, but now the money received by the fishermen goes out of the country and helps not to build up Canada, but to build up a foreign country.

The International Commission to which I have referred was formed because of the fact that our neighbours to the south were doing absolutely nothing to protect the fish. We had hatcheries, we had close seasons, we did everything we could, according to the best judgment of the men in charge of the department concerned, to conserve the salmon; but the Americans did nothing but take the fish. On the other side of the line they had large traps in which thousands of these fish were caught which otherwise would have come up to the spawning grounds in the Fraser river. It is unfortunate that those who had to do with arranging the boundary between Canada and the United States in the early days did not take these circumstances into consideration. The condition is an unnatural one that should not have been permitted to exist. However, we are face to face with it; and now we have this International Commission.

My point in referring to this commission is that, according to reports in the press, it has recommended that the number of licenses on the Fraser river be limited to 1,800. Up to the present time any one who wanted a license has been able to get one. But if the number of licenses is limited to 1,800, are we going to allow the Japanese to have the whole of them or shall we so arrange it that they will get only a fair proportion of them? One of my constituents has asked me to see if it would be possible to get the Government to make some kind of regulation cutting down to fifty per cent of the total the proportion of licenses to be issued to the Japanese. It seems to me that that suggestion is along the right line, but under present conditions its adoption is out of the question. The Government and the Minister of Marine and Fisheries will have to consider what is to be done for the future; will have to consider whether foreigners are to be allowed to have all our fishing rights.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Why are foreigners accorded fishing rights in the Fraser river?

Mr. McQUARRIE: We call these men foreigners, but as a matter of fact they are not foreigners. According to the law, they are naturalized British subjects. Now, you know what that means; anybody who lives in British Columbia knows what that means. These men are citizens of this country only in name and only for the particular purpose of securing a fishing license. They take the oath of allegiance to His Majesty the King, but remain loyal subjects of their own emperor.

I have referred to investigations. As a matter of fact, an investigation is now being conducted in British Columbia by Mr. Justice Eberts, one of the judges of the Supreme Court of that province, under a Royal Commission. Many charges have been made in connection with the administration of the fisheries in British Columbia—charges of graft, corruption, waste, destruction, and so on. Some of those charges have been made by men who have been rash in their statements and very unfair to the fisheries officials and to the Government. A member of the British Columbia Legislature, a returned soldier with a distinguished record in the war, made what I consider to be rash and uncalled for statements. I refer to Major Richard Burde, D.S.O. He made these charges in the Provincial Legislature and also at a public meeting. I have in my hand an extract from the Vancouver Daily Province of February 7, 1919, which reads as follows:

Big Graft Ring in Fish.

Major Burde Used Strong Language in Legislature Thursday.

Gives Details of Difficulty in Getting an Inquiry at Alberni.

Victoria, Feb. 7.—Calling the Fisheries Department a standing disgrace to Canada, "smelling of fish but of a rotten brand," Major Richard Burde, of Alberni, scathingly indicted the Federal Administration for what he described to the legislature yesterday as its absolute disregard of citizens of this province.

"There never was a bigger graft in Canada than there is in the circle where one must wait to-day for a fishing license," he said. "The very fact that an application for a seine-net license is made in private to the Chief Inspector of Fisheries and the public does not know anything about it must make any one of a penetrative mind smell graft.

"You can sell a fishing license any day in a real estate office for $3,000 or $4,000. Our fisheries in this province are being depleted. The sockeye salmon has gone to the museum and the herring would soon be in the same class, but for an inquiry which we now have instituted in the district of Alberni. Herring packers have recently gone into that territory, and fishing for them are more Japanese than I believe have

any right to be in British Columbia. These men are employed to the exclusion of the whites, although fishing might well be considered a good employment for returned soldiers. In Alberni we procured thirty affidavits to prove that there had been almost enough herring wasted by the seine-net ringsters to feed Canada for three or four years. The bottom of the harbour is silvery carpeted with dead herring. Yet, when we press for an inquiry, the Dominion member for the district, the chief inspector of fisheries and his satellites met us with chips on their shoulders. Our charges by inference involved the chief inspector, but when we asked Ottawa for an inquiry we were told that it would be made by this official. We replied that we would prefer to have the Federal department send a man down to investigate the inspector rather than have that official take up our charges. The reply from Mr. Desbarats, Deputy Minister of Marine and Fisheries, was that our message was impertinent, and that if we persisted in that course we would not get any inquiry at all. But we persisted and public opinion forced a probe. Now we have a situation where a Dominion department reluctantly consents to granting us an investigation it should have made long ago itself. This department has apparently outlived its usefulness. I am told that the seine-net fishermen impound about 150 tons of herring in each drive. Sixty per cent of them are smothered and dead by the time the other forty per cent are loaded. The dead fish drop to the bottom of the harbour, and thus the terrible waste goes on. It seems to me, and in fact I have that admission from the chief inspector of fisheries, that hundreds of Japanese working for these herring concerns have no right to engage in the occupation because they are not naturalized. But somehow or other they produce naturalization papers when called on. People say that the canneries hand out the naturalization certificates to the Japanese whenever they wish to employ them. The Japanese going home to the Orient leave their certificates behind, and the Japanese contractors apparently sell them to the new-comers or to the canneries."

The speaker went on to say that the Japanese put up tons of immature herring and ship them via Tacoma to Japan, in this way robbing British Columbia of one of its most valuable assets. The question was one which the province should take up with Ottawa and fight the matter through with the Dominion, he considered. The administration of the fisheries of British Columbia would well be in the hands of the province itself. It might be urged, of course, that to seek to bar the Japanese would be to raise an issue with an ally, but it seemed to Major Burde that if the Empire owed a debt to Japan then the Empire should pay rather than ask British Columbia to meet the whole price of the alliance.

Major Burde was not content with making a statement in the legislature involving the chief inspector and other officials in the Department of Fisheries. At a meeting held in Alberni he made further charges, involving also the Federal member for that constituency. I have here the Vancouver Daily Sun of February 22, 1919, from which I purpose reading this extract:—

Major Burde Alleges that West Coast Fisheries are Controlled by Graft Ring.

Port Alberni, Feb. 21.

Major Dick Burde, M.L.A., made a fighting speech here to-night, at a meeting of fishermen and citizens attacking the cannery men, H. S. Clements, M.P., Chief Inspector Cunningham, of the Fisheries Department and Al. Hager of the New England Fish Company, Vancouver. The provincial member was wildly applauded by the crowd when he repeated the charge that the West Coast Fisheries were controlled by a Graft Ring and urged the fishermen to stay with their fight. He contended that the scope of the inquiry should be extended, and that Mr. Cunningham should be put on the stand. If this was done, some sensational evidence would come out, he said. "There was a graft ring in fish bigger than the Yukon whiskey ring," he asserted. "I believe it because I can smell it."

With regard to Mr. Hager, Major Burde said he had heard that Hager told certain men at the Hotel Vancouver that "Burde is a liar; if we get him on the stand we will make dog meat out of him."

In answer, the major said "if Hager said he will make dog meat out of me, I'll make dirty, rotten fish meat out of him."

Referring to the Fisheries Department, Major Burde said it was the Department's business to start the investigation, not that of the fishermen. He said this was to the disgrace of Clements and the Department. "We are up against a bunch of brigands," he said. "We must not start anything we can't finish."

I will now take up the investigation. The investigation was held and Mr. Cunningham, chief inspector of fisheries, went on the stand and was examined and cross-examined at length, denying each and every one of these charges of graft and incompetency that had been made. At that investigation not one thing was proved in the way of graft or dishonesty or anything of that kind against the member for Alberni, the chief inspector of fisheries, or any of the officials of the department, and, strange to relate, Major Burde, although requested to give evidence himself, did not see fit to do so. It seems to me that when a man, whether he is a returned soldier or not—and I give Major Burde all credit for his service at the front—make such charges in the legislature, he should know that his charges are going to be substantiated, and that when an investigation is held, when the country is put to the expense of thousands of dollars to hold an inquiry of this kind, the man who makes the charges should, if he is not able to come and give evidence himself to prove his charges, produce the men upon whose statements he relied when making his charges. This kind of thing is bad for everybody concerned in it. It is bad for Major Burde; it is bad for the

fisheries officials; it is bad for Mr. Clements. It does harm because people see the first reports of those charges and think there is something in them, and they do not see the last reports, which show that the charges have been absolutely exploded. The situation in connection with the fisheries of British Columbia is, to say the least, very unsatisfactory. The control and management of the fisheries is vested absolutely in one man—the Chief Inspector of Fisheries. It is absolutely a one man affair, and if that appeals to the minister as proper, I can tell him that it certainly does not so appeal to me or to a great many others. No matter how honest and capable this one man may be who has the control of licenses and all details in connection with the fisheries of British Columbia, dissatisfaction is bound to exist. The Chief Inspector is managing director, as it were, of the fisheries, with full power. It is only natural that a man who is refused a license should be dissatisfied and think there is something wrong with the man who refused him the license. This gives rise to suspicion and rumours, and rumours nearly always result, as they have done in this case, in charges and insinuations. It will not do. No one man is big enough to have full control of the fisheries of British Columbia, and I am glad to know that the acting minister is considering the appointment of a Fisheries Board for British Columbia, composed of no less than three men with a thorough knowledge of the fisheries and whose awards will be accepted by the people of the province.

I have another complaint to make in connection with the fisheries of British Columbia, and it is with regard to the removal of the office of the Chief Inspector of Fisheries from New Westminster, where it had been for fifty years, to Vancouver. I do not care to discuss this matter in the absence of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), as I may have an opportunity on some other occasion to go into the matter fully. There is a question of principle involved which I shall then discuss. After what I have said I think the House will agree that I was quite correct in saying that all signs pointed to trouble in connection with the administration of the fisheries of British Columbia. I regret very much indeed that the Minister of Marine and Fisheries did not see fit to go to British Columbia in connection with the fisheries. I trust that he will be back in his seat before long and will bring down legislation to remedy some of the evils I have mentioned.

Mr. Speaker, many splendid speeches have been made in this debate on various matters by men much more competent than I am to discuss them, but as I have come almost three thousand miles I hope the House will bear with me while I express a few Western ideas in a Western way. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) has told us that we have to raise millions and millions of dollars and that there will have to be an increase in the income tax; there was nothing else for it, he said. I would suggest to him and to the Government that before increasing the tax an effort should be made to collect the taxation imposed by the present Act. I have here a clipping from the Vancouver World dated February 14 last, which says that according to an official statement from Ottawa:

> The returns to date from the Income Tax Act of 1917, which applies only to incomes in excess of $3,000 in the case of married persons and $2,000 in the case of unmarried persons, show that about 30,000 assessments have been made, of which 19,000 are paid.

The first question I would ask is, why have the other 11,000 assessments not been paid? Secondly, why have only 30,000 assessments been made when there should have been at least twice that number? I will tell you the reason, Mr. Speaker. It is because a great many persons liable under the Act have not filled out the returns which they received from the tax collector, but have simply torn them up and thrown them in the waste paper basket, saying: "We shall simply be making trouble for ourselves if we fill these in." I have been told that it is a regular joke in the clubs the way men are tearing up these forms. The statement has also been made to me by men of financial standing that a great many of the returns that have been sent in are not altogether correct. If my information is correct, certainly something should be done to remedy this state of affairs. Everyone liable under the Act should be made to pay, and a return that is at all events reasonably correct should be insisted upon. I think that if that were done it would perhaps be unnecessary to increase the income tax. We should get the money that we require, in an equitable manner, and not, as we have received it heretofore, from some and not from others who were entitled to pay. I am not attaching blame to the men who have charge, in the different provinces, of the collection of the income tax. I know that in our province we have a good man. He has done his work well, but he has not a proper staff. He has not the proper clerical assistance which he

should have to enable him to perform his work in the way in which it should be done. I think that the collectors in the different provinces should be afforded the necessary assistance to carry out their work more satisfactorily.

In regard to the Business Profits Tax, there seems to be a general impression that the Government intends to discontinue this tax. I do not know whether that is correct or not. In this connection I may read an editorial—a short one—which appeared in the Vancouver World of February 19, of this year:

A Tax That Should Continue.

The Business Profits War Tax, it is said, will not be renewed for 1919. If this be true Parliament ought to have a word to say about it.

The Federal Cost of Living Commissioner, in his report for last month on stocks of products in cold storage, points out that profiteering is still going on and strongly recommends that the order limiting profits should be restored and "rigidly enforced." He advocates special measures for the "protection of all Canadians for the period of reconstruction."

One such protective measure is the Business Profits War Tax. It tends to reduce profiteering and at the same time goes some distance towards allaying the labour unrest throughout the Dominion. Besides this, Canada has a huge bill of the war costs to meet and those who have made money out of the war or out of the conditions that will follow the war are the logical persons to bear the heaviest share of this debt.

Public opinion should make itself felt at Ottawa. The profiteers should not be allowed to have it all their own way.

With the sentiments expressed in that article, if the facts are correct, I entirely concur. It seems to me that this is a tax which might very well be continued; it is a tax which has produced a good deal of money. The returns under the Business Profits Tax appears to be very satisfactory, certainly a large amount of money has been collected in that way. According to information which I gather from the press, the assessments under this tax have aggregated $65,000,000, of which $59,000,000 have been collected. The balance will probably be received within the next two months.

I come now to the question of highways. I am pleased to note that the Government intends at last to do something towards assisting in the construction of highways; but I am afraid I cannot altogether agree with the manner in which this assistance is proposed to be given, as outlined in the resolution standing in the name of the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Hon. J. D. Reid); and I hope that before it is finally disposed of, the resolution will be considerably amended. I think we need, not so much the expenditure of money as the obtaining of results. We need to have assistance from the Dominion Government in the building of highways which will be of some use to the people of Canada. Now, we have in British Columbia a highway which we consider is important enough to receive assistance. I am referring to what is known as the Pacific Highway, which runs from Vancouver to San Diego, California, on the border of Mexico, a distance of some 2,000 miles. It is an international highway passing through the States of California, Oregon and Washington. In those states the counties all along that road are at present hard-surfacing it. Every county is doing its share, and the state is assisting; so that that highway of 2,000 miles down the Pacific coast will have a hard surface practically all the way. In British Columbia there is about thirty miles to connect up with that splendid international highway. Thirty miles is all we have to do to complete our portion of the work; twelve miles has already been done. The road from New Westminster to Vancouver is a splendid one, a beautiful pavement,—one of the best in Canada, and one of which we are justly proud. Only eighteen miles remain to be done. I think—and I am supported in this opinion by the people of British Columbia, the Good Roads Associations, and all other organizations interested in roads—that that is a road which should receive assistance from the Dominion Government. Now, we have heard from various hon. members on both sides of the House of the necessity for effecting national unity, encouraging the national spirit, and with those sentiments I am in entire agreement. I think we in Canada are too provincial; we know our own provinces and no others. We do not know what the rest of Canada consists of. Take British Columbia, for instance. Do we, in British Columbia, know anything about the province of Quebec, except what we read in newspapers, and observe casually on trains passing through that province? What do we in British Columbia know of the great provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, which are right at our doors, Manitoba, Ontario, and the Maritime Provinces? We know practically nothing.

4 p.m.

The hon. member for Westminster District (Mr. Stacey) the other day, advanced in splendid words, a beautiful plan for promoting the spirit of national unity. I have another plan to suggest and it seems to me

that it is possibly more practical. The best way to promote national unity in Canada is to have a road which runs from one side of Canada to the other, a good highway that you could travel over with your motors during the proper season. It is not such a big contract at all. A large part of the road has already been constructed.

In British Columbia, we are in this unfortunate position, that if we wish to go to Alberta or Saskatchewan, we must either go by rail or take our motors down by way of Seattle and Spokane, through the State of Washington and around through the United States into Alberta or Saskatchewan. Then we go up and continue on our journey. But we miss the finest part of the British Columbia scenery which compares with anything that exists in the world. The famous Alps have nothing on that scenery. It would be a great thing for you people down here to be able to get up into these mountains. It would be a great thing for us to be able to get through the mountains. What ought to be built is a road through the mountains of British Columbia connecting that province with the province of Alberta.

You may say that we want all this money for British Columbia. But, you are forgetting that you also will be able to take full advantage of this wonderful highway. You will be able to enjoy that wonderful scenery and make just as much use of the road as we will. I suggest for the serious consideration of the minister the construction of a Canadian highway. I would ask him to see whether he cannot do something more than to give us $80,000 with the small amount which will be in accordance with our population, because, if we get paid according to population we are going to get a very small amount. Our population is small but our needs are great. I would like him to consider this and see whether he cannot possibly amend his proposal in some way.

I have heard some criticism of the Official Record which has been published under the auspices of the hon. the President of the Council (Mr. Rowell). Personally, I feel that the record is filling a long felt want, that the information which it contains is of considerable value and that every copy of the record is worth keeping. History is being recorded in it from a Canadian standpoint. I hope that the minister will keep up the good work and that he will continue the record.

I am glad to see that there is an entire agreement apparently between hon. gentlemen on both sides of the House that technical schools should be established by the Dominion Government. We are very badly in need of a technical school in British Columbia. I sincerely hope that the Government will assist us to establish a technical school in that province.

I was glad to see the announcement in the speech from the Throne of the intention of the Government to establish a Department of Public Health, and I listened with a great deal of interest to the eloquent speech of the hon. member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) in this connection. I join with him in hoping that a first-class medical man will be placed in charge of this department. I would like to see the jurisdiction of this department considerably enlarged. I would like to see it given power to control the prices of drugs. You may talk about profiteering in foodstuffs but the profiteering in drugs has been beyond comprehension. It is nothing short of highway robbery the prices that we have had to pay for drugs all over Canada and I find it here in the East even worse than it is in the West. This is not right. It was not right during war times to allow those men who are responsible for this to take advantage of the conditions to increase their profits. I do not know who is responsible for it, I do not say that the druggists in the towns are responsible, but somebody is responsible for it and that profiteering in drugs ought to be stopped. I would like to see this department of health do something useful, take up that question and control the price of drugs.

I would also like to see the department take up the matter of supplying free medical attendance to those who wish to take advantage of it. I recognize the fact that there will always be in the medical profession men who, because of their outstanding ability, will be specialists, who will be entitled to carry on as specialists and who will be consulted as such; medical men who will command their own private practice and I would not like to see anything done to interfere with the private practice of anybody. These doctors are doing a noble work; they are members of a noble, a splendid profession. I have every respect for the men who are in it. But a great deal of sickness results from the fact that poor people do not like to go to a medical man because they are afraid of the amount of the fee that they will be charged. They say that in medicine prevention is better than cure. It is better to take a disease or a complaint of any kind in its initial

stages rather than to look after it later on. Epidemics are started because cases are not attended to as they should be at the first. There should be free medical attendance for those who wish to take advantage of it. At the present time all the machinery for carrying out a system of free medical attendance is in existence. You know, Mr. Speaker, that the Government has medical officers and has hospitals to look after the returned soldiers who require medical attendance. These men are supplied with medical attendance, drugs, medicines and so on.

In due time, and I hope in the not far distant future, the soldiers will be discharged from the hospitals, and there will be no further work for those institutions or for the medical men who are looking after them. Why not continue those hospitals and those medical men in the service of the country, and give free medical attendance to the people who want to take advantage of it? I hope that the new Department of Public Health will consider that question, because I believe, and am convinced, that it is very important.

Now as to the high cost of living. I got a letter from my wife yesterday, and she said: "I hope you people down there in Ottawa will try and do something to bring down the cost of living. That is about the most important business that you can think about." That is the way all the women in this country feel at the present time. I do not see anything about this subject in the speech from the Throne, but I think some action is contemplated in the programme of the Government. Mr. Speaker, we must consider the women more than ever now under present conditions——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McQUARRIE: —and if they demand that the cost of living be brought down we shall have to comply with that demand. How it is going to be done I do not know, that is something that will have to be worked out.

As to the Civil Service Commission, I have listened with a good deal of interest to the criticism of that body, and I hope that patronage as in the old days will never be restored in Canada. Personally I do not wish to have anything to say about any of the appointments which are to be made in connection with the Civil Service. At the same time, however, I think that the Civil Service Commission can stand some remodelling, it is not working out very satisfactorily. I am not saying that with any desire to criticise any member of the Civil Service Board, I think they are trying to do their best, but the existing system needs improvement. It is all new, and the needed reforms will have to be worked out. My experience with the Civil Service Commission has been something like this: I have not heard anything from the commission since I have been a member, neither have I communicated with it, but a rather remarkable thing has happened in that connection, and that is what I want to call attention to. As a matter of fact a great many of the applicants for Civil Service positions from my constituency gave my name as one of their references. I do not know whether it was right or not for them to do so, but at any rate they did so, although not at my request. Now, the peculiar part of the proceeding is that never on one occasion have I had any reference to me from the Civil Service Commission as to any of these applications, and no appointment, so far as I know, has been made by the commission of any one from my constituency. We have good men in my constituency, just as other hon. gentlemen have in their constituencies, but they do not seem to have been recognized by the commission. Whether it is that their applications were refused and thrown out immediately the commission saw that a member of Parliament's name was given as one of the references, or not, I cannot say, but the fact remains that no reference was ever made by the commission to me. Neither am I aware whether any reference was made to any of the other gentlemen who were on the applications or not. I think it is a strange thing that before making appointments the Civil Service Commission should not communicate with all the references given on the applications. I think the Civil Service Commission will be all right if it is given time, but I do hope that patronage will not be returned to the members of Parliament.

With regard to immigration, we have to consider it as a problem—one of the greatest problems of demobilization. The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) speaking on this subject, as reported on page 220 of Hansard said: "The first thing is to get population." Again, as reported on page 221 he said: First of all get population, get people with money." I can hardly agree with the hon. gentleman that money should be the only qualification. I would say, get population, but get the right kind.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. McQUARRIE: The hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton says, "Hear,

hear," so that I know that I am voicing his sentiments in making this declaration.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Hear, hear.

Mr. McQUARRIE: To my mind there are certain classes of population that we do not want in this country. The first class is one which includes people who cannot readily be assimilated. Among this class are, the Chinese, the Japanese, the Hindus, and other Eastern races. So far as the Chinese are concerned, we get them in British Columbia. The unfortunate thing is that when you speak of the number of Chinese in Canada you practically have reference to the number of Chinese in British Columbia. I only wish the Chinese would come down here in large numbers, and that you would employ them as you think they would be useful to you. I know how you feel about it here in Ontario. You have no sympathy with us, when we speak against Oriental immigration. You say: "These Chinese will be very useful to us, we want cheap labour." I want to tell hon. gentlemen that when you get the Chinese you do not get cheap labour. The Chinaman, like everybody else, has become educated, and he is not going to work for any cheap wages. Although there is an overabundance of Chinese in British Columbia at the present time, yet they demand big wages. What would you people in Ontario think of paying $60 to $70 a month to an ordinary farm labourer, when down here you probably pay about $25, or $30?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. McQUARRIE: I venture to say you pay considerably less than $60 to $75 a month for good farm labour. In British Columbia you cannot get a Chinaman who is any good to work on a farm for less than that wage. You cannot get a Chinaman, who is any good, to work in a house or residence, for less than $50 a month and board. If you want to get a good one, you must pay $75, $100 or $125 a month. Talk about cheap labour; you do not get it with the Chinese. I am safe in saying that there are too many Chinese in British Columbia, because I have no less an authority for it than the Chinese Consul at Vancouver. Conditions are so bad that he has found it necessary to go to the Vancouver City council and make representations in the matter. In speaking of these Orientals, the Chinese, Japanese and Hindus, I am referring, of course, to the coolie classes. The Chinese Consul has asked the Vancouver City council to make representations to the Dominion Government with a view to restricting Chinese immigration. I have here a copy of the written statement made by Koliang Yih, the Chinese Consul, in the Vancouver City Council chamber on February 7, 1919. It is as follows:

Although there is only one Chinese to every 3,000 Canadians in this country, yet labour conditions here, aggravated by the large number of returned soldiers, whom we all honour, make it advisable that no more Chinese labourers be allowed to come at present, unless they are returning Chinese or bona fide exempted class, pending a gentleman's agreement between the governments concerned to abolish the head tax and to limit the number of immigrants.

I understand that some 2,000 alleged students, paying $500 head tax each, have come to Canada during the past few months without expecting the war would end so suddenly, and that head tax has been received here and elsewhere on more than 1,200 alleged students who have not yet left China. I think you should petition your Federal Government and suggest that these head taxes be returned to those paying same and those who arrived at Canada three months before the armistice was signed, if they desire to return. I will do my part in requesting my government to allow no Chinese labourers to come here without applying for government's passport, properly vised by a British Consul.

Many Chinese already in this country are finding difficulties in making a living at present, and the stand I am taking now is for the protecton of their immediate interests as well as those of the Canadians.

Between the period of 1906 and 1917, no less than 30,000 Chinese have paid their head tax to the amount of more than $15,000,000 to your Federal Government. Many Chinese, finding that the conditions, both economic and social, were unbearable to them, have since returned to China, and this statement can be proved by the fact that according to the last census taken, there were less than 30,000 Chinese throughout the whole Dominion. Those unfortunate fellows who paid in the tax and went away elsewhere have certainly found themselves between the devil and the deep sea, without being driven to the latter by others.

The Chinese who are planning to come to Canada know little or nothing about the true situation caused by the sudden end of the war, and it is only right for your Government to refund the tax when it knew itself that 50 per cent of the so-called students applying for admission are unable to go to school at all. Your Government should be more rigid in examining these alleged students and more lenient in dealing with other exempted classes. But once the Chinese are admitted they should be entitled to every right and protection as any citizen or subject from other countries enjoying the most favoured agreement. I have heard so much of the Britisher's traditional sense of justice and I hope it will show itself in this case.

After all, this big question should be amicably settled by the government concerned while we are here simply to express our own points of view. I therefore suggest that the question brought up by the representatives from Fairview and Grandview be not considered by this council, and that the less talk about the Oriental immigration to mislead the public the better.

I have under my hand an extract from the Vancouver World of February 26, 1919, touching this question. It is as follows:

Chinese Pour into Vancouver.

Arrive at Average Rate of Three Hundred a Month, According to Official Return from Ottawa.

Number of Japanese Exceeds Annual Quota.

Agreement to Limit Immigration to 400 a Year Apparently Not Observed.

According to an official return obtained from Ottawa more than 400 Japanese who were to enter the country under the "gentleman's agreement," have actually passed through the ports of the Dominion inward bound during the last few years. The average for the last half-dozen years, in fact, has been nearly double the prescribed number.

There was a tremendous influx of Chinese in the year 1913-14, over fifty-five hundred coming in. The first year of the war saw this number reduced to about twenty-five per cent and during the next three years the whole number of Chinese immigrants just equalled that for 1914-15. During the first nine months of the official year 1918-19, however, the figures jumped to 2,670, or more for three-quarters of the year than for the whole of the four previous years put together. Should the influx be maintained at the same rate to the end of the period, the present official year will see the Chinese population increased by about 3,500 new-comers.

The figures referred to in the official return are as follows:

Year.	Chinese.	Japanese.
1913-14	5,512	856
1914-15	1,258	592
1915-16	88	401
1916-17	393	648
1917-18	769	883
1918-19	2,670	879

The last figures are for nine months. The question of Oriental immigration must be considered from the standpoint of the returned soldier, and I believe the returned soldiers' organizations are rather exercised over present conditions. This is an extract from the Vancouver World of February 27, 1919, which reflects the feeling fairly well:

In considering the problems dealing with the repatriation of returned men, some attention must be given to the Asiatic question, Captain F. C. Brown, of the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Commission told the Kiwanis Club, on Thursday, in making an appeal for co-operation in behalf of the men who are now coming back from the front. During the months of January and February, no less than 3,000 men were brought back to this city and discharged, and of this number 1,700 are still without employment. In seeking the solution of this condition of affairs, he urged that earnest consideration would have to be given the Asiatic problem in this city, declaring that in some parts of Vancouver, one would never realize this city was not an Oriental city, to watch the passers-by and listen to the language being spoken. South of Granville Street bridge, he mentioned that no less than seven Orientals were in business for themselves, and said that he had been informed by white merchants in competition with those Orientals that if they did not have to meet that competition they could employ more returned men. It was all very well to talk about those Orientals being Allies, he said, but it has also to be remembered that they did not go away and fight for the country.

He said there seemed to exist in the minds of some business men fear that the returned men would have to be discharged again if given employment, and in this connection put forward a plea for more consideration to be shown the returned man, pointing out that the man who had been through the thickest of the fighting at the front was usually the most difficult to get back to civil life again. He urged business men not to forget the service such a man had rendered his country and to keep up the spirit of gratitude.

I have stated that the Japanese have already obtained practically a monopoly of the fishing industry. They are now going out after other industries. They are commencing to take up small farming, and there is a feeling that if this movement goes on, they will, in a very short time, monopolize small farming in British Columbia. I have not one word to say against the Japanese. The Japanese are a fine people; their men are industrious, hard-working and sober. But still they come within the class to which I have referred, namely, those who cannot readily be assimilated. In this class, we have also the Hindu. I need not say anything more about the Hindu except that so far as I can see the Hindus who are being sent to this country are some of the very worst who could possibly be got together. In any event, they are not suitable for the country; they may like the country, but the country does not like them. With all this class, the same thing prevails, namely, they cannot readily be assimilated and they will always exist as an Oriental settlement in our midst. They send a great deal of their money back to their respective countries; they do not spend it in this country. They do not help to build up this country. They take away from, rather than give, to Canada something that is worth while. There is another class which I think should be kept out. That is a class of people who might be readily assimilated, but who are of such moral fibre that we do not want them just at present. I refer, of course, to our enemy aliens. We do not want any Germans, Austrians, Turks, in this country until they are so changed in their ideals that they will be able to look at things as we do, until they reach such a stage of mental development that they will make decent and respectable citizens of this

country, that is, if such a thing ever comes to pass. I notice that practically all the other Allied countries are deporting enemy aliens as fast as they can. China has despatched several boatloads of them. They are being deported from Belgium, France, England. Canada seems to be rather slow in getting rid of her share. I agree with the previous speakers who have said that we should send the alien enemies out of Canada as soon as possible. If it is necessary and advisable to do that, surely we do not want to bring into Canada other people of the same class.

The third class of people that we should keep out of Canada is the Bolsheviks. We do not want them in this country. After hearing the splendid exposition made by the president of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) of the doctrines of the cult of Bolshevism, I think we will all agree that we do not want any Bolsheviks in this country.

There is a fourth class that we must keep out of Canada, and which is pretty nearly as bad. I refer to the I. W. W's., and included in that class are the labour agitators. I can speak from information which has been given to me as to conditions in British Columbia. During the last year, hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of damage has been done by the I. W. W's. in British Columbia.

Their doctrine is to destroy everything that is of value. They destroy timber by starting fires in the forests, reservoirs by blowing up the dams, machinery by letting the water out of boilers, and all that kind of thing. They destroy anything and everything, and during last year they have certainly destroyed a whole lot in British Columbia. I do not know what destruction they have been guilty of in other parts of Canada, but certainly we do not want these men in this country, no matter how much money they have. I class with the I. W. W. the professional agitator. He is the cause of all the trouble in labour circles at the present time. If you go back far enough you will find that every strike in Canada during the last few years was caused by two or three or half-a-dozen agitators. We should not let men of this sort come into the country, and we should drive out those already here. I agree with the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) that we need population in this country, but we want population of the right kind, and our immigration officials should be very careful as to the class of immigrant they admit. It is better to get along with our present population rather than have it increased by any of the classes to whom I have referred.

I wish to say a word on behalf of the returned soldier. I am afraid there is a tendency already in this country to forget what the returned soldier has done for us. I have heard it said that he is asking for too much, that he is unreasonable. I do not believe it. I do not believe that the men who had the interests of this country and of the civilized world sufficiently at heart to go over there and offer up their lives, if necessary, would make unreasonable demands on the people and resources of this country on their return home. All the returned soldier wants is a square deal, and he is certainly entitled to that. We should not forget his wonderful record in this war, and the great changes that have been brought about during the last four years by his fighting for us. Great monarchs, like the German Emperor and the Czar of Russia, have lost their thrones and their governments are being reorganized. Other crowned heads have fallen, and the map of Europe, of Asia, Africa and other places is being made anew. Nowadays we talk of millions and billions without winking an eyelash and I think it is about time we changed our ideas of what should be done for the returned soldier. Never in the history of any country has the returned soldier got a square deal or been treated as he deserves. I am glad to see that the Government will bring down legislation on behalf of the returned soldier, in the way of increased pensions, for instance. I hope this Parliament will do a whole lot for the returned soldier. We certainly cannot do too much for him.

Mr. Speaker, you have borne with me very patiently. I trust that my remarks will bear fruit and that this Parliament will evolve means to solve the serious problems that now confront us.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (Chambly and Vercheres): Mr. Speaker, one day in the British House of Commons after the Rt. Hon. Walter Long had been speaking for three hours, Mr. Balfour's desk-mate whispered to him, "When is he going to finish?" Mr. Balfour answered, "He has finished long ago, but does not know how to stop." Without wishing to be discourteous to my hon. friend from New Westminster (Mr. McQuarrie) I must say that I was reminded of that incident in the British House while he was speaking.

Mr. Speaker, the second session of the thirteenth Parliament of Canada opened

under very remarkable circumstances—circumstances which all those then present will never forget as a blending of joy and grief, of hope and distress. Joy, at the news that the monster of war that had been threatening humanity for four years had finally been vanquished and overthrown. Grief, at the death of the most prominent member of this House. Hope, that the treaty of peace would free humanity forever from sanguinary contests. Distress, at the thought that the voice of the premier representative of Canadian statesmanship and patriotism would never again be heard in this House.

Mr. Speaker, I should be unworthy of the solicitude and kindness which the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier always showered upon me if my first utterance this afternoon were not a word of respect and admiration for the memory of one who, though dead, yet lives and will always live in the heart of every true Canadian. Sir, the achievements of his illustrious career have already been eloquently referred to by the church, the state, and the press. His wisdom, his brilliance, his loftiness as a statesman, his magnanimity, his magnetism and eloquence, indeed, the entire devotion of his life, from his first public utterance in the early sixties, up to a few weeks before his death, to the interests of peace, fraternity, and unity of creeds and races in this country will fill the noblest and brightest pages of Canadian history. But, Sir, he will especially be remembered and cherished on account of his kindness of heart and his generous courtesy even to the most humble. "I am glad Sir Wilfrid Laurier did not die while he was Premier of Canada," was the remark I overheard at the funeral of the great statesman. This remark was made by a modest, unknown citizen. "Why?" I venture to ask. "Well, sir," he said, "if Sir Wilfrid Laurier had died while he was Premier this tribute of admiration, and all the expressions of sympathy which have been made in regard to him from every part of Canada, would probably have been attributed to his high position in the state. But look at these enormous crowds lining the streets of the Capital and bearing visible signs of grief, people from every part of the country; they are not lamenting the death of a premier, they are mourning the sudden and final cessation of a heart whose every throb was alive for his country and his people."

The impressive ceremony could not fail to remind me of Tennyson's immortal words:—

The dark crowd moves and there are sobs and tears,
The black earth yawns, the mortal disappears
Ashes to ashes, dust to dust,
He is gone who seemed so great.
Gone, but nothing can bereave him
Of the Force he made his own
Being here, and we believe him
Something far advanced in State,
And that he wears a truer Crown
Than any wreath that man can weave him.
Speak no more of his renown;
Lay your earthly fancies down,
And in his peaceful rest leave him.
God accept him, Christ receive him.

Mr. Speaker, I heartily join in the congratulations which have been showered on the mover and the seconder of the Address, in such profusion that it would have made the hon. members blush with confusion had they not been accustomed to more severe bombardments, and although I believe that the honour conferred upon them had the effect of making them rather eulogistic of the Government, their effort on the whole was very creditable.

I may, however, express regret at the fact that the well established custom of having the seconder's speech delivered in French was departed from in this instance. This departure is surely not an indication of progress towards racial unity in Canada. The official excuse given was that the Government, having exhausted last year their French-speaking talent in the person of the hon. junior member for Ottawa (Mr. Chabot) were not in a position to follow the custom. Now, I think that this action on the part of the Government is an emphatic and uncalled for ejectment from the Unionist party of the hon. member for Edmonton East (Mr. Mackie), who speaks French very fluently, and, I may add, eloquently, and who, as the hon. member for Fort William and Rainy River (Mr. Manion) has said, could not possibly have mutilated the beautiful language of Molière and Racine. Be that as it may, I concur entirely in the sentiments expressed by the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address and other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, in their plea for a better understanding between the races and creeds in Canada.

5 p.m.

I have carefully preserved all the printed references which have been made to our late departed chief by hon. members of the House and by the press, and have pasted them in a scrap book, already containing articles emanating from the same gentlemen, and the same press during the campaign of 1917. It will be an edifying and instructive page of history for my son to

read when he shall have attained the age of fifteen.

Mr. Speaker, the first part of the speech from the Throne I cannot but concur in, that is the expression of relief at the cessation of hostilities, and the victory of the Allies. The happiness which our brave boys will bring back with them will be marred only by the memory of those who will never return, and who are now sleeping their last sleep in the blood-stained fields of France and Flanders. This victory is not a victory of one of the Allies, but of all the Allies. Little Belgium held the enemy for a few weeks at a tremendous sacrifice. France, by the indomitable courage of her troops and the genius of her generals, held the foe until relief could be sent. The British Empire, with her watchdogs of the sea and her army always increasing, stopped the invader. Italy, buckled up Austria, and our neighbours to the south, although arriving late, delivered a crushing blow. Mr. Speaker, when the history of this war is written, it will be shown that it was not a victory of any one of the Allies, but that the victory could not have been achieved without the co-operation of each and all of them.

But, thank God, this butchery is over, and we read in the speech from the Throne that, prior to the armistice, plans had been made for the return, demobilization and re-establishment in civil life after the close of the war of our soldiers and their dependents overseas. I am not thoroughly acquainted with the work of the department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, but it seems to me that the word " prior " at the beginning of this item is not very accurate in reference to the resignation of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) and the official cause of his withdrawal. The news of the conditions, and the riots at Kinmel Camp, seems to confirm our belief that the chairman of the Repatriation Committee was perfectly right when, in the first part of his speech, he repeated three times that the armistice took him by surprise. I am informed from a reliable source that the conditions at the camps are intolerable. A returned man of the 42nd, who enlisted in 1914, arrived at the camp on the 27th December last and stayed there a month. Nearly all the men at this camp are invalids and have been wounded. The officers in charge force them to work and assign them to all kinds of hard and dirty jobs. The officers do not take into account the length of service of a man when the question of return comes up and many men who have been in Europe for a few months are returned before those who had been fighting in France since the beginning of the war. The men are only told a few hours before their departure. The returned man who gave this information started from the camp at 12 p.m. He had to walk five miles to the station. No care was taken of the crippled, the wounded, the sick or the invalided. The officer ordered these men to take their kits on their backs and it took them two hours to reach their destination. Some of the men were totally exhausted. These men, I am informed, had asked for motors, or carriages, for their transportation and they were refused.

I heard from another man who enlisted as a private in 1914, and who arrived a few days ago. He had been over there since the beginning. He was promoted to a lieutenancy on the battlefield and he had been wounded three times and invalided. He was booked to return at the beginning of January last. He prepared himself to come back, but he was notified on the eve of his departure that an officer who had only been in London for three months attending pink teas, was taking his place and the wounded and invalided man had to wait another month.

In a beautiful booklet artistically printed by the minister and distributed by the Repatriation Committee, we are told that since the armistice the men have been classified in order to their better civil re-establishment. Since the armistice? Why, Mr. Speaker, this work had been done for the soldiers of France, England and the United States months prior to the armistice. This situation is a disgrace to this country and shows an incompetency on the part of the department and of the authorities in charge which cannot be too strongly criticised and denounced.

There are many other items in the speech from the Throne which will need our careful consideration. Amongst them is the question of prohibition. I am not prepared to give my view of this legislation before it is brought down in a more concrete form, but I wish to warn the Government of one thing. If it is their intention to have total prohibition, I hope the measure which they will introduce will not be a law of exemption like the Ontario Temperance Act. The remark made the other day in this House by my hon. friend from Dorchester (Mr. Cannon), that in Ontario men are not valued by the amount of wealth they have but by the amount of liquor they possess

is perfectly true. A few months ago I happened to spend a week in Toronto one Sunday and I asked to be shown the beautiful residences of the city. The taxi driver, when I inquired of him who was living in such-and-such a beautiful place, told me: This is Mr. So-and-So; he has $50,000 worth of liquor in his cellar.

Sir, some of my hon. friends were surprised the other day at the threatening menace of Bolshevism in this country. No wonder, with such measures as the Ontario Temperance Act. Why should the man of wealth, the profiteer, be allowed to gather regular warehouses of liquor and drink as much as he likes, while the working man of modest means, not being able to mobilize his meagre capital, will be sent to jail if he dares attempt to indulge in the very limited consumption of a glass of beer with his meals? Is it fair for the returned man to hear when he comes back, that while he was fighting overseas, those for whom he was risking his life were "stocking up," and at the same time framing and passing a law to restrict his liberty and deprive him of legitimate enjoyment? There are, Mr. Speaker, sincere and deserving people preaching prohibition, deserving apostles of prohibition, and I entertain a most profound respect for them; but there are also hypocrites, and I want to know where they are. If total prohibition is passed, let us clean the cellars, let us publish a list of all those who have liquor in their houses, or, if my suggestion is better, let us pass a law—

An hon. MEMBER: An Order in Council.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Or an Order in Council which will force the hypocrites to wear a badge or a button, with a yellow star for every case of liquor they possess; then, I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that some of the most vituperous prohibitionists will look like Indians. Mr. Speaker, prohibition—I mean total prohibition—does not seem to be very popular nowadays. Let me read you a few extracts from this week's issue of the Toronto Saturday Night. I quote:

> Out in Alberta the Stewart Government has, in utter desperation, abolished the Commission created to enforce the Prohibition Act, and has "passed the buck" to the Hon. John Boyle, Attorney-General. In turn the Attorney-General also takes a pessimistic view of the situation. For instance, in a speech on the floor of the Legislature the other day, he remarked that out of the 100,000 estimated male adults of the province 60,000 of them were guilty of some infringement of the Liquor Act during 1918. That the violation of the Liquor Act in British Columbia is the chief form of popular amusement in that province is too well known to require further comment, other than to remark that it is estimated by British Columbians of unquestioned standing that fully eighty-five per cent of the male adults in that neck of the woods have in some form or other broken the prohibition enactments.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: Now let us come to a province geographically nearer to us. The paper says:

> In centres like Toronto we were promised that when prohibition was in force crime would decrease until there would actually be no use for jails or police. What has been the result? According to the annual report of Chief of Police Grasset, of Toronto, 25,714 persons were apprehended for crime in the year 1917, as compared with 28,206 in 1918, an increase of 2,492 for "dry" 1918. The Chief goes on to state the obvious: "There is no reason to believe that the morals of the people are improving."
>
> Among the members of the Ontario House there are gloomy forebodings. When prohibition is mentioned a chill runs up and down the spines of the members, and more particularly Government members. They are all wondering how the prohibition cat is going to jump. They look back to the half score by-elections and their pedal extremities seem colder than the mild winter warrants. In a word, they are in a "blue funk." The other day Colonel H. A. Machin, who sits as Conservative member of Kenora, had his first opportunity since returning from overseas, to express views on the subject. In speaking of the growth of Phariseeism in Ontario, the gallant Colonel referred to the "sin hound" who spent his time trailing people who wanted to live their own lives in their own way, and he reminded his hearers that Canadians had gone "over there" he among them, to fight for democracy and human liberty, and they came back to find their own liberty as British subjects taken away from them. The Colonel made it clear that he did not wish the return of the bar, but he did believe that the present wave of fanatical Puritanism had led the Government into taking unwarranted steps, and in so doing had trampled underfoot the rights of the individual.

I would say furthermore, Mr. Speaker, if we are going to have total prohibition, let us have machinery that will enforce the law, so that dynamite whiskey—to use some expressions from the West—squirrel gin, or rot gut, sold in blind pigs will not ruin the health of those who are not millionaires or profiteers.

I was astonished, Mr. Speaker, upon reading the speech from the Throne, to find that it contained not one line about the high cost of living. After a few moments' reflection, however, I found out the reason. I discovered again the hidden hand of the masters of this Government, the profiteers, who will not permit any attempt at the deflation of the cost of the necessities of life. The Labour Gazette of last month shows no relief in the matter of the price

of these necessities—meat, eggs, milk, etc. And, Sir, the profit on these things goes not to the producer or to the farmer, but to the food king.

Perhaps the House will be interested to know the profits of the milling companies for 1917—and I am told that those for 1918 are even higher. The Ogilvie Flour Mills in 1913 made $470,000 in profits, and in 1917, $2,100,000. Their reserve fund in 1913 was $473,000; it is now $2,690,000. Up to 1916 their dividend had been 8 per cent; in 1916 it was 12 per cent, and in 1917, during the war, when everybody was told to be economical, it was 26 per cent, war taxes paid.

The Lake of the Woods Milling Company made $385,000 in profits in 1913 and $700,000 in 1917. In 1913 the dividend was 10.7 per cent; in 1916, 14 per cent, and in 1917, 18 per cent. Although the company redeemed $800,000 of bonds from 1913 to 1917, its actual reserve fund is now a million dollars more than it was in 1913.

The Maple Leaf Milling Company made $241,844 in profits in 1914 and $1,763,000 in 1917. After deducting $1,000,000 a year for depreciation, it still had $1,100,000 by way of net profits in 1917.

The Western Canada Flour Mills paid a war tax of $35,000 in 1917, but this did not prevent their profits, which were $445,000 in 1913, from climbing to $840,000 in 1917, to say nothing of an important amount paid up to their sinking fund.

Other milling companies of less importance made a brilliant showing. For instance, one of these which had a deficit of $62,000 in 1913 had a surplus of $138,000 in 1917. The result is that we have to pay an exorbitant price for bread, 7½ to 8½ cents a pound. Mr. Speaker, I could go on giving you figures on the same scale in respect to practically every necessity of life

Mr. NICKLE: Were the increased profits of the millers the result of an increased turnover or an increase in the profit per barrel on flour?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: I am not prepared to answer my hon. friend now, but I will tell him this: When the people are paying more and more for bread and the millers are making more excessive profits every day, something is wrong somewhere. That is common sense.

Our food control is a joke. We have another very artistic booklet. The Government is evidently in the printing business for good, and is flourishing at it, as you have noticed by the report of the commission appointed to inquire into conditions at the Printing Bureau and the present strike of employees in that institution. What do we find in this booklet? We find that the revenue derived from food licenses was $531,719 last year, and that it cost the people of Canada $491,000 to collect that amount. Is that good business, Mr. Speaker. Is that good management? No wonder the speech from the Throne did not touch this question. Imagine what the returned hero, who for four years has been risking his life at the front, will say when he finds his wife driven to despair and his children starving on account of the prohibitive prices of foodstuffs.

Another omission from the speech from the Throne was any reference to a matter which recently was of but minor importance, but which last year, through the action of the Prime Minister of Canada, developed into a matter of great importance. I refer to the question of titles. I was surprised that there was no mention of that subject in the speech from the Throne. You will remember, Sir, that last year, when the House was practically unanimous on this question, the Prime Minister came into the House armed with his whip and threatened to resign if the members on your right did not swallow all they had said and vote against their opinions. The Prime Minister gave as his principal reason for his action at that time, if I remember well, the fact that His Majesty's Government had asked that the proposal be stayed until the holding of the Imperial Conference, when the matter would be settled. He intimated that the action of the Conference would be recorded before the next session, and that in the meantime no titles would be granted. The member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) stuck to his guns and to his honour. The member for West Lambton (Mr. Pardee), the member for Lethbridge (Mr. Buchanan), and the member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden) gave their support to the Government on the express condition that the matter would be discussed at the Imperial Conference and that in the meantime no titles should be granted. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) wanted to withdraw his motion, and when he could not withdraw it, on account of the objection of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe), he declined to support the amendment he himself proposed. The hon. member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) did the aeroplane act and flew out of the room. The crack of the lashes of the Prime Minister's whip is still ringing in my ears, and I still see the hon. members crouching before their master. What happened,

what was done at the conference? The speech from the Throne should have enlightened us on this subject, but it does not, and I am therefore not in a position to know what was done. But what I know, and what every hon. member knows, is that a few weeks after this slavish incident, contrary to the solemn promise of the Prime Minister, titles were conferred on three persons, one of them being the Minister of Trade and Commerce who must have known what was coming to him when he defended the titles a few days before with a voice trembling with pathos and tears.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Who were the others?

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: If I am correctly informed, one of them was the brother of the Prime Minister and the other was the Clerk of the Senate, formerly, private secretary of the Prime Minister.

Mr. MURPHY: Then there was a gentleman from London.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT: A question closely connected with the high cost of living is the labour question to which the speech from the Throne makes no reference. Is it possible that the Government is so blind that it does not see the tidal wave of labour unrest and legitimate revindications threatening to invade and flood our political and social institutions? Is it the intention of the Government to wait until these institutions are swamped without hope of rescue, before they wake up to realities and shake off their criminal indolence? Is it not time that the barons of finance, the industrial and railroad kings should not be given the powerful liberty of imposing upon the country their political wishes and of exercising on Canada an arrogant and unjustified dictatorship? In these times of the rejuvenation of the world, the workingman is no longer satisfied to be the material instrument producing wealth for the profiteers, without receiving any share of the comforts of life for himself and his family. Unless the workingman has confidence in his employer and is given for his own protection and welfare, a reasonable control in the management of industries, we are bound to see this peaceful country become the prey of dangerous agitators. In England, the Government has decided to apply the Whiteley system of giving the workingman a share in the management of Government workshops and yards. I hope this Government will see fit to adopt a similar measure and at the same time to provide old age pensions for the workingman.

Of all the speeches made by hon. members on your right, Mr. Speaker, the one which impressed me most was the eloquent address of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder). But after it was all over, I tried to relate to a friend of mine what the minister had said, and although my memory is fair, all that I could remember when the noise had ceased, and the western tornado had passed, was, first, that hostilities had ceased very suddenly; secondly, that hostilities had ceased much sooner than had been expected; thirdly, that the end of the war came suddenly, and fourthly, that he was still a Liberal; that no person could make him anything else, and that no one could drive him out of the Liberal party. Not relying upon my memory, I waited until the next day and on reading his speech in Hansard, I found that my remembrance was right.

As to the first three points, unpreparedness, unpreparedness and unpreparedness I would respectfully suggest to the Acting Prime Minister that a new department be created and called the Department of "Lack of Foresight" with the Minister of Immigration at the head of it, As to the fourth point, the minister seemed to be the porte-parole and premier exponent of a certain number of hon. members on the other side, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) included. I wish to ask a few questions of the minister, and I am very glad to see him now in his seat. I do not insist that he should reply immediately to my questions; but I wish he would spend just a few minutes of his valuable time on them, and see if the answers to these questions are quite satisfactory to his political conscience. First of all, what is Liberalism? Is it an association composed of members who are at liberty to belong to it when they wish, who can join when they want to, who can be expelled from it, no matter what their ideals or principles are; or is it a creed, a faith, a group of fundamental principles? Is it not repugnant to reason and to the teachings of political history that no matter what are his principles, his ideals, nay, his company, a man can always call himself a Liberal and be an adept exponent of Liberalism. I quite agree with the hon. Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder)—I was almost going to say the Minister of Unpreparedness—that no one has the authority to rule him out of the Liberal party. He has a perfect right to call himself a disciple of Liberalism as long as he wishes, but I submit that his assertion, in order not to

be in conflict with the truth, must be supported by his principles, by his ideals, and by his company. I refer, of course, to his political principles and ideals. Let us see whether his principles and ideals are those of Liberalism. What is Liberalism? I have read somewhere that Liberalism is, in essence, the problem of realizing liberty. It seeks the setting free of the mass of the people in regard to self-government, trade, religion, education, and industry in all the manifold ramifications of society. The opposite to Liberalism is restriction, and means the centralization of government in the governing classes, the setting of the brakes on social progress and liberty. The aim of Liberalism is the common good: the aim of those opposed to Liberalism is the individual good. Gladstone said that the principle of Liberalism is, "Trust in the people, qualified by prudence." The principle of Unionism is mistrust of the people, qualified by fear. Mr. Asquith has said that "Liberalism is a living faith, a spirit, an attitude of mind, a form of political temperament and genius, a temperament, which, whenever it sees a wrong, would redress it absolutely, and wherever it discerns a cause for grievance anywhere would pluck that cause out by the roots." In three words I will give you, Mr. Speaker, my own conception of Liberalism: Masses versus Classes.

Now that we know what Liberalism is, let us see if the hon. Minister of Immigration has lived up to Liberalism. As a minister in the Unionist Cabinet, he is responsible constitutionally for all the acts of the Government, and constitutionally again, if he wishes to relieve himself of this responsibility his only course is to resign. Not having done so,—and there are no signs that he intends doing so—I logically surmise that all the measures of the Government have his approval.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to put my questions. Is the voting against a measure abolishing titles in Canada included in the Liberal doctrine? Will my hon. friend pretend that the War-Time Elections Act, breaking faith with thousands of citizens and dragging the honour of Canada and its fair name in the mud, is a Liberal measure? Is it the opinion of the minister that the Military Voters' Act, especially in view of the purpose for which it was used in the last election, is imbued with pure Liberalism? Was not the campaign of racial and religious prejudice carried out by the Government to which the hon. gentleman sticks like a leech anything but Liberalism? Is the consolidation of the financial ring of Toronto, erstwhile denounced by my hon. friend, an action that he could call Liberal? Is the companionship of food profiteers and the benevolent paternalism of bacon earls fit for any one who still calls himself a Liberal? Are the instructions to the military officers to disregard the orders of the established courts in accordance with Liberal principles? Is the exemption of Victory bonds from taxation, which is nothing less than a camouflage enactment to protect those who have enriched themselves during the war from paying income tax, a Liberal measure? Can my hon. friend state, without wincing, that the censorship of the press and the gagging of independent opinion is pure Liberalism? Is not the censorship on publications, which goes so far as to make it a criminal offence for any one to have in his possession Plato's Republic, anything but Liberal? Is the wholesale buying of the press of this country for political purposes a Liberal measure? Is the incompetency and indifference to the welfare of the masses, as evidenced by the present high cost of living with no relief in sight, true Liberalism? Is my hon. friend aware that Liberalism stands for a just share by the working man in the profits of industry? Does my hon. friend believe that militarism in its most truly Prussian form can be regarded as an offspring of democracy? Will my hon. friend dare to contend that the forcible sending of men to Siberia without authorization of Parliament is in accordance with Liberal ideals? I should also like to know whether it was a Liberal sentiment which prevented representatives of the people from being called into counsel during the most momentous nine months in our history?

Does the flagrant abuse of the War Measures Act, passed at a very critical time, appeal to the Liberalism of my hon. friend? Is the Government of the people by Orders in Council, even when Parliament is sitting, considered by my hon. friend a Liberal measure? Did my hon. friend ever consider that the passing of Orders in Council, with retroactive effect, is in direct violation of the liberty of the citizen? Can the hon. minister contend that the operation of the War Measures Act, three months after the war is over, to liquidate a railway company, is up to Liberal standards?

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. JOSEPH ARCHAMBAULT (resuming): Mr. Speaker, before recess I was in the middle of an argument regarding the Liberalism of the hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization and that section of the Government who hold his views and still believe that they can logically call themselves Liberals, and remain on your right. I had, to the best of my ability, given to the House my opinion of Liberalism, and the definitions of such men as Gladstone and Asquith. I then proceeded to put certain questions to the minister, and I had a few left when six o'clock arrived. I now beg leave to proceed with them. Did my hon. friend ever consider that the passing of Orders in Council with retroactive effect is an entire violation of the liberty of the citizen? Can the minister contend that the use of the War Measures Act, three months after the war is over, to put a railway in liquidation is up to the Liberal standard? Is my hon. friend of the opinion that the handing on a plate of a parliamentary seat to a friend of the Government, distrusting at the same time the judicial authority of the Supreme Court of Canada, an action derived from the best examples of Liberalism? Does the minister believe that secret Orders in Council are not against Liberal doctrine? Well, Mr. Speaker, I have in my hand an extra of the Official Gazette of 7th February last, in which nine Orders in Council passed at different dates, one as far back as the 28th September, 1917, are published for the first time—seventeen months after they were passed. To prove my assertion I will cite pages 24 and 25 of the Canada Gazette of 7th February last. The introductory passage says:

> The nine following Orders in Council were first published in the Extra of the Canada Gazette dated the 7th February, 1919.

The first Order in Council is dated 28th September, 1917; the second, 4th October, 1917; the third, 24th December, 1917; and the next, 8th day of January, 1918. But, listen to this. The next one is dated Wednesday, 1st May, 1918. Government by Order in Council is bad. It is contrary to constitutional Government and must only be resorted to with prudence and in cases of extreme urgency. But government by secret Order in Council is surely the limit of autocracy. Yet, Mr. Speaker, it is not the limit to the Kaiserism and Czarism of the present Government. There is one of these Orders in Council passed 1st May, 1918, and published for the first time on 7th February, 1919, to which I especially wish to direct the attention of the House. It contains the following enactment:

> Any person who makes default in the performance of a duty imposed upon him by this paragraph shall be liable on summary conviction to imprisonment for three months with hard labour or to a fine of $100 or to both.

The fact that a man might be sent to prison for not obeying a regulation adopted in secret by the Government and never made known, even to the limited class that reads the Canada Gazette line upon line, shows to what lengths governments may go when allowed to be, as the present Government were, more or less, a law unto themselves. Surely the Liberalism of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization is the Liberalism of the Middle Ages when men were sent to dungeons by lettres de cachet at the will of the autocrat. His ultra Liberalism leads him to pass a law creating an offence punishable with imprisonment at hard labour and enabling him to jail a citizen for an offence that he could not possibly have committed. If my hon. friend has the ability, or the elasticity of political conscience to reconcile such measures with Liberal principles he will have well deserved the surname which was given to him of being "the Bob Rogers of the new Administration."

It is useless for me to take up any more of the time of this House in order to show that the company that my hon. friend is keeping is only, as my revered departed chief said last year, Toryism with a little veneer. However, I submit that the only way in which the Minister of Immigration and Colonization can make good his claim that he is still a Liberal is by answering the questions that I have put to him. If his answers satisfy the Liberal party, I will say no more, I shall be satisfied; but if the hon. gentleman's answers should not satisfy the Liberal party then how will he stand with the Unionist party at whose christening he is understood to be anxious to officiate? It is not for me to answer that question, but I have no doubt that his Unionist colleagues would like to hear from the hon. gentleman a full report about his visit to Quebec a short time ago, as to whom he met and what was discussed. Lastly, when the hon. gentleman has studied

all these questions, will he not say that he is trying to clothe himself in the livery of Heaven to serve the devil?

Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) made a statement last night against which I desire to register my most vigorous protest. After indulging in a remarkable eulogy of France he spoiled his tribute of respect by saying that last year France was ready to quit. Sir, France has never quit; France cannot quit; France cannot die because she is immortal. My hon. friend cannot point to one incident in the whole history of France in which she did not finish what she had started. She did not even quit in 1870, when she was left alone and defenceless to fight the Prussian invasion; and if last year France made some remonstrances it was because some public men amongst her Allies were not willing to adopt the only policy which enabled us to beat the Hun —unity of command. My hon. friend from Springfield also seems to be a very ardent supporter of the Government, and although he has painted a most vivid and pathetic picture of the battlefields of France—for which he has my entire endorsation—the cause of his admiration and devotion to this Government may not be strange to the treatment which he received over there. I wish my education in English would allow me to introduce into my description of the feasts he attended, the slangy expressions and phraseology with which he has decorated his address; but not having had the opportunity that the hon. gentleman had of associating with the distinguished people using these expressions, I am only going to give the House a report of one incident which happened while my hon. friend was attending one of the many banquets tendered to him while in England. I am quoting now from a British paper:

> R. L. Richardson, M.P., is extremely fond of grapes. He attended a Guildhall banquet recently as a member of that expedition of Canadian editors which has been irreverently termed "Beaverbrook's printers' picnic," and being seated immediately in front of a huge fruit-basket filled with the luscious hot-house product, he proceeded to gratify his cravings with the same nonchalance as if he were in Canada. Famished Englishmen who noted his fine work estimate that at the current price (about 7 cents a grape), the Editor of the Winnipeg Tribune put away some eleven dollars' worth.

Mr. Speaker, while listening to my hon. friend Tuesday night, and hearing him state that he never believed in the sincerity of the Liberal party regarding the tariff I could not but call to memory the Macdonald election, when the hon. gentleman told the electors of that constituency the unmistakable faith he had in the Liberal party on tariff matters—that was in 1912, was it not?—and his unequivocal belief in the insincerity of the Premier of Canada, and I could not do otherwise than recall the banquet where, like Noah of old, he showed a propensity for the product of the vine, and my natural conclusion was that the eleven dollars' worth of grapes which he introduced into his anatomy some months ago have fermented and produced the spirit of affection which he displayed for the Government on Tuesday night.

I am coming now, Mr. Speaker, to a much graver question. Of course the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) had to have his usual attack on Quebec, otherwise he would have been censured at the next meeting of his lodge, as the hon. member for Toronto was last year. But I submit, Sir, with all due respect to the brethren, that the hon. member for Frontenac was not particularly happy or convincing in his argument. The hon. member gave us some figures about the number of men who joined the Expeditionary Force from the different provinces, and although he has not indicated the source of his figures, or whether they are official or not, I have no doubt he acted in good faith when he gave them. But, even supposing, for the sake of argument, that the hon. gentleman's figures were correct, I cannot agree with his conclusion. As the basis of his argument to indicate the number of men who enlisted from different counties of the province of Quebec, he took the official return of the elections in 1917, showing how many soldiers voted in each constituency. He said, for instance, that in the constituency of the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) only fifteen soldiers polled votes and he concludes that only fifteen soldiers left that constituency. Sir, after the debate on the military votes last session no one can seriously contend that the return of such votes can constitute a sound basis to determine the number of soldiers who enlisted in each constituency in the Dominion. The votes of the soldiers were placed at will by the "democratic" agents of this "democratic" Government in the constituencies where they would be most useful. This, Sir, was proved beyond a doubt, and was even openly admitted at the judicial inquiry at St. Johns into the military vote, where soldiers and officers did not conceal

the fact that their purpose was to vote, not in the constituencies where they came from but in the constituencies where their votes would be most useful to the Union Government. The member for Kamouraska informs me that a great number of the military electors of his constituency were forced to poll their votes in the constituency of Cumberland, N.S. May I digress a moment to request the Government not to forget, when they carry out their housing scheme, to provide homes for the six hundred odd officers and men of the Engineer Training Depot at St. Johns who swore that they had no residence in Canada.

As to the other figures given by the member for Frontenac, although I believe in his good faith I am inclined to think that his elaborate calculation about the number of men who should have enlisted in proportion to the population is utterly unfair. Let me remind him and the House, Mr. Speaker, first, that the number of persons engaged in agriculture in Quebec is much larger in proportion to the population than it is in Ontario; second, that the male population under eighteen is about five times as numerous in Quebec in proportion to population as in Ontario or in the other English-speaking provinces; third, that the number of married men in Quebec between the ages of eighteen and thirty-five is about five times as great in proportion to population as in Ontario and in the other provinces; fourth, that the British-born in the English provinces are about twenty times more numerous than they are in the province of Quebec.

Another basic element in connection with this matter which, I believe, has not been discussed in the House, was brought to my attention by an article published in Toronto Saturday Night. I was surprised to read such an article, and before I communicate it to the House, in order that my sentiments shall not be distorted, I wish to state that I have the utmost admiration and respect for the men who went overseas and who made sacrifices in so doing. Nothing is too good for them and their dependents in this country, and the Government should provide with the utmost care and diligence for their welfare and civil re-establishment. Having made these preliminary remarks, let me read the article to which I refer:

> You have seen what a real hero looks like. Thank Heaven he is plentiful enough to be recognized! Now take a squint at the other sort. Here he comes down the street. Observe him closely, for he is a type, and in his own person sums up all the charges that can be made against the wrong kind of returned hero.

[Mr. Archambault.]

> Before the war he was one of our "unassimilated population." He worked in spots, and the spots were not many. He never liked work here or anywhere else, then or now. He never had a job that demanded more than a twelve-year-old boy's intelligence, but now that he has come back he wants a clerical job, "no manual labour" if you please, and a gentleman's salary. He has become one of the leisured class, and fancies no labour harder than lifting his envelope once a week, or once a month, or whatever the term of loafing may be. His idea is to live on the Government, which will make a job for him even when there is no job and he isn't fit for it anyway.
>
> The chances are that he is not a hero at all, that he never got farther than Shorncliffe, that he was an unfit or a bad 'un and was sent home for cause. But take him at his own value and give him the once-over. Cap on the back of his head, no shave, tunic unbuttoned, belt missing, trousers rumpled, shoes dirty—looks as if he had slept in the back-yard of a livery stable all night. He went to the war to get a "trip 'ome," and now that he is back without having seen anything of the war nearer than Folkestone, he brings a grouch with him.

Sir, this article gives me another reason why the figures of the member for Frontenac are not sound. It is this: In Quebec we have not the type described in Toronto Saturday Night. In Quebec, every French Canadian who left made a sacrifice. In Quebec, not a French Canadian left to make a "trip home;" his only home is Canada. In Quebec, every French Canadian who went overseas left behind him dear relatives, often feeble and poor. In Quebec, not one French Canadian who left could be classed as one of our "unassimilated population." I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, that the member for Frontenac has given this opportunity of finding why the enlistments in some provinces were large while in Quebec they were not. I repeat that I would not have discussed this matter again had not the member for Frontenac resorted to his bad habit of attacking Quebec every time he addresses this House. Let us hope that he has done so for the last time.

Sir, the union, harmony and fraternity between the two greatest races in the world, the French and the British, have been cemented forever on the battlefields of Europe, and I cannot find a more appropriate way of ending my remarks than by repeating the words which were uttered in this House by my revered and departed leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, during the Boer War. He said:

> Men representing both elements of the Canadian family have been fighting shoulder to shoulder for the same cause and under the same flag.
>
> Some of them have made the supreme sacrifice, their bodies rest in the same grave, in a

fraternal clasp, until the end of time; are we not allowed to hope, and this will be my last word, that in this grave will be buried forever the last remnants of our strifes and differences.

Mr. SAUL BONNELL (East Kootenay): Mr. Speaker, I desire to say a few words this evening, and while I have not trespassed upon the time of the House before, I shall make my remarks very brief, because this debate is drawing to a close, and I am sure the members and the public in general are not anxious to hear a rehash of all the arguments which have been put forward. At the outset, I wish to offer my congratulations to the mover and the seconder of the Address and to add my congratulations and approval to their efforts, which are especially pleasing to me because they are both men who have served their King and country overseas. It is a matter of special gratification to me because the seconder of the Address is a member of my own profession.

We, in Canada, I am sure, all rejoice in the grand and glorious termination of the war. We are proud of the part that Canada has taken and played in this titanic struggle. We are also proud of the imperishable fame which our Canadian boys have brought to Canada.

We are now face to face with the problem of getting some three or four hundred thousand men re-established in civil life. This is not an easy task, and the country has this and many other problems of great importance to deal with. Let us consider, for a moment, what this means. During the past four years, our whole machinery has been untilized towards the developing of a fighting programme. We are now bound to bring ourselves back once more to conditions of peace. The man who has been in the army for one, two, three or four years, has had some one to think and provide for him. He did not have to worry where his next meal or his next suit of clothes was coming from. Everything was provided for him, even medical attendance in case of sickness or accident. When he returns, he will be thrown on his own resources and will have to provide all these necessities for himself. In many cases he is not the same man as he was when he left our shores. He has many times gazed into the jaws of death, and it is not to be expected that he should be the same man mentally and physically as he was when he went away. I want right here to sound a warning to employers of labour on this man's behalf. Since coming back to Canada I have, in connection with medical boards, come in contact with these men appearing for medical examination with regard to pensions. I have, as a medical man, observed that these men are not the same mentally or physically as when they went away. I have watched them come back and get employment in Canada. I have watched them try one job after another, become dissatisfied with one job, throw it up and try something else. Many of them are not able to give one hundred per cent of service. All I ask for them is that the employer shall be a little patient with the returned soldier and in a short time he will be as good as he was when he left.

I am sure the Government is to be congratulated on the energetic manner in which they are dealing with these problems which are new and with which no country has had to deal with before. The huge programme of expenditure which the Government have in view will go far towards providing employment for all, and I was glad to hear the Acting Prime Minister state that in a few months there would be no unemployment in Canada. We must all recognize that we have a duty to perform in this matter, and we must not throw the burden of responsibility from one to another, or as the common phrase seems to be "pass the buck." The Government of this Dominion has a great duty to perform in providing employment for these men. The governments of the different provinces, the municipal authorities, and so on all down the line, must bear their share of the burden. During the past four years public expenditures have been reduced to a minimum. Public works have gone into disrepair. The time has now come when these public works must be put into a proper state of repair and proposed public buildings which have been left in abeyance must be erected. This will take care of a great deal of the excess of labour.

One thing in the speech from the Throne with which I am very much pleased is the statement that the Government have finally decided to constitute a department of public health. I consider this one of the most important pieces of legislation, if not the most important, to be introduced in this House at this session. We take great pride in conserving all our natural resources, but I consider the greatest asset or resource which we possess is our national life. This should be taken care of and fostered, and right at the outset I would say, not that a medical man should be in charge of this department, but that, to get the best results, a medical man must be in charge of this department. The duties of this department would, amongst other things, be to regulate immigration, to protect child labour, to deal with tuberculosis, venereal

diseases, contagious and infectious diseases, such as typhoid fever, etc. It seems to me —and I am sure it is a fact—that the country and the people in general do not appreciate the seriousness of the ravages of tuberculosis.

The statistics for 1916, which are the latest I have, show that in that year the deaths from tuberculosis were as follows: Ontario 2,559, or 92 out of every 100,000 people; Quebec 3,327 or 150 out of every 100,000; Saskatchewan 323, or 45 out of every 100,000; British Columbia 413, or 108 out of every 100,000; Nova Scotia 921, or 181 out of every 100,000; Manitoba 484, or 96 out of every 100,000. There probably is no disease which can be cured more readily than tuberculosis if treated in the early stages. During the latter stages, of course, the deaths are practically 100 per cent. When the disease is recognized by medical men in the early stages and the patient put under proper treatment, at least 90 per cent of these cases can be restored to health. This is a matter of vital importance to the people of Canada. In 1916, 8,027 deaths occurred in this Dominion from tuberculosis, and I am sure that if we had proper housing conditions and sanitaria conveniently situated throughout all the provinces where people attacked by the disease could receive proper treatment, the great majority of these people would be living to-day and be an asset to this country. But the trouble now is that we have not sufficient sanitaria to take care of these people, and sometimes the responsibility is shifted from one province to another. A doctor in the East, for instance, will recommend a patient suffering from tuberculosis to go to British Columbia because the climate there may do him good. The patient may arrive in British Columbia in the latter stages of the disease and if the authorities there have not hospital accommodation for that man they may say, "You do not belong to us but to Nova Scotia or New Brunswick; go back there." Now that condition of affairs is not right and I trust that when the Department of Public Health is established it will turn its attention first to this great problem of tuberculosis and inaugurate and encourage the building of sanitaria throughout this Dominion. The sanitaria should be built and supported by the Dominion because the responsibility for the lives of the people of this Dominion rests upon this Government.

I have looked into some of the Government's plans for settling our soldiers on the land, and although in a matter of this kind one is bound to proceed rather slowly I am pleased to see that splendid progress is being made. In the province of British Columbia we have in our valleys land as fertile as can be found in any other place in the world, and thousands of the soldiers who enlisted from that province will take up land and go on the farm. Many thousands also will be attracted from the other provinces by our climate. The province of British Columbia probably offers a brighter prospect for the farmer than any other province in Canada, because the farmer there has a market right at his door. In the year 1917, we imported into the province $20,000,000 of farm and dairy products, and it practically took every dollar of gold, silver, copper, lead and zinc which we mined to feed ourselves. So I am glad that the Government is holding out inducements to the men to go on the land, and I am sure those who settle in British Columbia will meet with every success. One difficulty in British Columbia is the cost of clearing the land, and I would suggest that the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment make provision for additional assistance to men taking up land in that province to help defray the cost of clearing.

I am sure we are all glad the war is over. The wives and the sisters and the mothers of our soldiers are thankful to have their men home once more. We are all proud of our soldiers for the immortal fame they have brought to this country. We trust that the Peace Conference now sitting in Paris will achieve the object for which the war was fought, which was to make it impossible for another war such as this to occur in the future. In 1860, Tennyson looking into the future spoke of aerial combat and the aeroplanes "raining down their ghastly dew," and went on to say that the battle flag would be furled in the Parliament of Man, the federation of the world. May Tennyson's prophecy come true, and may the Peace Conference be successful in its deliberations and bring about a condition where there shall be a Parliament for the World, to which all disputes can be taken and each case decided on its merits.

Mr. JEAN J. DENIS (Joliette): Mr. Speaker, if the incertitude and unexpectedness in the trend of human events were still to be proved, the history of the past year would serve to establish them. Less than twelve months ago, on the 18th day of March, the first session of the thirteenth Parliament opened. Shadows of doom and forebodings of evil were then prevailing in

our minds; for we lived in anticipation of the dreaded and boastfully heralded German attack on the Western front. Three days after the opening of the session—on March 21st—the attack was launched with an incredible fury such as the world had never before witnessed in warfare. In less than three days the Germans had destroyed the Fifth English Army and had advanced to a depth of more than thirty miles from their starting point. So great was our despair and our peril that, in the confusion of our minds, it seemed to us that the war was already lost. We all know what followed. We know of the prodigious efforts of the Hun, of the masterful strategy of the Allies, and of the ultimate crushing defeat of the enemy. The rapidity of these events, from impending defeat to complete victory, has been one of the happiest surprises of this war, so full of wonders.

The speech from the Throne refers to the successful conclusion of this greatest of all wars, and we are all happy to unite with the Government in devoutly thanking Providence for deliverance from so awful a peril. This session of Parliament, therefore, was summoned under the most favourable auspices. But suddenly, like a thunder bolt on a day of sunshine, a national calamity threw our country into mourning and deep sorrow. I refer to the death of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It had been announced that the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) and the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) would share the honour, on this side of the House, of paying a tribute to Canada's Grand Old Man. I hope I may be pardoned if I, too, following the example of hon. members on both sides of the House, take the liberty of adding my quota of admiration to the memory of Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I shall not speak of Sir Wilfrid Laurier as a nation-wide, or even as an empire-wide statesman. By so doing I might possibly do him injustice by exaltations which would not adequately

9 p.m.

describe his virtues. What has been spoken, written, and done throughout Canada since the hour of the death of the master, speaks for itself, and is sufficient to immortalize him. But in the name of the people of my race I wish to deposit one more crown of unwithering laurels upon his grave. Our national poet, Mr. Louis Frechette writing about the great compatriot, Louis Joseph Papineau, says:

Il fut toute une époque, et longtemps notre race
N'eût que sa voix pour glaive et son corps pour cuirasse.

When one ponders the sad event of the past few weeks, these words of the poet seem vividly to apply to our hero. Lover of liberty, defender of the oppressed, he always made himself the champion of the rights of the minority, and unfortunately it so happened that the minority which were so attacked were the people of his own race. The chant of the poet, eminently adapted to Sir Wilfrid Laurier under the present painful circumstances, will forever find its echo in the hearts of the men of his race.

The war is over. Reconstruction has begun; and racial and religious prejudices are vanishing. Generation will follow generation, and history will write the life of Laurier; and when in the years to come pilgrims from all over this country shall travel to the grave of this great man, our children and our children's children, remembering his noble work in the interests of his race, will repeat:

Il fut toute une époque, et longtemps notre race
N'eût que sa voix pour glaive et son corps pour cuirasse.

As to hon. members on this side of the House, his disciples, I can find no expression better capable of adequately and justly describing our affliction than this text from the Holy Book: "I will smite the shepherd and the sheep of the flock shall be scattered abroad." The shepherd, Mr. Speaker, has been smitten with an invisible hand, an inevitable hand, and the sheep of the flock, bewildered by the suddenness of the shock, have been scattered abroad with wailing and lamentation. But the flock have assembled anew. They have chosen a new leader, a new shepherd,—good, kind, and devoted—in whom they have placed their esteem and confidence.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to contribute to the numerous expressions of congratulation of which the mover and the seconder of the Address have already been the objects. Their quite apparent sincerity, together with the broadness of the views they have expressed, goes a long way, indeed, towards the bridging of the gap which now separates the two main racial elements in Canada. Let these hon. gentlemen and other hon. members of the House rest well assured that the gallant move which is now being made to unite and consolidate the divers elements in our dear country will not pass unheeded by the generous French-Canadian race, who are ready to go the full half way to meet their English compatriots and heartily shake hands with them. It was with no little pleasure that I listened the other night to the hon. mem-

ber for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) paying an admirable tribute to the French-Canadian people of Quebec. I am not able to quote the words of the hon. member verbatim, but I have them in my heart, and if I understood him aright, he spoke about as follows:

The people of the province of Quebec are good and generous; the people of the province of Quebec should be known better by other elements in this country; I am sure that if closer relations should exist between the people of Quebec and the people of the other provinces the sentiment which of late has not been what it should have been perhaps would be improved greatly not only to the benefit of the people of Quebec but of every other province and of the whole Dominion. Those were the words, or that was the sense of the words which were used the other night by the hon. member for Springfield. I want on this occasion to take the opportunity of offering my thanks to the hon. member and to all the other members of this House who think as he does and from what I can see there are a good many of such hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House. This country is too great, its possibilities are too immense that any of us should be allowed to divert its energies from the course which Providence has set before us or to destroy these energies in the furnace of racial and religious conflict. I believe that in so speaking I express the views not only of the members of this House but of the majority of the people of this country. However good and sincere our dispositions may be I am sorry to say there are still left in this country unrepentant sinners whom I cannot help but mention in relation to race and religious conflicts that greatly grieve me. I may be wrong in my judgment. Pehaps I am wrong as to this matter that I have reference to but I for one felt that I should not allow this article that I am going to mention now go unchallenged.

On the 20th of last month while our hearts were bleeding freely because of the death of the great man a Toronto newspaper whose principal aim appears to be to insult everything Catholic and French Canadian was addressed to me and apparently to all the members of this House. I am referring to the edition of the Orange Sentinel of February 20. What was the object of having that paper addressed to us in the hour of our deep sorrow if not the malicious intent of digging deeper the ditch which unfortunately separates the English from the French by exasperating the latter race. At a time when every citizen is turning his thoughts more and more towards the unity of Canada, this paper has made it its object to work in an opposite direction. Looking at the heading on the front page of this paper I read the following:

The tragedy of Quebec, and the great failure of French-Canada in the war.

What a great English newspaper says about conditions in Quebec where the people are held in bondage to the black robes.

The lengthy article which follows and which is presented as the expression of the Saturday Review is nothing short of a web of falsehoods and misrepresentations of the most libellous character. I am convinced that the article must have been contributed by some one on this side of the ocean who is a regular contributor to the Sentinel because I cannot believe that any one in England with even the most superficial knowledge of Quebec could ever have written so false an article.

Evidently "the black robes" of Quebec are the enemy and as a consequence the French Canadians are singled out to bear the wrath of those who speak through the Sentinel. I feel very sorry that the education of those people has been so neglected that they should not know of the work of "the black robes." Ever since Canada was discovered, are they not aware that it was "the black robes" who followed, step by step, the first colonists of this country? And that the second largest river in the world, the Mississippi, was discovered by one of those black robes, Father Marquette, together with Joliette? Are they not aware that these black robes were equal in every sense to the martyrs of the first ages of Christianity in sacrificing their lives, many of them dying under torture by Indians in order to implant in this country the ideals of Christianity and civilization? Are they not aware that during the rebellion of 1837 the black robes remained faithful to the English Crown, against the people of their own race and religion, notwithstanding the injustices of which, as history has since recognized, these people had been the object? To speak of more recent times, are they not aware that the black robes of Quebec, for many years, were the supporters of Sir John Macdonald, an English Protestant and an Orangeman? They followed him against one of their own faith and race. Who will say after this that the black robes of Quebec are bigots, that they are being led in politics by religious influences largely, or that these black robes are not rendering justice to every class and to every political party in this country? They have

supported Sir John Macdonald against Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I would not repeat an incident of that kind if it were not an historical fact. My friends should also be aware that, in turn, Sir John Macdonald always had the greatest consideration and respect for the black robes of Quebec. The apostles of the Sentinel should at least, if they are Tories, respect those whom Sir John Macdonald respected, lest they would pretend to be more loyal than Macdonald himself. If they are Liberals let them respect those whom Sir Wilfrid Laurier respected, lest they should appear to teach a lesson to Laurier. But I do not think these people should belong to either the Conservative or the Liberal party, because they appear to be unaware of the principles which have always guided the two great leaders whom I have mentioned. They are people belonging rather to a class of their own and I do not know how to qualify them better than by saying that they are, perhaps, more to be pitied than censured. Looking at the front page of this paper, I read:—

Our watchword: One School, one Flag, a united Canada.

I wish to draw the attention of the House to these three words and try and find out what they mean as they appear on the front page of this paper.

This motto, appearing in a paper of this kind, is certainly worth noting, as it constitutes one of the finest examples of contradiction and mockery which can be found. "One flag." Every one, I understand admits the desirability of this—even the black robes of Quebec, and it is a surprise to me that this loyal Ontario paper should have as a watchword a proposition which no one in Quebec would ever think of discussing for a second. Are we to believe that there are in Ontario, where the loyalty of the people is unquestioned, people whose faith in the flag is so staggering that it has become necessary for the Sentinel to read them a warning of this kind? " One school." If this means anything, it means that, according to the ideals of those people, there should be throughout Canada one class of schools only, and that is the English non-religious schools. Again I have to tell my friends: You are forgetting the most elementary principles of British institutions, otherwise you would be aware that in Canada, Egypt, South Africa, and every other country in the world which has been conquered by the British, they have made it a principle to leave to those whom they have conquered the free and unmolested use of their language, faith and institutions. Without these principles, the British Empire would never have become what it is to-day, and the devotion and love for the flag and the conqueror would never have been implanted in the hearts of the conquered. During my whole life, I have been taught to believe that I should be proud to live under the British flag because of the freedom and liberality of its institutions. Not only have I been taught to believe this, but I have believed it and I do believe it now. For generations my people have been taught to believe the same principles. Not only have they been taught to believe it, but they do believe it now. And yet to-day there is a newspaper published in loyal Ontario with a watchword calculated to destroy, with one stroke of the pen, what has been the immutable principles of British liberty and freedom for the last two hundred years, and which have contributed more than anything else to make the British Empire what it now is. And yet these people of the Sentinel proclaim themselves loyal subjects. They think themselves empire builders. Empire builders are they? No, they are empire destroyers, and it is fortunate that this class of people are not more numerous throughout the Empire, for they would do more to tear it asunder and destroy it than the Hun himself could ever have done.

A united Canada—this is the third proposition of the watchword. It is hardly necessary to say that this proposition is a fallacy and a mockery in the mouth of those for whom the Orange Sentinel speaks. While these people proclaim a united Canada, they are doing everything in their power to disrupt and antagonize the diverse elements which people this Dominion. I have never seen so illogical a proposition, and I can not explain it otherwise than by saying that the minds of these people have been obscured to such an extent as to deprive them of the happy faculty of common sense. If it be true that there are still in the province of Ontario people so narrow as to find delectation in the reading of absurdities such as those contained in this edition of the Sentinel, give these people their daily bread, but in the name of truth and common sense, strike out from the paper these words "A united Canada," and replace them with the words, "The disruption of Canada," for no one is contributing to a greater extent than they are in the nefarious work of disuniting and rending the component parts of Canada.

Sir, I think perhaps I have been led to discuss this last subject at too great length,

and I feel rather sorry that I have done so, convinced as I am that it is not worth while speaking so long and occupying the time of the House to such an extent, trying to answer propositions such as those we see in the Sentinel. I promise the House that I will never again enter upon a consideration of a subject of this character, because to insist any more upon the views which I have expressed would be to inflict upon hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House what I would call a grave injustice, because it would tend to make other people believe that perhaps large numbers of members in this House share the ideas which are taught in this paper the Sentinel, whereas I am fully convinced that the good thinking English people of Canada reprobate these articles just as much as we reprobate them ourselves.

Now, Sir, a very important question has been more or less discussed by the speakers who have taken part in this debate—I refer to the question of indemnity. In opening up this question I think we may be allowed to ask ourselves, "What shall Canada get from this war?" We have contributed five hundred thousand men—in fact the figures show that nearly six hundred thousand have been enrolled, either voluntarily or under the Military Service Act. We have spent for war purposes nearly two billion dollars. The war is over, we have triumphed, but I think it is reasonable for every Canadian citizen to ask himself, "What shall Canada get from it?" I can imagine my hon. friends on the other side quite ready to ask me: Are you so far behind the times that you are not yet aware of what Canada is getting out of this war? To my mind what we are getting is of a two-fold character. There is first the moral question, and this is the one to which my hon. friends opposite would refer if I had been interrupted on this point. The moral result. That is the good that Canada—in fact all civilized peoples and humanity at large—has derived from this war. If we examine this proposition, I would say to my hon. friends that Canada has benefited immensely from the war because it has helped to save civilization and democracy in this world. So that from that point of view we have won tremendously. But we have not a monopoly of the moral gain; it is shared by all the other Allied nations. We are, therefore, all on the same footing so far as moral gain is concerned; we are satisfied within ourselves that we have done our duty in helping the Allies to win the war.

[Mr. Denis.]

But there is another question that we should examine; it is that of material gain. We have spent large sums of money in carrying on our part in the war, and our debt now amounts to $2,000,000,000. If I understand rightly the speech delivered by the Minister of Public Works (Hon. F. B. Carvell) the Government does not at this juncture see its way clear to pay this debt, or even the interest on it. How are we to make up the $100,000,000 that we are short? Let me make a comparison. France has helped to save civilization; she is on the same footing as we are in that regard. But France will receive a material indemnity as a result of this war. France will gain the coveted provinces of Alsace and Lorraine and will obtain other territories, the particulars concerning which have not yet been adjusted. France will gain something of immense value in the way of future guarantees, and she will be able to maintain an army much smaller than heretofore and spend very much less upon armaments than she was spending before the war. Consequently, poor France, sorely tried as she has been, is getting material gain out of this war.

Now, let us take England. England has new possessions that she did not have before the war. She has Palestine; so far as we can judge, she can have the Dardanelles if she wants them; she can control Asia Minor. England has seen the removal of the German menace against her colonies. Egypt and India are no longer threatened; South Africa will no longer be bordered by German colonies. England has established the supremacy of her navy. England will obtain great advantage in the unparalleled development of her trade. Before the war Germany was the great competitor of England in trade and commerce; after the final conclusion of the war by the signing of peace Germany, as a competitor in this regard, will have disappeared.

I have heard people say that England went into this war for the gain that she expected to derive from it. Sir, I should be ashamed of myself if for one moment I supported a view of that kind. If England had gone into this war simply to obtain some material object and had spent hundreds of thousands of lives in accomplishing that object, she would no longer deserve the respect of the world. England did not enter the war for that reason. But, actuated as she was by a sense of justice, by her responsibilities in respect of treaties she had signed, and by her desire to protect Belgium, it is nevertheless true that England will derive immense material bene-

fit from the successful conclusion of the war. Italy also will have her gains; she will have her lost provinces on the Adriatic and other lands in the Balkans or in northern Africa.

That brings us to the inquiry: What is Canada getting out of this war in a material sense? Canada is not getting a dollar's worth of material benefit out of this war. Canada has sent her men and spent her money, but is getting no material recompense. Even if the indemnity to be paid by the Germans is sufficient to pay only a part of the debts that have been incurred, I submit that it would be reasonable for Canada to have a justly distributed proportion of that indemnity. I go further; even if the indemnity is sufficient to pay only 25 cents on each dollar of England's war debt, Canada should get more than that, because England is obtaining numerous material benefits out of the war while any indemnity paid to Canada would be the only material gain that would come to our country.

I read in the Montreal Gazette of March 8, the following despatch:

> London, Sat., March 8.—According to the Daily Mail's Paris correspondent, the powers have agreed to distribute the German warships among themselves, but the United States and Great Britain are in accord regarding the necessity for sinking their respective shares.

According to this despatch, the ships handed over by Germany will be divided among the Allied nations, but England and the United States are going to sink their shares. Certainly we have nothing to do with England or the United States sinking their shares. But it is admitted that Canada is not getting any material compensation in respect of her part in the war, and Canada needs ships. Canada needed ships in 1911; our party was defeated at that time partly on a programme of building warships. We shall need these ships after the war just as much as we needed them in 1911; the time is not far distant when this Government will be called upon to build a Canadian navy. If England sinks her share of the ships surrendered by Germany, it is quite possible that immediately after that is done Canada will begin to build battleships.

I cannot understand a policy of this kind. I can very well understand that, by reason of the competition between England and the United States, because neither wishes the navy of the other to be increased, the navies of neither of these two powers should be augmented and that the ships that are allotted to them should be destroyed. But instead of destroying the ships that are allotted to England, why should she not distribute them amongst her colonies? The United States would not be jealous of that. The United States would be jealous if England were to get too many ships and England would be jealous if the United States were to get too many, because rivalry will not end with this war. But what wrong would there be if the Dominions overseas, instead of having to build warships with their own money when their resources are exhausted, were to have distributed amongst them that part of the German navy which will be allotted to England? This is only a suggestion of mine, and I am making it for what it is worth, but at first sight, it appears reasonable to me.

Another question which has been very little dealt with in the course of this debate is that relating to defaulters. How many defaulters there actually are in this country, I do not know. Perhaps there are twenty thousand, perhaps thirty thousand, perhaps forty thousand. I have no idea as to the number, and I am sure the Government does not know what the number is. But we are sure of one thing, namely, that these defaulters do not all belong to the province of Quebec. In every province of the Dominion there are thousands of defaulters. What is the Government going to do with those people? We have a debt of $2,000,000,000. We have taxes to meet. We have the question of reconstruction facing us. We need men to cultivate the farms and to develop the industries of this country. We need help from all around. Now that the war is over, now that every one in this country is eager to work in order to unite Canada and make it a great and prosperous country, are we going to take these defaulters by the thousand and send them to jail? It is about time that the Government should let its policy on this point be known, not that I am so eager to hear it, but in order that we may know what we have to do. Not any later than the day before yesterday I was called upon to advise one of these defaulters who has been arrested and brought to Montreal. I quite understand that every man who is an outlaw is liable to be arrested and brought before a court of justice or a military tribunal and tried for his offence. But what is going on throughout Canada? Until recently, we have seen defaulters being punished with fines ranging from $5 upwards, or terms of imprisonment up to a maximum of ten years. The

Government has recently passed an Order in Council fixing the amount of the fine, if I am not mistaken, between $250 and $5,000. But this does not settle the question. The Government should take the matter in hand at once and should adopt a policy in regard to these people. And I feel confident that when the Government adopts a policy, it will be a liberal policy towards these people. We all know that at all times during all wars there have been defaulters. Such men are what we term political criminals; they do not belong to the ordinary class of criminals. Now, that the war is over, what is the object in going after these people? What is the use of the Government paying officers to go through the cities, towns and villages of this country in order to arrest these defaulters, bring them before a judge and have them tried? Such a course is simply spending unnecessarily the public money. The Government need money too much to keep in their service hundreds and hundreds of detectives for this work. I do not think I should pass over this subject without quoting what I would call a reliable authority on the matter. Everybody in this House knows the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) well, and I think every one will agree with me that the hon. member has no feeling of kindness towards defaulters. This is what the hon. member said not any later than March 6:

I will tell you why I object to placing these men behind prison bars. They have been guilty of a breach of the Military Service Act. You take a man and place him in prison or in the penitentiary. Apart from the fact that he has not responded, as he should have responded, to the service of his country, he has shown no criminal instincts whatever. Is it a wise thing to take a man who has given no evidence of criminal instincts and put him in prison along with men steeped in crime? Is that wise from the national standpoint? What chance has that man to come out after two, or five years' incarceration alongside of the worst criminals the country may have produced and play the part of a man? For that reason, and not because I think they should be exempt from punishment, I believe it is a mistake to place these men behind prison bars in our penitentiaries and jails.

I always thought that the hon. member was very far advanced in his ideas in regard to punishment for military offenders. Consequently, I wish to ask the Government to follow the good advice given to them by one of their followers.

It is no more right to fine the defaulter than to put him in prison. The fine now ranges from $250 to $5,000. For the rich man the fine means nothing. The rich man can go before a judge, be fined $250, $500, $1,000,—it does not matter what amount—and he will pay the fine. But what are you going to do with the poor man? He will not be able to pay the fine and will, therefore, have to go to jail. Consequently, if this question is to be settled by imposing a fine, the rich man will escape and the poor man will go to jail.

Can we afford at this juncture to put thousands and thousands of men in jail? For no one will deny that if the defaulters are to pay a fine of $250, half of them or perhaps one-third—I do not know just how many, but at all events, a large proportion of them—will not be able to pay the fine and will have to go to jail. I say that it would be unjust to send to jail the man who cannot pay and let go scot free the man who is able to pay the fine. It would be equivalent to allowing a man to purchase his release from military service. We all know that it has been proved that some have purchased their release from military service. But the war is over now, and the Act is no longer in force, and if the Government persists in this policy it will fall very heavily on the poor man who is not a whit more guilty than the rich man. The poor man may have had to stay at home to support his parents and dependents, while in many cases there was nothing to prevent the rich man fighting for his country. I humbly request the Government to suspend these prosecutions, at least for the time being, until they have formulated a definite policy with regard to defaulters, because the question the Government have to decide is extremely important as it will affect between twenty and forty thousand people in this country.

I listened with keen interest the other day to the excellent speech of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). He is a veteran of this House and a man of recognized high culture, and while I would not have the temerity to engage in combat with him, I find it hard to avoid attempting to answer certain statements in his speech. The hon. member spoke as follows:

On the question of tariff, in my humble judgment—and I have tried to inform myself—those who represent what was formerly the Liberal party occupy a less advanced position than did the whole Liberal party of a quarter of a century ago, so far as their political policy has been stated up to the present time.

Mr. Speaker, to say that I differ in opinion with my hon. friend would be but a weak answer, but the statement that my

hon. friend here expressed, an opinion quite different from his action of less than two years ago is worthy of the attention of this House. I will try to make good my statement and prove that the hon. member spoke in contradiction of his action of less than two years ago, not on the question of conscription, but on this very question of the tariff. On the 29th of May, 1917, when my hon. friend, then a Liberal, and still a Liberal according to his own profession of faith, was sitting on this side of the House, on the motion of Sir Thomas White that the House go into Committee of Supply, Hon. Frank Oliver moved in amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:

"In the opinion of this House it would be in the public interest if the Customs Tariff Act were so amended as to provide:

1. That wheat, wheat flour, and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list.

2. That farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery, and repairs for same, rough and partly dressed lumber, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers be added to the free list.

3. That staple foods and food products (other than wheat flour), domestic animals and foods therefor, be admitted into Canada free of duty when coming from and being the product of, any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty.

4. That substantial reductions be made in the general tariff on all articles imported into Canada, excepting luxuries.

5. That the British Preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff.

After discussion a vote was taken on this amendment, the details of which appear on page 1790 of revised Hansard. Among the yeas I find: Bourassa, Buchanan, Clark (Red Deer). So my hon. friend voted for the amendment, and the vote, so far as I can judge, was a straight party vote. Sir Robert Borden, Sir Thomas White, Sir George Foster and Messrs. Cochrane, Doherty, Meighen, Reid, and so forth, voting against the amendment. Those of the Liberal party who were then present voted for the amendment and the Conservative party voted against it. The amendment was negatived. Therefore, after having given his support to the fiscal policy of this party less than two years ago, how can my hon. friend get up to-day and declare that the Liberal party occupies a less advanced position than it did twenty-five years ago? If it be true that the Liberal party in the course of the last twenty-five years has followed a retrograde movement, why has the hon. member followed this party all his life save for the last eighteen months or so? To say that the Liberal party has retrograded is equivalent to the hon. member's admitting that he himself has followed a retrograde movement. But on the merits of the case is it accurate to say that the Liberal party has not retrograded—not for one minute. To prove my assertion I need only say this: If the amendment of 1917 which I have just quoted was moved again this year and a vote taken on it, who would vote for and who against it? I think I am safe in saying that the hon. members on this side of the House would vote for the amendment and the hon. members opposite against it; at least, the majority of them would. How would the hon. member for Red Deer vote? I am sure he would have to leave behind his friends of to-day and vote for the amendment. Otherwise, he would come in conflict with his own principles in the most flagrant way. I could not for one moment entertain the idea that the hon. member should have changed his principles in regard to the fiscal question in less than two years; and I am quite sure that he would still support the amendment if it were put to the vote; otherwise he would be voting against himself and against the principles he professed less than two years ago. If the hon. member voted for the amendment, then he would be giving a vote of confidence to the party which sits on this side of the House, and against the party on the opposite side. The Liberal party has not followed a movement of retrogression, as is suggested. I may have been mistaken when I understood the hon. member to say that the Liberal party was not what it was twenty-five years ago. I cannot understand how the hon. member could support the fiscal policy of the Liberal party less than two years ago, and to-day say that this party is following a retrograde movement, notwithstanding the fact that its policy is precisely the same as it was at that time.

Now, Sir, with great literary taste and a fine sense of humour, in my opinion, the leader of the Opposition concluded his address with the parable of the light in the window; and since then a dozen speakers on the other side have devoted their talents to the discussion of the allegory which it contains. I was really surprised at this, for it never appeared to me that my leader, by placing his little light in the window, was offering any kind of provocation comparable to the challenge of the toreador waving his red flag. Nevertheless the hon. member for Red Deer has made an effort to

extinguish the light in the window. For what purpose I do not know. I can see no reason why so much labour has been expanded on the other side of the House to put out this light, so inoffensive, and so flickering in the opinion of my hon. friend, if it is not their fear that that light may possibly be harmful in the way of dissolving some of the heterogeneous elements which compose the governmental majority. Why this exaggerated fear on the part of my friends? Is the Government which they support so vulnerable, that a wee
10 p.m. light in the window should be capable of perturbing it? Our friends are giving us every reason to answer the question in the affirmative. Of course, the light is not the only frightful device. The latch string is another. Is the latch string dangerous? I do not think so. What is a little latch string in comparison with the formidable lasso which the hon. the Prime Minister made use of in the formation of his Union Government?

The attitude taken by the hon. member for Red Deer leads one to believe that the sect of the Pharisees is by no means extinct. Like the biblical personage, my hon. friend sits in a conspicuous place in the temple and tenders his thanks to God that he is not like the publican sinner, my leader. We need not be surprised, after this, to hear my hon. friend speak of a little shack, as he called it, as representing the home of the light. If the ideals in the materialistic mind of the hon. member do not rise higher than the roof of a shack, no one but himself should be held accountable for the deficiency. To me, the light in the window has a very different significance. I look figuratively to it as to a grain of mustard seed, "which a man took and sowed in a field; which indeed is the least of all seeds, but when it is grown it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof."

The light in the window, small but steadfast, is the symbol of those small heavenly stars which serve faithfully to guide the mariner to his port; while the light which my hon. friend and his associates followed when they crossed over to the other side, may justly be compared to the dazzling and treacherous fires lighted by the vengeance and craft of the Trojans to entice upon the reefs the vessels of the Greeks returning from the siege of Troy.

[Mr. Denis.]

Mr. RICHARD COE HENDERS (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, in rising to address the House I do so with considerable diffidence, and were it not for the fact that I occupy a somewhat unique position, largely representing the agricultural interests of the country, I should have refrained from addressing myself to this question during this debate. I cannot but realize the wonderful difference there is between the meeting of the House at this time and that which took place twelve months ago. At that time the nations of the world were in the throes of the mighty conflict which has just closed. We in Canada were greatly interested in the issues involved in that conflict, and we scanned the papers for news from across the sea with intensest interest, wondering what would be the issue of the next hour. Things have changed wonderfully since that time. The forces that were struggling for liberty and righteousness, justice and democracy as we see it, though they felt the strain of the conflict at that time to be intense, yet their arm was sufficiently strong and their courage sufficiently great to carry them through to victory. Democracy was saved, freedom was secured, and the small nations of the earth were accorded the satisfaction of knowing that they would be free to work out their own destiny in their own way. The war is over. An important conference is dealing with the aftermath of the struggle and preparing for conditions which, we hope and pray, will usher in a peace that shall fill the earth. We hope that the Peace Conference will be wisely guided and that its decisions will mean the end of all wars.

Coming to the issues that affect us in connection with the circumstances bringing us together in this session of the House, I may be permitted to express my views with regard to one or two things. We were impressed by the magnitude of the problem which the war presented and the energy which the people of this country put into the struggle in order that victory might be achieved. But, Mr. Speaker, while the war is over, while the fighting is done, while we hope the last drop of blood has been spilt, the problems of the war are not settled. The gathering up of the results of the war has yet to be attended to. That which is necessary to secure, out of the war, conditions which will bring peace to the peoples of the world has yet to be attended to. The responsibility resting upon the Government while the war was on in connection with marshalling our forces and despatching them overseas was very great but yet I claim that the problems confronting this

Government to-day are more intricate and difficult of solution than those which already have been solved. I have an anxiety that the men who are at the head of affairs in this country shall be wisely guided and that their hands may be strengthened in every possible way in order that we may get safely through the aftermath of the war.

This brings me to make another statement. The people of Canada elected this Government as a war Government to deal with the war. I believe that I rightly interpret the mind of the people when I say that dealing with the war means dealing with all the issues of the war until normal conditions obtain. Therefore, the obligations assumed by this Government continue until reconstruction is attained and the repatriation of our men has taken place. If the people by the pronouncement they made a year ago last December declared that the Government should assume the responsibility of carrying the war through to its conclusion I claim that they demand of the Government that they stay with their job until their task is completed.

With regard to the administration I feel fairly satisfied with the conduct of the affairs of the country by the Government during the year that has passed. I do not mean that the Government has not made mistakes. A government that is traversing new ground, dealing with new issues and new problems and which has not history to fall back upon, unless it is too fearful to amount to anything, is sure to make some mistakes. A government that is progressive and courageous, and that is seeking to grapple with important questions, will push forward, will carry the issues through and it is just possible that some mistakes will occur in connection with its work. But, it is better to make mistakes of a minor character and go through, than it is to fall down in the great and important work which has been undertaken.

Some criticism has been made in regard to the War Measures Act. I would like to express an opinion in regard to that Act. Like some hon. members of the Opposition, and I have no doubt this is the opinion of members on this side of the House as well, I will say that we do not require, and would not tolerate, a War Measures Act except under peculiar and very special circumstances. Some of us believe that the circumstances were such as to demand that an extraordinary measure should be made use of and the War Measures Act, we believe, was made use of as an extraordinary measure to meet the exigencies of the case.

Why was it made use of? We had been operating under certain regulations in gathering up the men who were to arm themselves and go overseas to fight our battles. We remember very well that in connection with the Militia Act the great majority of the boys responded heartily and readily to the call. But there came a time when more men were needed and the call became more urgent. There was not that hearty response there ought to have been; at least some felt that that was the case. To overcome the difficulty that confronted us at that time other methods had to be resorted to and the introduction of those methods brought serious opposition. When these methods were made use of, people who were not so very free in coming forward under the old Militia Act became very active in propagating the idea that the old Militia Act was all that we needed.

However, the men were not forthcoming, and because of that conscription was brought into force. We come a little further down, and it came to the matter of putting into operation this new Act. The people were looking about for a government that would give effect to the law, and we find the same difficulty confronted the people. Those who said in the first place that the Military Service was good enough, but were not attempting to apply it and to use it to the best advantage, were utterly opposed to the new Act when it came into force. Therefore when the people were seeking for a government who would enforce that law, and an appeal was made to the country, the Union Government was brought into existence. That Government took hold of the enforcement of the Act, and succeeded in obtaining the men that were needed. At all events the army was brought up to the strength which the Premier of this country had pledged, and it was maintained at that strength. The material essential for the equipment of the army was also maintained in the requisite quantity. Canada was carried safely through the war, and the Government has fulfilled its pledges to the people in that connection. The people are now looking for the carrying out of what I may call the aftermath of the war, and it seems to me we may reasonably expect that the Administration which carried the country safely through the war will have the public confidence in dealing with these other questions. The Government succeeded in getting our troops together, and in training and equipping them and transporting them Overseas. Now that the war has been won,

the people expect that the same Government will be able to take care of our troops, bring them back again, and reinstate them in civil life; and the Government will not have discharged its full duty until it has accomplished that work.

One of the speakers this afternoon enunciated his conception of the principles of Liberalism. I did not catch all his definitions, but I would like to make reference to one or two of them. I heard the hon. gentleman in question make use of the term "Freedom" as a term that would express what Liberalism means. He propounded certain questions to the minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) and asked how he would square his line of action with the great principles he enunciated. The inference was that the adherence to those principles was entirely on the Opposition side of the House, and that an hon. member seated on this side could not claim those principles in any way. While this hon. gentleman was making his argument I could not but think of some of the men in the past who had advocated the principles that the hon. member referred to, and how they stood up for them. I could not help but think of the men who sacrificed life and all they held dear in defence of these very principles. Then my mind reverted to some of the utterances made by certain hon. gentlemen sitting to your left, Mr. Speaker, when the cry came from our gallant boys at the Front, who were fighting for freedom and liberty, to send them assistance. The question was then plaintively asked by some of these hon. gentlemen: "Has not Canada done her share?" The suggestion was that we should let the rest of our boys stay at home until some other people had sent forward a quota equal to our own. There were our lads overseas, sending back messages to us, and asking: "What are you doing that reinforcements are not coming?—you placed us in this struggle, and you are not behind us." And yet in Canada the declaration was being made, "Canada has done her share, let other people do theirs." Were the people who talked in that way the defenders of freedom? Mr. Speaker, I think that any man possessing a spark of love for freedom, could not have given expression to such sentiments. It was because the Government wanted to stand shoulder to shoulder behind the boys overseas that they took the step they did at that time. Moreover, it is because they wish to see the war problems satisfactorily settled, provision for our war indebtedness made, and our boys safely brought back and taken care of that the supporters of this Government stand shoulder to shoulder to-day. And they intend to do so, no matter what is said about "a light in the window" on the Opposition side. Mr. Speaker, those who legislate in the interests of the Dominion in the future will be men who have quit talking about Gritism and Toryism, and all that sort of thing, playing with party politics, men who stand for the principles of democracy.

Coming now to deal with some of the matters referred to in the speech from the Throne, I wish first to make a few observations with regard to the creation of the proposed Department of Public Health. I would rather that the wider appellation had been used of "public welfare," because it would express more fully, I think, what is in the minds of the people.

I hope that in the carrying out of that idea this wider meaning will be kept in mind, and that all matters pertaining to the welfare of the people will be taken care of in that way. Canada is big enough to realize that her greatest asset is the country's manhood, and that she will be strong only in so far as she preserves that manhood in the highest state of efficiency. I have no doubt that when this matter comes up for consideration such conclusions will be reached and such arrangements made as will meet the case and produce satisfactory results.

I wish to express my appreciation of the statement in the speech from the Throne that the Order in Council referring to the liquor question is to be taken care of and that legislation is to be put into effect that will hold conditions as they are until the boys are safely returned. And when they are safely returned I know that there is democracy enough in this House to cause us to say: We will face the issue, we will submit this matter to all the voters who will then decide what Canada's future policy shall be.

Representing as I do a rural constituency, I wish to direct the attention of the Government to the Daylight Saving Act. Someone has said that "God's time is good enough for me." I believe that the vast majority of the people of Canada are of that opinion. The Daylight Saving Bill has served its time; it has ended its pilgrimage upon which it was started by this Parliament a year ago, and has been quietly buried; let us hope that there will be no resurrection. As far as I understand it,

the people, particularly those in the rural districts, are utterly opposed to it and do not want any more of it. I think that until there is a very strong demand for it, the Government would be well advised to leave it quietly alone.

With regard to Reconstruction, the Government has a very important task to perform. I hope that when this Parliament's work is completed, arrangements will have been made to distribute the economic burdens of the country as equitably as possible upon the shoulders of the people. Previous to the war there was a good deal of talk about the burden of taxation imposed for carrying on the business of the country. If it was an important matter to provide the money necessary in pre-war days to take care of the interest on our national debt and provide for the carrying on of the Government surely, having regard to the responsibility that rests upon us to-day, it will require the united effort and the best thought of this Parliament to devise proper means for our carrying the burden that will fall upon us in those coming days. I am not a pessimist by any means; I believe that with the natural resources which Canada possesses and with the energy and industry of our people devoted to this task, if our forces are united and the burdens of the people are equitably distributed, we shall overcome our difficulties and come out into a successful future.

This is an opportune time for the Government to consider matters that will have to be dealt with in the later sittings of the House and for members from the different constituencies to voice the views of the people on important issues in order that they may receive consideration before the Budget is brought down. So I wish to direct attention to a question that affects very vitally the great interest of agriculture. I refer to the trade policy that is to be inaugurated in connection with the carrying of our indebtedness and the meeting of our expenditures.

The people in rural life believe that the economic burdens of this country have not been equitably distributed. They believe that in connection with a certain economic policy that was introduced in Canada, privileges were obtained and certain classes of the community were able to take advantage of the position in which they were placed by these privileges and to escape the full share of their economic responsibilities and duties.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. HENDERS: I hear some member on the other side of the House say "hear, hear." I wish to call attention to the fact that when these burdens were imposed upon and were being borne by the people, that same kind of cry was heard from the Opposition for a good many years. Hon. gentlemen characterized these burdens in very unmistakable terms, such as "legalized robbery," and so on.

I quite agree with the terms that were then made use of, but before hon. members opposite say "hear, hear," too loudly, I want them to remember this, that the people who made very strong use of these terms in the past and who declared their intentions as to what they would do, should they come into a position where they would have to deal with these conditions, were not so loud in their decrying of these principles after they came into power as they had been before. We have not very much to hope for or to expect if we are to be governed by the teaching of either of the old parties when we come to deal with this question. I am looking to the Union Government—

Mr. DUFF: You have great faith.

Mr. HENDERS: I am looking to the men who are not tied to any of the traditions or records of the past, because those records contain nothing flattering—I am looking to the men of the Union Government, having completed the duties and responsibilities before them, regarding the war, to undertake the responsibility of framing a fiscal policy that shall be to the advantage of the people of Canada, and after they have formulated that policy, in due time to appeal to the people of this country for their endorsation. I make this statement to them to-day, that as soon as they formulate that policy—and it must be this session—then some of us who hold strong views on this question, will declare where we are going to stand with regard to it. From what the Government has done since they came into power, I believe that we can safely look to them to open a way into the future and to give us a policy that will be in the interest of the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. JOHN EWEN SINCLAIR (Queens, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I wish, at the outset of my remarks, to join with the members of this House who have preceded me in extending my felicitations to the mover and the seconder of the Address for the manner in which they have acquitted themselves. I also wish to join with the other members of this House, and especially do I wish to do so on behalf of my constituents,

in saying a word of tribute to the memory of the late departed leader of the Opposition, Sir Wilfrid Laurier. It may truly be said of this world-renowned statesman that by his passing a vacancy is left in the political life of Canada that cannot easily be filled. It may also be said that in his passing a life has closed that was full to overflowing of all the elements that go to make for a true democracy, a life so refulgent in its beauty and brightness that it will cast a radiant light down the future ages of this country that will lead the way and enable future leaders to attain to a higher standard in democratic ideals than they could ever have expected to attain had Sir Wilfrid Laurier never lived.

I do not intend to follow closely the argument of the hon. member (Mr. Henders). As regards his reference to the controversies that have come between the two parties in the last two years, I will just refer to them in this way—and perhaps it may be interjecting a little of a personal reflection, but I feel it is my duty to do so. When I was elected to this Parliament a little more than a year ago, I took this ground; I knew my electorate, and my electorate knew me; and the policy on which I stood was a straight and staunch supporter of the principles of Liberalism as known, announced and worked out under the leadership of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. The members of this House all know the disturbed state of mind among the electorate on that occasion, being in the midst of the great war and with all the questions which were put to them. My stand on that occasion was that I reserved from all bias of party affiliation my free right as a citizen of this country to vote for any measure, from whatever source it might emanate, that might, in my judgment, assist in bringing the war to a speedy and successful conclusion. I can say to this House to-night that I maintained my stand to the highest point and never on any occasion was it necessary for me to deviate from the leadership of the late Rt. Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. In the short time that has passed since our late lamented leader has departed, I firmly believe, from the records so far of his worthy successor, that I can maintain the high commission given to me by my electorate and, at the same time, be a loyal supporter of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) who now heads the Opposition.

Coming more directly to the matter contained in the speech from the Throne, I wish to express my approval of, and to concur in, that part of the Speech which tenders the gratitude of the nation to the gallant members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force for the suffering they underwent and for the endurance they exhibited in fighting the battles of liberty and freedom across the seas. I wish also to express my feelings of sympathy and condolence for the sisters and brothers, the wives and sweethearts, and especially the parents, of those brave boys and nurses who made the supreme sacrifice, laying down their lives on the fields of France and Flanders that liberty and civilization might be vindicated and truth and justice prevail.

Reference is also made in the speech from the Throne—and perhaps I am now entering upon matters that will be of more contention during this session of Parliament—to the intention of the Government to grant from the Dominion Treasury substantial aid to the different provinces to aid in the building of permanent highways. It is well known that this question has been discussed at great length in former Parliaments, and I wish to say that, so far as it indicates the intention of the Government to render assistance from the Federal Treasury to the various provinces, that intention will meet with my hearty approval. But from the information contained in the Notice of Motion, I feel that the method employed in granting that assistance to the provinces is not being wisely considered. We have been told time and again that the control of public roads is vested in the provincial governments, and what strikes me most forcibly in the Government's proposed legislation is the fact that the Federal Government will be interfering with and overlapping the work of the provincial governments. This overlapping or dual authority is causing a great deal of waste of money and energy in the different departments of the Government to-day and has been doing so for many years, in some cases even since Confederation.

The speech from the Throne foreshadows a proposal to establish a Department of Public Health in Canada. To illustrate my point I shall make reference to other departments of the public service at the present time. I mention the Department of Agriculture, not because I wish to criticise that department any more than any other department of this Government, but simply to show how the duplication and overlapping of work leads to waste of public money, and to raise my voice in protest against further departments of Government being organized on the same principle. It is a condition that has prevailed in the Department of Agriculture for a very long time, and was probably brought about by

a lack of foresight on the part of the Fathers of Confederation. Under this Department of Agriculture we have a condition of affairs which is not wholesome or conducive to getting the best results for the money expended. We have the Federal Department of Agriculture directing its energies to the marketing end of agriculture, while nine provincial departments are taking care of production. This may seem to the casual observer to be a fair distribution of labour, but in practice it is working out in a very different way. To attain a uniform standard of excellence for Canadian produce from the Atlantic to the Pacific requires a productive organization with a single purpose, with unity of action, and kindred ideals everywhere. It must be truly Canadian, and in all its departments it must have co-operation, co-ordination, and unanimity. It must have one head, and its activities in Canada must be directed from a common centre and towards a common end. In every province we have an agricultural policy that differs essentially from the policy of any one of the other eight provinces. Examples of overlapping of work, discord among officials, and clashing of policies may be found everywhere. It would seem that the haphazard hit-or-miss propaganda of the provincial departments depends largely on the initiative of a few individuals in provincial affairs. Provincial policies thought out by men trained to think in terms of a province are somewhat narrow and wholly provincial. This must be so, because they are working to a provincial end. It will be said that precisely at this point the Dominion Department of Agriculture comes into operation and takes up the work where it is laid down by the provinces. This is what was intended, but the intention is far from being realized. Our Dominion department is failing in the duty it owes to the Canadian nation. Here we have the organization that should have scope and vision and power to achieve. We have also the men unhampered by provincial atmosphere and restriction, who ought to be able to stand out and give direction to the affairs of the country in a manner befitting the trustees of the nation. They should be able to co-ordinate the work done in the several provinces into a complete Canadian system. But upon analysis we find that the power which logically and rightfully belongs to these men and their organization has been vested in the representatives of the provinces. This leaves the Dominion department to a certain degree powerless. It simply marks time and haggles away at the edge of things while provincial organizations without either the knowledge, the incentive, or the ideal, work along in a vain attempt to frame the policy of the country. It works out wrongly. It is like trying to dress a man in a boy's suit. Whole battalions of officials are struggling to get Canada into a suit of clothes cut to fit Ontario, Quebec or one of the other provinces. The Dominion officials follow up, taking what is left for them to do, and very kindly see that nothing is left out or forgotten by the provincial brotherhood, while down in the country the public is asking questions that no one can answer.

This, then, is the kind of production policy that is in existence. It is upon such a superstructure that a system of selling associations is to be built that will emancipate the farming community from the dilemma of markets, and guarantee to both producer and consumer an efficient business system and equitable prices in the distribution and sale of the country's foodstuffs. This is a short description of the method employed to encourage agricultural production in our national agricultural policy, and I have given it simply to show the waste of money that such a policy entails.

The war has drawn public attention to the waste in production and marketing. The demand for food controllers has shown that when the nation is under stress, waste and profiteering are intolerable. As a sound economic principle, it may be stated that any public service that can be carried on by the people in the public interest should not be handled by private enterprise for private profit. In the past, deplorable waste has taken place and the business of marketing has been carried on for private profit. The Markets Branch has undertaken to assist agricultural development by organizing the sale of farm produce on the co-operative plan as a means of eliminating these two evils. Until the system of co-operative selling organizations is complete, every production organization in the country will remain handicapped. Marketing is the final process of the farm, and is purely and essentially the farmer's business. This being so, the ultimate success of the whole agricultural machine depends on the Markets Division. The Markets Division in turn depends for its very existence on the disjointed efforts of a producing organization having nine different heads throughout the Dominion. Each of the nine organizations works independently of the others, and all work without a common ideal or a national viewpoint. This,

Sir, is the condition existing to-day in the agricultural policy of Canada, and when the Government proposes to introduce legislation creating new departments, such as the Department of Public Health, it is but proper and right to expect that this House should be informed as to what has been done to co-ordinate with those new departments, the different policies of public health that exist to-day in the various provinces of the Dominion. I gather, Sir, from a perusal of the speech of the leader of the Opposition that our constitution is not clear as to whether the authority in matters of public health is vested in the provincial governments or in the Federal Government, and with this condition of doubtful authority existing I think that it is the duty of the Government, before creating such a department as is suggested, to come to a common understanding with the provinces, and adopt one authority under which matters of public health shall be administered, in order to obviate the useless expenditure of public money in the overlapping of the work of officials, and to establish a condition by which the usefulness of the Department of Public Health will not be forever handicapped.

When we come to this point we naturally ask ourselves the question: Did the Government consider this matter at the meeting of the provincial premiers and their associates in conference with the Cabinet during recess, and, if so, what decision was arrived at? Before the proposed legislation to create a Department of Public Health is introduced, I think we are entitled to a report of the discussion and the conclusions that were arrived at in that conference, in order to enable us intelligently to consider such legislation. If an agreement has been arrived at with the provinces, each of which has a department of public health of its own, we should be informed of it. But if there is no such agreement, and the authority is not vested in the Dominion Government, then, Sir, I claim that it is the duty of the Government to defer such legislation until such time as the common authority is defined by which the Dominion Government will direct the policy of public health and not "mark time" haggling away at the edge of things while provincial organizations without either the knowledge, the incentive, or the ideals work

11 p.m. along in a vain attempt to frame a national policy for the country.

When we look at the general principles of the proposed increased grants to the Department of Public Health and for assistance to public highways, we are almost led to believe that the Government has adopted this as a means of pacifying the provincial premiers and their governments in regard to the settlement of the various claims that are held by the provinces against the Government of Canada. What transpired at that meeting has not yet been laid before this House, but it is a well known fact that, had an agreement been reached consistent with the claims that were put forward and discussed by the provinces at that meeting, it would entail a considerably increased grant of money to the different provinces, and, Sir, it appears to me that, in interfering in matters in which the provinces are now directly engaged, such as the public roads and the public health, the Government is merely endeavouring to appease the provinces and not sufficiently defining the authority responsible for the proper expenditure of this money.

I suppose it would seem strange to some of the older members of the House if I, as a representative of the most easterly province in Canada, Prince Edward Island, were to make no reference to the subject of transportation. In view of the fact that the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) has informed the House that large amounts of public money are to be spent in providing work for the unemployed, especially for the returned soldiers, I take this opportunity of stating, for the information of the Government, that productive works can be carried on in the province of Prince Edward Island that will yield within a very short time a profitable return for any money that may be expended on them. During the past year the Department of Railways undertook the work of broadening the gauge of the Prince Edward Island railway. Only a small portion of that work has been completed, and I am sure that if the hon. Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) can see his way clear—as I think he can—to conclude this work, it will furnish employment for a large percentage of the labourers of Prince Edward Island who might otherwise be idle. It would also tend to develop the agricultural and fishing industries of Eastern Canada. The inadequate means of transportation which we have had in the past, has always been a serious handicap to the two great industries of the province, and I am confident that if the Government will continue the work so well begun, a great benefit will accrue to the agricultural interests of Prince Edward Island. I do not wish to dwell at

too great length upon these matters, but they are of such importance to the province from which I come, that I feel it my duty to make reference to them. Our means of increasing production in Prince Edward Island lies not in the taking up of vacant land, but in applying the methods of intensive farming that are now being practised on the best farms. There is nothing that will induce our farmers to increase their production so much as the provision of adequate transportation facilities, and I think it is only fair to ask that these facilities be supplied.

In connection with the fishing industry, I would suggest to the Government the advisability of dividing the Department of Marine and Fisheries, and establishing a department under the direction of a minister whose sole duty would be to develop the fishing industry of Canada. The effect of the operation of such a department would be to encourage our fishermen to develop their business. It is as necessary to give assistance to the returned soldiers who wish to engage in the fishing industry as it is to assist those who desire to go back to the land.

There is another class coming back and it is composed of those who have volunteered in the naval service of Canada and the Empire during the war. They have been trained to the sea for the past three or four years. Many of them were from the maritime parts of Canada, both east and west, and when these boys come back they will take much more kindly to developing the deep-sea fisheries of Canada than to going on the land. I urge upon the members of the Government the necessity of making provision for the boys who want to return to the sea as fishermen equal to that made for the boys who choose to go back to the land and serve as farmers. I hope I have made myself clear on that point as it is a very important one. We, in Canada, in the past have looked upon our boundaries largely as the shore line, but in the future we must remember that some of the best industries can be established far beyond our shore line in the deep seas on the Atlantic and Pacific.

I wish to put myself on record as being against government by Order in Council. I can readily see the necessity for a War Measures Act extending to the Government the power to do business during the war by Order in Council, but I cannot see the necessity of using that power when the war is over—to carry on the general business of the country by Order in Council. I wish to record myself especially against the Order in Council that was referred to by the hon. gentleman on this side of the House who preceded me a short time ago, that which increased the minimum fine for defaulters to $250 and made it retroactive. I believe that the people and the Government should take a different attitude towards those who are classed as deserters or defaulters now that the war is over. We have it on no less authority than that of the Prime Minister of Great Britain that conscription in the Old Country is to be done away with. We should approach this question on a broad basis.

It was stated by the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders), who preceded me, that the Government was called upon to frame policies and reconstruction measures in connection with the closing of the war without the aid of historical precedents. In that I cannot agree especially in the sense of this Order in Council to which I have referred. If you will go back and look at the condition of affairs in the United States at the close of the Civil War you will see the stand that was taken by the then President, Abraham Lincoln. In the closing days of the war, and shortly before his assassination, he issued a proclamation stating that all deserters who would report themselves to the provost marshal and serve the remainder of their term of enlistment would be pardoned. There is history and the action of the President at that time proved to be the correct solution of the problem. We must put this matter upon a broad basis looking to the future unity of Canada and having regard to the problems of reconstruction immediately before us and the great changes that we may have to face.

There is another point closely akin to this question, although not the same, which has been referred to in terms in this House and that is the Franchise Act and the application that it has had in the past, and may have in the future, to those who are termed alien enemies. While I am not by any means a lawyer, and do not profess to be, on this question I feel that it is the duty of every member of this House to record his sentiments plainly and openly. In reference to the franchise I wish to say that the sentiments expressed by the Government in the speech from the Throne with reference to granting the franchise to women and giving them seats in this House meet with my hearty approval. But when I say that, I must express the disapproval of myself

and my constituents of the measure known as the War-time Elections Act. While I have no intention of anticipating what may be affixed to the Franchise Act, from the opinions expressed by some hon. members seated on your right hand, Mr. Speaker, we may expect that a selective franchise will be offered to this House at this session. In this connection I wish to refer particularly to the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Kings (Mr. McIsaac), who, speaking on alien enemies, said:

> I, for one, sincerely hope that the Government will exercise its utmost powers in carrying out whatever regulations may be enacted to drive these people out of the country. They have no rights here, and they have done much harm; I hope the Government will leave nothing undone to suppress them.

I cannot interpret that as the true sentiments of the citizens of Canada towards the people who are termed alien. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden), in his eloquent speech, referred to alien enemies and said that we would not be true to our soldiers who went overseas to fight in France and Flanders if we did not send these people home. In justification of his statement he went on to say who these alien enemies were and what constituted alien enemies. The proof which he cited simply showed that the men whom he called alien enemies had made certain statements to the effect that they were not Canadians. I have no brief to defend alien enemies. I have always taken the ground of a common citizenship and encouraged in every way possible our people to be loyal. But, if those who are termed alien enemies were to be approached in accordance with the sentiments expressed by the hon. member for Kings and the hon. member for Brandon, you could only expect to get the worst and basest principle of their nature brought to the surface. And, Sir, if we are to give a lead—a proper lead—to our people we must not use expressions that will set one class against another. We must propound and carry out a policy in this Parliament that will lead all classes—a policy that they can follow, and follow as a unit. In regard to this matter, I desire to place myself on record in this House, that so far as my influence and voice will go, I will stand for a common citizenship and a universal franchise as the only means of leading Canada towards her proper position in relation to the different colonies of the Empire and the nations of the world.

In conclusion, Sir, permit me to say, that our motto must be: "Let us all be Canadians in the broadest and truest sense of the term."

"Let us be Canadians."
"Let us be broad Canadians."
"Let us all be Canadians."

On motion of Mr. Peck, V.C., the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Friday, March 14. 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Certified copy of an agreement between the Elgin and Havelock Railway Company and His Majesty the King.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

INTERNATIONAL WATERWAYS COMMISSION VACANCY.

ON THE ORDERS OF THE DAY.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Some months ago a vacancy occurred on the International Waterways Commission owing to the appointment of Mr. Mignault, K.C., to the Supreme Court of Canada, and I understand that the recommendation has been made to the Imperial Government to fill that vacancy. Has the appointment yet been made by the Imperial authorities? If not, when will it be made?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): No recommendation has been made for the filling of the vacancy in question.

RIOTS AT KINMEL CAMP.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE: In view of the great interest that is taken in the country in connection with the military riots at Kinmel Camp, may I ask the Acting Prime Minister when we may expect some report from the Commission, which, according to his announcement of the other day is making inquiry as to the real cause of the trouble?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am advised by the Overseas Minister of Militia and Defence (Sir Edward Kemp) that a board of inquiry is holding a full investigation. As soon as it reports communication will be made to the House. In the meantime it is not possible to make any official statement because the board of inquiry is proceeding with the hearing.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: What about the riots at Witley Camp?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: As I stated the other day, we have no official information regarding any riots at Witley Camp.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East), for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session resumed from Thursday, March 13th.

Lt.-Col. CYRUS WESLEY PECK, V.C. (Skeena): Mr. Speaker, I had hoped not to intrude upon the notice of the House at such an early date because, in the presence of so many experienced Parliamentarians and debaters, I thought it might be more modest for a new member like myself to wait a while. At the same time I felt that there were some subjects being discussed on which I might be particularly qualified to speak, and being a new member and not very familiar with the rules of the House, I thought that in the debate on the Address I was less liable to get out of order; because, Sir, I have noticed from the remarks so far made by hon. members that there is an extraordinary wide range of topics which may be discussed in this debate, and one may speak about almost anything under the heavens, provided he does not talk too strongly upon those subjects which really matter.

Now, Sir, there are one or two things I am going to speak about and they relate to things which really do matter. First of all I desire to allude to a certain statement which appeared in the morning paper. I understand that when imputations are cast upon the character of hon. gentlemen the opportunity is afforded them of rising to a question of privilege. I do not wish to follow that course, or to cause any unpleasantness; I merely desire to say that the statement in the morning paper representing me as being a lawyer is absolutely and entirely untrue.

I wish to thank the House for the exceedingly kind welcome it accorded me on my arrival, and also to all hon. gentlemen on both sides for the very cordial way in which I have been received in this Chamber. I likewise desire, Sir, to thank the staff of the House for the courtesies which they have extended to me during the short time I have been here, and which, I can assure you I reciprocate in the very greatest degree.

I desire especially to thank the hon member for South Renfrew (Mr. Pedlow) for the very kind remarks he made concerning me when I entered the House and to extend my thanks to the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) for his very kind references to me. I am exceedingly sorry that I shall have to take sharp issue with the latter hon. gentleman on some of the statements which he made during his contribution to the present debate.

I join all the hon. members of the House who have so far spoken in paying my tribute of respect to the illustrious statesman who so long adorned the benches of this House, and who has now gone forever. I was exceedingly impressed with the touching and noble eloquence of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) in the speech he made the other day, when he spoke of the personal charms and personal character of the late great Leader of the Liberals. It will be well indeed if the Liberal party—I do not know the present leader of the Liberal party very well—all I know is to his credit because his name is associated with the tartan which I have worn for a long time upon the battlefield—the Liberal party or any other party will do very well indeed if they get a leader of the same fine mould, the same high character, the same lofty ideals, and who will be followed with the same devotion, the same enthusiasm and the same abiding faith, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier was followed in this House and in the country.

It is not my intention, in the few remarks I shall make, to enter upon the general subjects of politics which have been very fully covered by other hon. gentlemen who have spoken. I have not been too conversant with the ordinary subjects of politics, and if I may be excused for so saying during the last four years, to quote from the poet.

> Little of this great world can I speak
> More than pertains to feats of broil and battle.

I was very grieved indeed, Sir, on my entry into this House to hear the hon. member for Victoria and Haliburton (Sir Sam Hughes) make certain statements which I deem to be of the utmost gravity. He made statements with respect to the leaders of the Canadian Corps in the field which pained me very much. I was exceedingly pained, because I felt that those statements might revive the grief felt by hundreds, nay thousands, of people in this country, who have lost their dear ones in the war. There are thousands of bleeding hearts in this country to-day, Sir. Thousands of hearts that will never be healed; thousands of mothers, sisters,

wives and sweethearts are listening in vain for that footfall upon the garden path that will never sound again; and I say that any man who says anything to cause these wounds to bleed afresh should have behind him the most indisputable facts, should be able to guarantee his statements to the utmost, and should be absolutely convinced that what he says is absolutely necessary to be said in the public good. The hon. member for Victoria, whose redoubtable character I respect, in his statements in this House said that the lives of a great many Canadian soldiers had been sacrificed in vain to serve the idle ambition of the leaders of the Canadian Corps, sacrificed for no useful purpose. The hon. gentleman said: "I know Cambrai well, and General Mewburn has seen Cambrai." I do not know whether the hon. Minister of Militia wishes to associate his reputation as a tactician with the hon. member for Victoria, but that is what he said. The hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) further said:

I know Cambrai well. It is a dirty little one-horse town that is not worth the life of one Canadian soldier.

I do not know what the hon. gentleman's religion is, but I rather imagine from his speech that he is a spiritualist, because he seems to have a supernatural knowledge of things that have taken place on the battlefield. As a matter of fact, I think his medium must have been out the night before he made his address, because what he says is absolutely at variance with those things which we who were actually upon the ground saw take place. He says that Cambrai is a little one-horse town, not worth the life of one soldier. Now, I have here two maps, one a German map showing the town of Cambrai on a large scale, and the other one of our own maps showing the town on a smaller scale in its relation to the rest of the country. I wish hon. members could see this map; I shall be glad to show it afterwards to any member who wishes to see it.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Perhaps the hon. gentleman could tell us the population of Cambrai.

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: I do not know the exact population, but I do know that it is far from being a little, one-horse town. Cambrai is a town of from 30,000 to 50,000 inhabitants.

Sir SAM HUGHES: 27,000.

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: Very well; that is near enough to it. But the question is not so much the population of the town as the relation which it bears to the rest of the front. If hon. gentlemen will look at this map they will see that six or seven great national highways lead into Cambrai; that several great double-track railways run into the town; that single-track railways and hundreds of roads lead into it. They will see also that a great canal system runs through the town; so that however you consider it from an administrative point of view, as a road junction and railway centre Cambrai is a place of the utmost importance and was of the greatest strategical value on that front. Moreover, if you look at this map you will see that the German army commander whose army held Cambrai and the high ground to the north would naturally rest his flank on the La Sensée canal. That canal is a very much more formidable military obstacle than it appears to be as shown on this map, because miles of the surrounding country have been flooded by the Germans. So that the German commander would have on that canal a safe and secure flank and would have a very comfortable feeling indeed. But if he lost the town of Cambrai and that high ground he would at once find his right flank to be tremendously involved in the canals and rivers that lie northeast of Cambrai, and he would have to beat a very hasty retreat —as, indeed, happened when the Canadians and the British corps got through.

It must have been the opinion of the generals of the British army that Cambrai was a very important point; otherwise, why should so many military enterprises have been attempted against it throughout the war? And, Sir, such was the opinion not only of these generals, but also of the German general staff. Perhaps you remember a statement made by Ludendorff or Hindenburg, I forget which, before Cambrai fell, in which he tried to cheer up the drooping spirits of the German people and to belittle the efforts of the Allies. The statement said: "They have really gained nothing, but when the British get into Lille and Cambrai they may begin to talk, for our situation will be serious indeed."

The hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) tried to paint a vivid picture before members of the House with regard to the town of Cambrai, and if you looked into the background of that picture you would see the villain of the piece: Sir Arthur Currie, the cold, machiavellian leader, who he says was willing to throw away the lives of all kinds of Canadians to gain a little transitory glory.

Now, the action of Cambrai was not at all a local Canadian action; it was part of an enormous military enterprise which extended over a vast area of country for days and weeks and which was only a part of what was taking place on the great western front. From the time when Foch struck his first blow, on the twenty-first of August, he continued to strike that front like a pugilist, striking here, there, and everywhere, always with relentless determination, always with consummate judgment and skill, no one knowing where the next blow would fall. The German prisoners used to say: "We live in constant terror; we never know where we are going to be attacked." He kept pounding away until he wore down the German army, demoralized the German defence, broke the heart of the German people, and made the German Government sign the most humiliating armistice ever signed in the history of nations. So, Sir, if the battle of Cambrai was wrong, it was not the fault of Sir Arthur Currie or the higher command of the Canadian corps, it was the fault of the British general staff, and had the concurrence of Field Marshal Foch, the generalissimo of the Allied armies and the greatest military genius of the age.

The hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) said in his speech,—I thought I had the Hansard here to quote from, but I have not, —that Cambrai should not have been attacked by suburb or street fighting; and he quoted the words of an American officer, addressed to General Buller at Colenzo, to show that the only way is to "go around the darned thing." Well, Sir, that is what actually happened.

Sir SAM HUGHES: One week later.

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: Hold on; we will find out about that. I fought in two phases of the battle of Cambrai in which I did not see the town; that shows what a tremendous event the enterprise was. The Canadian corps were a long way ahead of Cambrai on the northern flank and the British corps were a long way ahead on the south. The reason why they did not actually take the town by storm was because they did not want to cause undue casualties. We had known for a long time that Cambrai was doomed; it was only a matter of time. We can generally tell from the tactical situation what is going to happen, and we knew what was going to happen in this case. So finally these corps closed in and Cambrai fell. As far as I know, there was very little, if any, street fighting in Cambrai. Our Third division went through the town, and the boys of the Canadian battalions, with their usual enthusiasm, marked on the doors of some of the buildings: "Captured by such-and-such a battalion." The British, I have heard, were rather annoyed about this; they said that our boys had gone over too far into their territory; and as I shall prove later, the centre of the line ran through Cambrai. At any rate, I am acquainted with all the officers in the various divisions, and I never heard that there was any considerable street fighting on that occasion. Of course, there may have been a little; but I question whether it amounted to anything.

The hon. gentleman tried to make it appear that this was a minor and local event with the Canadian corps, and that Sir Arthur Currie or the leaders of the Canadian corps were sacrificing human lives in this last attempt to gain glory.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Wherein do I show that it was a minor event of the Canadian Corps?

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: I am using my privilege as a member of Parliament to defend the leaders of the Canadian Corps, because they are not here to defend themselves. I have no objection to answering any question put to me by the hon. gentleman, that I can, but he will have plenty of time in this House or in the country to reply to anything that I shall say.

Not only was this not a local event of the Canadian Corps, but there were two corps employed in the capture of Cambrai, which as I said, extended over many days. Further than that, if my memory serves me aright—and I will bank more on my own memory than the hon. gentleman will go on his—, not only was this a division between two corps, but it was the division between two armies, because we were fighting on the right of the first army and a British corps was fighting on the left of the third army. One does not have to be a great strategist to see that this was not a local event which was ordered merely for the purpose of gaining glory for the Canadian leaders. I think the casualties were reasonable considering the strategical importance of that point. Cambrai fell and the great German army commenced a rapid retreat going helter-skelter up the roads that lead to southern Belgium.

I want to say this—and perhaps this may be the most important part of anything I shall say about the casualties—our orders were to this effect: that we should press forward with all possible vigour, but that

we should not incur heavy casualties. I wish I had the orders with me, but these were the orders we had from the Canadian Corps, and, in my case, from the First Canadian Division.

If I may be permitted to relate an incident in which I was personally concerned in this war, I shall relate one which will fully illustrate that point. During the last three days in which my battalion under my command, and the First Division, was employed in this war, we advanced through a great series of towns and forests and in the very last days of the war the battalion under my command was advancing with the First Brigade on the left, and the good old Fourteenth, under Dick Worral, on the right. We were advancing through the forest of La Vicoigne to seize the great highway that leads from Valenciennes to St. Annand and Lille, and the double track railway that leads between those places, as well as the little village of La Vicoigne. We advanced cautiously all day, because we had to look out for ambushes, through this forest. It was a very exhaustive advance for tired soldiers, but we encountered very little opposition and incurred only two or three casualties. When we reached the edge of the forest, about 600 yards from the village of La Vicoigne, we were held up by a most intense machine-gun fire, so we got into some trenches there and I consulted with my officers as to the situation. It appeared to me that by a bold stroke after dark we might capture this village of La Vicoigne and relieve the whole situation to the south. I shall have to be very careful in what I say or perhaps the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) will be accusing me of losing human lives. I discussed the matter with my officers and also, as one frequently does, with the men in the trenches. My officers and men said this: Let us go into the town to-night and kick the Germans out and get some good billets for the night, and not stay in this dirty, damp trench.

I may say that our infantry are so immeasurably superior to the German soldiers, and they have such a contempt for them that they do not think anything of encountering them anywhere.

But I had in mind those orders which I had received, as all other commanders had, not to incur casualties, and I said: I shall have to go down and consult the brigade. So I rode back a few hundred yards to the brigade to consult the acting brigadier, who, I think, Sir, is a friend of yours, Lt.-Col. Charles Bent, C.M.G., D.S.O., who commands the 15th Battalion, and who is one of the finest soldiers in this war. I consulted with him and explained the situation as I saw it and what we purposed doing. He said: " That is exactly what I think should be done, but you see these orders about casualties." We commanders in the field have to be very careful; if you make a success of a venture you are a great hero, but if you happen to lose a few men, no matter how well your attack might be planned, your position, your reputation, and, perhaps, your head may be the price. He said, " In view of these orders, I think it would be better to defer the action until the morning or until something else develops." It is evident, therefore, that this order was in every commander's mind. It was the order of the Canadian Corps; it was the order of the First Canadian Division. That is all I have to say on that point, except, if hon. members are interested, I may say that my patrols pushed into the town in the evening. You cannot keep those Scotchmen away from anything they think is pretty good. They pushed into the town to those good billets, and the Germans, of course, got out of there very quickly. We entered the town at twelve o'clock in ghastly stillness, and the French people came out of their cellars and received us as only French people can. At one o'clock our outposts were out, the whole situation was secure, and the rest of us were tucked away in our beds for the night. The next day the Third Division relieved our division (the First Canadian Division) in the line, and the grand old First Division had fought its last fight and passed out to rest after having achieved a military renown and a record that has seldom been equalled since war began.

A few days later Sir Arthur Currie stood by my bedside (I was ill at the time), and with that unfailing kindness with which he treats all those under his command, he called on me to inquire after my health and to chat with me upon the military situation. He uttered these words: " Peck, we might wish to deliver a stunning blow; we could do it; we might wish to inflict a crushing defeat on the Germans and kill lots of Germans, and we would like to do that to revenge ourselves for the way they have treated all those noble men we have lost; but," he said, " the policy of revenge is not worth one man's life." He said, " I am sick and horrified at the losses of our gallant Canadian troops in this war; I have an easy conscience about it, but I do not

mean to start any fresh enterprise." I ask you, Sir, is that the language of a cool, cunning, designing commander who has no regard for the lives of his soldiers and who is working for and aiming at only his own idle ambition?

A few days later Mons fell. I was lying within a few miles of the city, but I did not hear any of the extraordinary things stated by the hon. member for Victoria. I find on referring to the official report of casualties that there were 75 casualties at Mons. I have a list here of casualties which cover the phases at Amiens, Arras, Cambria, Le Cateau, Valenciennes and Mons. These were only phases and may have extended over a few days, and possibly over the whole front. It is very probable that the 75 casualties at Mons were spread over two or three days or more, and probably over some miles of front. I am one of the senior officers in the Canadian Corps and I know officers in all the divisions. I have a great many grand old friends in those divisions, and we hear all the gossip that goes round. But I never heard a word about the extraordinary things mentioned by my hon. friend from Victoria. You would be surprised, Sir, to know how quickly gossip gets around in the army, and don't you ever think that you can hand these Canadian soldiers anything, or they will get your number so quick you won't know which end you are standing on. If there had been ruthless waste of life in any of those actions, we should have heard about it by other means than the eloquence of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes). I question very much whether all of these 75 casualties fell in the city of Mons. There may have been only a few casualties there. I advanced with my battalion, if I may refer to myself once more, eight or nine miles in one day and took five towns. I received a tremendous amount of bouquets. The warm-hearted people of France came out and the gratitude they showed would have moved the heart of anybody. I kissed an awful lot of women, and the only unfortunate thing was that the older women crowded to the front, so I could not get near the better looking ones. But my point is this. We advanced eight or nine miles and passed through these five towns without firing a shot or losing a man. All we captured was five or six German military policemen who had overslept in much the same manner that policemen are reputed to do in all parts of the world. The fact of the matter is the Germans were on the run. We had them on the run and we kept them on the run, and they did not stop to fight. I question whether any man knows positively that one man fell in Mons. I certainly question it myself, for there were very few Germans there to resist the advance.

I wish to say a word about Sir Arthur Currie, the commander whom I followed in this war. I have followed him and always will follow him with affection, esteem, and loyalty. I am proud to have served under him. I consider him to be one of the great Canadians, and one of the great commanders we have had in this war. I remember making a speech early in 1917 to my officers in which I pointed out that the character of Sir Arthur Currie, his great tact, his great military instinct, and high-minded devotion to duty marked him out as the natural leader of a great democratic army. In June of that year he became the commander of the Canadian Corps, and when he did become commander he had not one bit of political influence behind him. In fact, he had to encounter political intrigue. I do not want to say this against those in authority in England, but there are some gentlemen among them who have not forgotten their political habits, when they went overseas, and they had planned against the promotion of this distinguished commander. Nevertheless, he was promoted to command the Canadian Corps, and his promotion had the approval of the Commander-in-Chief of the British army. That was the deciding factor. No matter how many schemes politicans worked in other directions, the deciding factor was the approval of the Commander-in-Chief of the British army, and Sir Arthur Currie had the approval not only of Sir Douglas Haig, but what is very much more, he had the approval of the officers and of all ranks of the Canadian Corps. I hope that the Canadian Parliament and the Canadian people will reward and pay fitting tribute to Sir Arthur Currie and all those distinguished commanders who led us in the field. I can assure you, Sir, that I have the utmost admiration for them in every way, and for all the officers who supported them.

The hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) in his speech during this debate, enumerating the members of this House and their relatives who had served in the war, said:

Colonel John A. Currie, member for North Simcoe, served at the front with distinction at the Battle of St. Julien. I want to point again that the name of Colonel John A. Currie has been confounded with that of another, and deeds

have been attributed to him that have not been creditable and that have absolutely no connection whatever with Colonel John A. Currie.

To whom, Sir, could that allusion refer? What commander was at St. Julien of the name of Currie of sufficient importance to attract the eloquence of the hon. gentleman? I do not know any commander of that name who was present at that battle of St. Julien except Brigadier General Arthur Currie, who commanded the 2nd Canadian Infantry Brigade, and I should be very glad if the hon. gentleman (Sir Sam Hughes) saw fit to stand up in this House and deny that he meant to refer to that man.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I mean Sir Arthur Currie, and I shall take the first fitting opportunity in this House to say that it is Sir Arthur Currie and to tell what happened.

Lt.-Col. C. W. PECK, V.C.: I have heard that this campaign of infamy is to be continued, and if so, I certainly deplore the fact. It will be unfortunate for the reputation which the Canadians have won for themselves, and which should be cherished in the heart of every true citizen of this country. This truth should forcibly appeal, I think, to every honest Canadian.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The hon. member has asked me a question. May I ask him one?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it fair that Col. John A. Currie should go through this world under aspersions, without being vindicated?

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: I am not at all discussing the character of the hon. member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I assure you, Mr. Speaker, that, returning from the battlefield and being received so cordially by the Parliament of the nation, I should consider it the last thing in the world I would desire to discuss or even to question the courage of any hon. gentleman; and anything which I have said has been said only from a high sense of duty and because I know what has actually taken place. And because, further, I wish to defend the reputation of those who cannot defend themselves. I beg to say that if this campaign is continued much longer—I earnestly pray that it may not—I shall tell some things of which I know, and there will be some gentlemen who will curse the day they were born.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I rise to a question of privilege.

[Lt.-Col. Peck.]

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member is not in order in rising to a question of privilege. The hon. member for Skeena (Col. Peck) has the floor. He may be interrupted only with his permission, and only to be asked a question.

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: I am not a sufficiently experienced parliamentarian to deal adequately with these interruptions; but I freely state that I have the highest possible admiration for the redoubtable character of the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), and I am not one of those who think that he made a million dollars out of the Ross rifle. I have always had the greatest admiration for him, and therefore I think the statements he has made in the House are unworthy of his redoubtable character.

Now, Sir, an important subject has come up lately to which I wish to refer, namely, the discipline of the Canadian troops. We have all read the astounding intelligence of the riots that recently occurred at Rhyl, Wales. I will not for a moment attempt to condone those riots. On the contrary, I believe that if similar unfortunate events are repeated they will seriously impair the great reputation which has been won by the splendid Canadian army in the field. I shall refer to an article that appeared in one of the leading London daily newspapers. The newspaper despatch reads:

> The Daily Express in its main editorial to-day says that a most unfortunate state of feeling has arisen among the Canadians owing to the view they take of their recent treatment by the British Government and the British press. They say that, while British military troubles here and in France were minimized the Canadian camp disturbance was given full publicity. We would point out, says the Express, that this is only true of what happened in France. There the censor simply stopped the news crossing the channel, but what happened at Folkestone or Victoria Station and at Bow Street on Sunday was fully reported. None the less it is true that the blame attaching perhaps to 600 Canadians was placed on 19,000 completely innocent men, and that one or two comments were foolish and unsympathetic.

Now, Sir, that brings the British press and the British public into court, and I very much regret to strike a jarring or discordant note, as I feel I must do to-day. But I am bound to say that a certain portion of the British public and the British press have not dealt with the discipline of our Canadian troops with due tolerance and sympathy. As the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) no doubt knows, when the first Canadian contingent was in England, everything was said to exaggerate the slightest irregularity on their part. Now,

it is impossible to have several hundred thousand full-blooded young men assembled together without an occasional violation of what we call military law. Military law is altogether different from civil law. For instance, if a man fails to get in in time, under military law he is arraigned in the morning, tried for a crime, and probably found guilty; while under civil law a man may return home at four or five o'clock in the morning, and make the fact a subject of mirth at his club the next day, discussing the wonderful time that he had the night before. If a man is drunk, military law imposes on him a very severe sentence; whereas in civil life, if he has imbibed too freely at the club, the good boys take care of him, see him safely into a taxi, and he goes home a hero to his friends. So that there is a very wide difference between civil and military law. But, Sir, the great test, you will find, of the character of our soldiers is the esteem in which they are held by people with whom they have come in contact. You may go to-day from Ypres to the Somme, across southern Belgium and even in Germany, and you will travel through nothing but a swath of abundant good will on every hand towards the Canadian corps. Now, you cannot make people believe that men are bad who are not so in fact; and that the Canadians are good men is the general opinion of the warm-hearted noble French people whom we admire, the gallant people of Belgium,—aye—and even the people of Germany. My battalion—which, of course, you know, is the greatest battalion that ever served in the field—left Lindlar, twenty-five miles east of Cologne, and the German people got out and lustily cheered them. You can have no more striking evidence than that of the opinion which is universally held of the Canadian soldiers.

We marched up to the Rhine on the 13th of December. The First Division crossed on the southern bridge in Cologne and held the northern bridgeheads of the Rhine to the extent of twenty-five miles east of Cologne. The Second Division crossed at Bonn and held the bridgeheads in front of Bonn. From the first moment of the time we were in that vicinity, we found the British authorities very unsympathetic and, as the saying is, "They had it in for the Canadians." They asked that the Canadians might be debarred from Cologne, but Sir Arthur Currie refused to do that. After a while there was some trouble in Cologne, sufficient to furnish the British authorities with an excuse to exclude the Canadians from that city. I may say that the British Military Governor of occupied Germany was Sir Charles Ferguson, and from the outset, as I have said, the British authorities were unsympathetic. And when this trouble occurred in Cologne they put the Canadians out of bounds, and sent a most insulting message to the Canadian corps, saying, that on account of the continued misbehaviour of the Canadians they would be excluded from Cologne.

I am very proud to say that we had commanders in the field who resented that order. I myself saw a copy of a letter which was written by Sir Arthur Currie and also one by General Sir Archibald Macdonell, commander of the First division, which division held the bridgeheads at Cologne and in front of Cologne, in which they replied to the order of the commander of the Second army. Sir Arthur Currie said, in a letter which was characterized by its vigour and dignity: "We can only consider that order, from the way in which it is couched, as insulting." Sir Archibald Macdonell very soon had his Highland spirit stirred and he wrote a letter, of which I saw a copy, to the British army commander in which he called upon him to produce the proof that the Canadians had been unduly obstreperous in Cologne. Sir Charles Ferguson wrote and made certain charges which were very grave. Sir Archibald Macdonell, that doughty Scotchman, made a scientific and searching investigation of the thing and he found that the number of Canadians who were charged—not convicted—but charged in Cologne was very much lower than the number that would be ordinarly charged amongst a similar number of men during a like period.

When the First Canadian division at last, after four years of warfare turned its weary footsteps backward to return to the rear areas and to their homes in Canada, it did so with with the insults of Sir Charles Ferguson, the military Governor, ringing in its ears.

I want to say one word about the character of Sir Charles Ferguson and then I shall have done with a subject which is a very unwelcome one to me, because this is the last thing that I should like to bring up. Sir Charles Ferguson is married to a woman of Cologne and that may account for some of his strange sympathies for the inhabitants. Sir Charles was in command of the 17th Corps at Arras when the Canadian Corps was rushed down there to save that flank of the British army. I leave to history what was going on in the south—Sir Charles Fergu-

son was very invidious in his references to the Canadians. Sir Charles Ferguson said to one of our officers: "We never had any trouble here until the Canadians came," and our officer answered: "Yes, that is what the Germans say."

Sir Charles Ferguson was the man who gave up Monchy which was one of the points of vantage and which was really, in a sense the key to Arras because from Monchy, you could observe Arras and you would also observe a portion of the Lens salient. Who retook Monchy? The Canadian Corps. Sir Charles Ferguson gave up Monchy and several officers of the 15th Scottish division said to me that it was the most disgraceful moment of their lives when they had to walk out of Monchy and leave a perfectly good position, one of the finest on the front and give it up to the Germans.

Sir SAM HUGHES: About what date was that?

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: Just about the end of March.

Sir SAM HUGHES: In the retreat of March?

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: Yes. Why do I say all this? I will tell you. When I was standing before my grand old battalion at Lindlar, 25 miles east of Cologne; standing before those brave fellows with whom I had been associated for nearly four years, the grandest, the noblest, the finest men that it had ever been my privilege to be associated with, I said: "When I go back I am going to bring these matters to the attention of the House of Commons." I did not mention these things that Sir Charles Ferguson had said because they might have mobbed Sir Charles, or done something of that kind had they known. But I said: "I will go back to the House and defend the character of the Canadian army before the Parliament and people of Canada," and I mean to do everything I possibly can to make the name of Sir Charles Ferguson stink in the nostrils of all honest and patriotic Canadians.

A lot of things happened in the British army that you never heard a word about. I rode into a town in 1917—there were 40,000 British troops in open insurrection, and they had taken 3,000 or 4,000 Canadian troops, not one of whom ever made any trouble, and put them to guarding railways and bridges, which I suggest was an invidious duty. Things of this kind occurred and they never mentioned a word of it. The war is still on and I am not going to mention things that happened this year, but there have been things of the most serious character that have happened on the continent, but nothing is ever said about these things. But when a Canadian does anything it receives the utmost publicity in a certain portion of the British press.

4 p.m.

Now, I come to the question of demobilization. I am not going to discuss it at any length because I find that I have taken up more time than I intended. Most people do not seem to understand this question. I was very much impressed by the fine speech of the hon. the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) the other day. Very few people seemed to know that demobilizing a volunteer army is a greater task than organizing that same army and sustaining it in the field. The great object for which the armies have been striving has been achieved and our men naturally wish to get back to Canada and to resume their ordinary ways of life as quickly as possible. I am not here as an apologist for the Government I do not mean to do anything of that sort, Sir, but we wish to be fair. Therefore, I repeat, I was very much impressed with what the minister said. He said that the people seemed to think that their duty had ended.

If there was one thing that served as a comfort and sustenance to us in the field it was the knowledge that we had behind us a strong, vigorous, generous and chivalrous people. It was the knowledge that every day men of different creeds and different points of view were meeting together and striving in an honourable emulation to do those things that were necessary to support us in the field.

I am sure that we must all make due acknowledgement to the hon. Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) for bringing to bear on the great question of finance his undoubted talents, and to all those workers who directed the energies and encouraged the enthusiasm of the Red Cross workers and doing all those things necessary to make more effective the work of different organizations which contributed so greatly to the support of the troops in the field.

We owe an especial debt of gratitude to the fair women all over the land who met day after day in their little guilds and societies to organize the work of preparing and forwarding those comforts and parcels of wonderful things that we received in the field and which were so cheering to us in

those ghastly moments of warfare. That was the greatest comfort we had in the field in all those long years; it was like the shadow of a great rock in a weary land.

And now I wish to appeal to this House and to the country not to think that our labours are done. Having given of your blood and treasure as you have so loyally and generously, I appeal to you to join in this colossal task of demobilization, and to help in getting this wonderful and magnificent army of ours settled back into the avenues of peace and into the field of production, so that they may be able to feel that they have the gratitude of a generous people.

I wish to allude at this point to a statement which was published in the Canadian press of yesterday or the day before. The statement in question originated from the Canadian Associated Press and was to the effect that the soldiers at Rhyl had broken into the girls' quarters—that is the nurses—that they (the girls) cowered under threatened violence, and that the soldiers otherwise misused them. I desire to point out that Colonel Colquhoun, the commander of the camp at Rhyl, declared that the men had never gone into the girls' quarters and had behaved with the utmost chivalry towards them. I think the Government should investigate this report, and if the Canadian Associated Press is found to be circulating news in this country reflecting on the honour of our glorious soldiers it should be promptly repudiated.

Now, Sir, I come down to the affairs of mundane politics. There is one matter as to which I shall no doubt be out of order if I do not deal with it, and that is the matter of the latch string which has been so much referred to. The hon. leader of the Opposition has done two notable things in the last two weeks: he has become the leader of a great party, and he has coined a phrase. There was a great man who once said, "I would rather make an epigram than rule a nation." You can therefore see that the achievements of the hon. member (Mr. McKenzie) are quite considerable.

I am one of those who are considered by the hon. gentleman as having wandered from the fold. I do not agree with that. I was overseas for four years fighting for the principles of Liberalism, and if the Liberal party has not kept up to the scratch it is no fault of mine. The reason I supported the Unionist Government, and the reason the great bulk of the Canadian troops at the front did so, was because we had no faith in the Liberals getting on with the war. In the fall of 1917 our position at the front was desperate and precarious. We had had some successes that year, but we had only advanced at any point about two or three miles, except in one locality where probably an advance of five miles was made. We had only accomplished this by desperate fighting and after very serious losses. I am now speaking of the British army. We knew that the Germans were preparing an attack upon a vaster scale than had ever before preceded the assault of an army. We knew that the U-boats were making great inroads into the commerce of Britain, and it was just nip and tuck—from all the information I have gathered it was just nip and tuck from the way the U-boats were sinking vessels—and we knew that before the Americans could bring any considerable force into the field it would be very late in the following autumn. We knew that in the spring, whatever happened, we would be fighting with our backs against the wall for the very existence of the Allied armies, and for the very existence of the cause of liberty and civilization. Is it any wonder, then, that we turned to somebody who had a definite policy?

Now, Sir, I studied whilst overseas with the greatest possible attention the actions and the speeches of the members of the Liberal party as now constituted, and I could get no comfort—their policy was as the shifting sand. But, Sir, the Unionist Government at least offered us a definite policy, and a policy which gave us confidence that they would prosecute the war with all vigour. To whom should we turn therefore except to a Unionist Government, especially when we saw that their ranks comprised some of the most able and eminent Liberals in the country? Now, Sir, that is my position. When the Liberal party can show me that they have a more progressive programme than the Coalition, or any other party, and when they convince me that they are going to follow that policy, I will be prepared to support them. But I want to say this one thing: I am not going to go around in the darkness of the evening and gaze into the kitchen window, I am going to walk boldly in through the front door at high noon.

I am a Free Trader.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: I am very much gratified, Sir, to hear the cheers of hon. gentlemen opposite, and I only wish that they had evidenced the same enthusiasm during the last twenty years.

An hon. MEMBER: Cheer now.

Lt.-Col. PECK, V.C.: Like the hon. members for Red Deer (Mr. Clark), and Springfield (Mr. Richardson), I had been a supporter of the Liberal party for some time, but I have at last come to the conclusion that there is very little difference between the two parties. Free trade and low tariff may, in certain sections of the country be very good planks to ride into power on, but our administrators always seem to find protection the best policy to keep in on, and it does not seem to matter which policy is carried on so long as they can stay in power and bask in the sunshine of office. In that respect both parties seem to be pretty much on the same footing.

Now, Sir, I was elected an Independent and soldiers' candidate, to support the war policies of the Unionist Government, and I wish to say that I certainly mean to do so until I see something better. I think we should give the Unionist Government a chance, and I must say that not only here but in the Old Country, I found the members of our Unionist Government were honestly and sincerely trying to grapple with this great question of demobilization to the best of their ability. I think we should give the Government a chance, and therefore I appeal to hon. gentlemen on both sides to be charitable in dealing with this question. It is all very fine to make a grandstand play in the House, and to read a letter from some soldier who may have had rather a hard time. At the same time I know that hon. gentlemen opposite do not wish to take advantage of mean political tactics, and therefore I appeal to them to show a spirit of charity in their attitude towards the Government. I can assure hon. gentlemen they will find that I will take an independent stand on questions. I do not hold a brief for the present Government, but until we get a better Administration I mean to support them.

In connection with the taking over of the Grand Trunk Pacific by the Government, I hope that the Government will institute a vigorous policy in regard to that road. I am told that there is quite a feeling throughout the country that if we leave this thing long enough under Government control the people will get sick of it and go back to private ownership. But I do not think that is a good view to take. A great friend of mine who was a well-known statesman in this country—I deplore the fact that he has since gone—once said: "You cannot build railways without imagination." Well, I am afraid that you cannot run the Grand Trunk Pacific for a short time without imagination. But the Grand Trunk Pacific runs through a tremendously rich country in the northern part of Canada and taps the great hinterland that lies to the north of all the other railroads. If a vigorous policy is put in force in this connection it would only be a short time before the Grand Trunk Pacific becomes one of the best paying roads in the Dominion. It has the lowest grades and should compete, I think, in every way with the other railroads. I notice the Minister of Railways (Hon. J. D. Reid) looking the other way. I hope that when the season opens up in the spring, a fast, modern, comfortable daily train will be put on between Quebec and Prince Rupert; I am sure that in time it would pay. I hope, too, that steamship connection will be established with the Orient, because through the saving of thirty-six hours at sea and in going over the easy grades of the Grand Trunk Pacific, we can haul the rich cargoes of China, Japan and India, to the great markets of eastern Canada and the United States much more advantageously than the other roads can do it. It is only a matter of the Government prosecuting the business with vigour and with a proper outlook, and keeping it free from graft and politics.

In closing, may I just say this. In the trenches we have no politics. It does not matter whether you are English-born or French-born, Roman Catholic, or Protestant, or anything else; you are the same as any other fellow in the trenches if you are a good soldier—and all our boys are good soldiers. In the trenches we were one grand brotherhood. Unless you are a soldier you cannot understand the espirit de corps that prevails. It is the next thing to the family feeling; it is a great and wonderful love for your fellow man. As I saw these fellows perform their duties in the avenues of death, under conditions of the greatest peril, without a murmur, always with the greatest cheerfulness, I used to think what a contrast it was when I read in Canadian newspapers accounts of some of the squalid, sordid political quarrels that take place in connection with Dominion, provincial, and municipal politics. I used to say to my officers that when our men got back to Canada, we should surely have a better national life. If we do not have a higher and nobler national life when these men—who have never quailed or faltered on the field of battle, who have shown that they possess every human virtue that men can have—return to Canada and are in-

corporated into our national life, then, Sir, I think that our sacrifices shall have been in vain and our time lost indeed.

Hon. WILLIAM STEVENS FIELDING (Shelburne and Queen's): Mr. Speaker, one of our old parliamentary forms is that which allows us, on the motion for the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne, to discuss a very wide range of questions. I think it is a wise provision in the old rules because it enables members at the very beginning of the session, if they so desire, to give expression to their views concerning the public affairs of the country. Sometimes when the debate is protracted, as this has been, outside critics find fault and tell us that we had better quit nonsense and get down to business. Sometimes, I suppose, the practice and the rule are abused; but there is another side to this good old form. There have been cases—far be it from me to say that this is one—when the Government, not being too ready with its business, or possibly waiting for somebody who is away to come back—may find it agreeable to allow two or three weeks to be spent at the beginning of the session in the harmless occupation of passing the Address. Even that, however, has something to be said in its favour.

Then, there is a further and more serious aspect of the matter. Every government naturally and properly desires to form its policy in harmony with the recognized wish of Parliament, and when at this stage of the session we have this free-for-all discussion, the Government have the opportunity of learning public opinion from its various angles; and perhaps in the end the debate is helpful to the business of the session and not, indeed, a waste of time.

In a debate of this kind it is almost unavoidable that there should be a considerable amount of repetition; we deal with the same subjects and the same thing has to be said often. That I may avoid that as far as possible, may I be permitted, without dwelling on any one of the points, to say that I desire to have myself associated very cordially with many of the things which have been said by the hon. gentlemen who preceded me. I should like to be associated with the well deserved compliments that were paid to the hon. gentlemen who moved (Mr. Redman) and seconded (Mr. Manion) the Address; with the expression of gratification that we all feel upon the splendid triumph of the Allies and the apparent termination of the war; with appreciation of the triumphant and heroic services of the Canadian soldiers and sailors; with reverence for the memory of those who have given up their lives; with resolve that those who are spared to come home shall have every consideration from a generous and grateful people.

I should like also—need I say—to be associated with the many eloquent, earnest and touching tributes offered from both sides of the House to the memory of our great Liberal leader (Sir Wilfrid Laurier) who has passed away, a man who was honoured and admired by all and loved by those who knew him best.

To me it is a satisfaction—I believe it is to all of us—to feel that we have associated with us here in Parliament, in the work which we are undertaking as representatives of the people, so many gallant soldiers who served the Empire at the front and have won honour for themselves and for Canada. We are especially honoured by the presence and association of these men as fellow-workers in the discharge of our duty; and it will be no disparagement to others if I speak of the particular pleasure which we have all shared to-day as we listened to the voice of the gallant Colonel (Lt.-Col. C. W. Peck, V.C.) who wears on his breast the proudest honour that any soldier can have.

The subjects touched by the speech from the Throne are numerous. There used to be a time when, criticising speeches from the Throne both here and in our Provincial Legislatures, men were in the habit of saying that the Speech was more remarkable for what it did not contain than for what it did contain.

It is about the only thing that I have not heard said so far about the speech, and we cannot say that there is any lack of material.

The speech touches on many subjects of importance, and it sets forth a considerable bill of fare, promising a very busy session. There are some things that I suppose we shall be glad to have more information about. The overshadowing question before us to-day is one upon which we can at this stage hear but little. I refer to the financial question. The overshadowing question with us must be in regard to the tremendous burdens which are to fall upon us at the close of the war and in regard to how these burdens are to be met. That they must be met intelligently and courageously, we shall all agree. We cannot at present expect any information respecting those. That stage has not yet arrived. Indeed, we do not need much information, for the thing is so big, the figures are so

colossal, that we can easily realize the tremendous burden we shall have to face, the awful debt that is accumulating, the tremendous obligations that we shall have to provide for. All that we know almost as well as when the Minister of Finance will give us the information in greater detail. We must be content to-day with the glimpse we have had of those things from the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell). The figures, even in the hurried form that he gave them to us, are startling. We know, however, that they will have to be given to the House in greater detail later on. In the speech of the Minister of Public Works, there were one or two sentences which contained a meaning beyond what he intended. He dwelt, once or twice in his speech, upon the fact that his department, in determining upon expenditure on public works, would have regard, not so much to the good of the community, as to the necessity for guarding against unemployment. I thought he dwelt too much on the unemployment and too little on the usefulness to the community. The two things should, I think, go hand in hand. There is in Canada no need, for the sake of guarding against unemployment, to engage in the construction of works which are valueless or of doubtful value. Canada is still a comparatively new country, comparatively undeveloped, and in every part of our Dominion useful public works can be constructed, if we have the means to do so, where we can combine the guarding against unemployment with the service to the whole community. I hope the minister will think more of the good of the community, although I am quite sure we all sympathize with him in his desire to guard against unemployment.

There is one question that we must all think of a little as we look at the vacant chairs, when we recall that there are five ministers of the Crown who are absent from their departments, and absent from their seats in this House. One of those gentlemen, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), has, we have learned with great regret, been laid aside by a very servere illness. We rejoice to know that he is in a fair way to recovery, and we shall all be glad to welcome him back to his seat in this House, we hope, at an early date. As respects the others, the explanation is not so clear. The Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden), the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty) and the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) are absent. We are glad to know that they are not ill. It is a great pleasure to know that. We know that they are in Paris. That is rather a pleasant place to be in if you have nothing particular to do. But what they are doing there, that is to say, what business they are doing, that is to say, what Canadian business they are doing in Paris, is one of the things that no fellow can very well understand. The Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) endeavoured to give us a little explanation; the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) gave us a little more, but whatever impression it made upon others, I must say that their contribution to the discussion led me to believe that they were just as much in the dark as we were. What in the world are these gentlemen doing away from their seats at the present time when there is so much to demand their attention at home? Ah, but you will say; are we not interested in the Peace Conference? Surely, the whole world is interested in the Peace Conference. Canada is interested in the Peace Conference. If Canada had never spent a dollar nor sent a man to the war, she would still be deeply interested in the Peace Conference, because it is dealing with world problems. I admit all that, but still the question remains: What interest has Canada in the Peace Conference that is not her interest in common with the Empire at large? If I did not know the hon. member for Halifax as well as I do, if I did not know him to be a loyal member of an ultra loyal Government, I would feel some cause for suspicion in his remarks, because he absolutely ignores the fact that Canada is a part of the British Empire. He gave us to understand that if our ministers had not crossed the seas, Canada would not be represented. I cannot admit that for an instant. I am too good an Imperialist—an Imperialist of the right stripe, mark you—to admit what I would regard almost as a reflection on British statesmen. When Mr. David Lloyd George, Prime Minister of Great Britain, and Mr. Arthur Balfour, Foreign Minister, take their seats at the council board in Paris, Canada is represented, because Canada is a part of the British Empire. Unless it can be shown that Canada has some interest separate and apart from the British Empire, there is no particular reason why we should be represented there. I have enough faith in Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Balfour to believe that if we had not sent a minister across the seas, the interests of Canada would not have been sacrificed.

There are times when Canada has an interest in public affairs somewhat apart, an interest of her own, an interest not at variance with the interest of the Empire, but an interest specially of her own. In that case it is undoubtedly a wise provision that Canada should be specially represented. In the past there have been numerous cases in which it has been desirable that Canada should be represented. I notice that in the speech from the Throne we are informed that our ministers are "attending" the Peace Conference. I think I can congratulate the Government upon the happy choice of that word. There are some hundreds of officials over there attending the Peace Conference, but attending the Peace Conference does not necessarily imply that they are doing any very large part of the business, and I have not been able to see that we have had there any Canadian business which calls particularly for their presence.

There is overseas a commercial mission which we should distinguish from the political mission. We have sent across the seas several prominent business men who form a commercial mission. Their object is to extend the trade of Canada. From all that I can learn they are not as successful in the matter as we would wish them to be, but whether they succeed or not, is, after all, not the question. The object in view is an excellent one, and I commend the Government for sending the Trade Mission. That mission has work to do; we know what it is those gentlemen are trying to do. But we cannot understand what in the world is the Canadian work that our ministers are doing in connection with the Peace Conference. I want again to emphasize the fact that Canada, as a part of the British Empire, would be represented if those gentlemen had not gone to the Peace Conference at all. I admit at once, as I said a moment ago, that there may be occasions when Canada has a special interest and at such times Canada should, of course, have her own representatives. What Canadian interest is before the Peace Conference in Paris to-day? We have no territorial axe to grind. We are not seeking any extension of territory, are we——

Sir SAM HUGHES: Greenland.

Mr. FIELDING: —and in that respect we differ a little from our sister Dominion, Australia. Australia did have some special interest to represent. She had a question of territorial expansion to be considered, so there was that excuse for Australia having special representation. She does not appear to have made much out of it, by the way. Her special representation has accomplished nothing, and she could not have been any worse off if Mr. Hughes had stayed away, because the wishes of the Australian Government—I am sorry it was so—have been set aside. But Canada has no such ground for being there. We are seeking no expansion of territory, we have no islands to gather in; in the matter of expansion of territory we are absolutely without any claim.

What then? Indemnity? If we have a claim for indemnity, in all seriousness what in the world can we do but make out the bill and send it to Mr. Lloyd George? What more could anybody do? We cannot by any act of ours induce the Germans to pay us an indemnity. If there is to be an indemnity at all it will go to the British Empire, and I am loyal enough to believe that the British Empire will give us our share if we demand it. But it appears that we do not want any indemnity. Some of the information we get from Paris we have to look on rather doubtfully perhaps, but now and then we get some information which has an official look. I have in my hand an extract from the Montreal Star's own correspondent, Mr. H. N. Moore, who in a cable from Paris dated February 10, says:

> Canada will make no special claim. A certain responsibility was assumed during the war, and that responsibility will be carried to the end. If indemnities are claimed by Britain, if one of the terms of peace is that Germany must pay not only the bill for reparation and restitution, but must also shoulder the entire cost of the war, Canada would undoubtedly receive her share. But the delegation is not pressing for this. In fact, one might assume fairly that any such proposals would be deprecated.

So we have no territorial expansion to seek, we do not want any indemnity, and in all seriousness I wish somebody would tell me what is the Canadian question which is at this time engaging the attention of the Peace Conference. There is a glamour, I suppose, about this idea of Canada having special representation. There is something fascinating about it, and many people who I think ought to be wiser are magnifying its importance and trying to make something out of it. The question is asked in Holy Scripture, "Which one of us by taking thought can add one cubit to his stature?" It was a hard question in Bible days. It was a question which was asked for the purpose of showing that the thing could not be done—but that was before the days of the Peace Conference. Mr. Speaker, some people seem to think that practically by taking thought, by passing some petty

resolution in an Imperial conference or getting some second-class recognition in a conference at Paris, we are actually adding a cubit to our stature. We are not. Before we pass any votes of thanks or send bouquets to anybody in acknowledgement of this wonderful recognition of Canada as a nation, suppose we stop and think a little bit of what it all means.

What is the organization of this Peace Congress? To begin with, the congress is dominated, as it should be, by the five great powers which won the war: Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States. Each of those five powers sends five delegates to the conference, making a group of twenty-five; I shall refer to that a moment later. Inside of that group, and of greater importance, is the real working body, the governing and controlling body—and I shall give my authority a moment later for that expression—the council of ten, composed of two representatives from each of the five great powers. That is the working congress, that is the real Peace Congress, that is the big circus. The others are only side shows. Now, on that Council of ten, the real working body of the Conference, Canada has no representative; and Canada never was intended to have a representative on it. There is, however, a possibility of her being represented on it in this way: Under the panel system the powers are not obliged to be represented by the same men all the time, and if Great Britain wanted to do so she could on any given occasion name a Canadian on that Council of ten. I think I am correct in stating that according to the best information only on one occasion has that privilege been given to Canada. How it was given, when it was given, and why it was given, I may have occasion to show in a few moments. But it is important to remember when we are trying to understand what our good ministers are doing over there, that on this Council of ten, which is the real Peace Conference, we have no representation at all.

Then we come to the next body, the Council of twenty-five, composed of five members of each of the great powers. On that body Canada has no representative. Canada is a nation, you see, but she has no representative on the working body of ten, and she has no representative on the Council of twenty-five. Again, I say, she could have it on both Councils by means of the panel system, Great Britain having the power to name a Canadien also on the Council of twenty-five, if she sees fit to do so. But as it appears that the Council of twenty-five never meets, we need not worry ourselves very much whether Canada gets any glory out of that representation.

Now we come to the outer circle. We have first the Council of ten, the innermost Holy of Holies, then the Council of twenty-five, which forgets to meet, like one of those commissions of which my hon. friend from Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) was a member, and outside of these two we have the larger body which for convenience we will call the General Council. That must be composed of from seventy-five to eighty men all told, for there are twenty-five representatives from the five great powers, and representatives from all the minor powers. Canada—let us be clear now that we have got to the point where we find Canada,—has a place on that General Council. She is represented by two delegates, and the other Dominions by two or one, as the case may be. What are the functions of that General Council? Nominally, it is the big show, the whole business. In reality, it is nothing. The five great powers are dominating the whole business, and I am glad they are, because they are the ones who won the war and they ought to dominate the Conference. But there is a lot of humbug in pretending to give representation when there is really nothing to do. That General Council met at the beginning of the Conference to hear the opening-day speeches. It may have met once since, although I am by no means clear about that, and it will be called upon to meet again when the final treaty is prepared, but representation on that body is largely a matter of humbug. The real working body is the Council of ten, on which Canada is not represented. The next body is the Council of twenty-five, which does not meet. Then comes this larger body which seldom or never meets, and is not taken seriously. Membership in that larger body is largely a matter of making an appearance.

We are told in the public press that Mr. Lloyd George fought valiantly for the admission of the dominions to the Conference. I have no doubt that is true. We are told, too, that President Wilson opposed it, and that, I suppose, is also true. My hon. friend the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) emphasized the fact the other day that although the Americans at first objected to the admission of the dominions, they eventually kindly waived their objection, and that everything was therefore running smoothly. I have no doubt that Mr. Lloyd George fought valiantly for us. It is a pleasure, indeed, to know that the part Canada has played in this great

drama is fully appreciated by, and has made a deep impression upon, the people of England. Every English statesman recognizes the great service that Canada has rendered in the war; every English citizen is proud of Canada, and I am quite sure that Mr. Lloyd George and all his colleagues would like to please Canada in everything that is reasonable—indeed, in some things unreasonable. Now, was it reasonable that Canada should put on airs, as a separate nation, and demand admission to this Conference, when she had no business relative to the Dominion to bring before the Conference? That is a vital point. We do not deny that there is business to do. Great interests are at stake; but they do not relate, as far as we can discover, in any degree whatever to Canada, and I fail to see the reason for all this ado about Canada's representation. Well, it seems to be admitted that Mr. Lloyd George fought valiantly for Canada's representation, and that Mr. Wilson opposed the proposal. I give Mr. Lloyd George credit for his efforts on our behalf, and appreciate the generosity of his heart, but if President Wilson opposed our representation I cannot help thinking that he did so on very sound and logical grounds. President Wilson, we are told, abandoned his objection. I wish we could learn the circumstances that led to the abandonment of his previous attitude in the matter. In the absence of that information we are left to imagination. Imagination at times is too picturesque, but occasionally one can conjecture fairly accurately a probable state of facts, and I can imagine the interview between Mr. Lloyd George and President Wilson in regard to this matter. Mr. Lloyd George probably says to Mr. Wilson: "Now, Mr. Wilson, don't make a fuss over this matter; we can fix it up." Mr. Wilson answers: "What do you mean, Mr. Lloyd George? Do you want to put the dominions in and give them representation? Have you not got your own five members from Great Britain?" "Yes," says Mr. Lloyd George. "Then," says Mr. Wilson, "what do you want more for? We have five from the United States. Suppose New York should come along and say, 'We are not quite content with the American representation as it is; we want a few more to represent the state of New York.' Would you agree to that?" "Well, no," says Mr. Lloyd George. "But they have as much right to special representation as Canada has, for the state of New York is as big a factor in the affairs of the United States as Canada is in those of the British Empire." Mr. Lloyd George looks at him significantly and says: "Well, that is all right, Mr. Wilson; you are absolutely dead right; but hold on now. We will explain this matter. You see, Mr. President, we don't intend that these Dominion people should be put into the council to do anything. We are just going to put them on for peace sake, and we want you to help us. Look at the Canadians. They are splendid fellows, but a lot of their politicians have a bee in their bonnet that they would like to call themselves a great nation, and would like to have special representation. Now, it won't hurt us to give them a kind of representation. We don't mean to put them on the Council of Ten, or the Council of Twenty-five, but merely on the outer circle which rarely or never meets at all. We will only put them alongside the smaller nations, like Liberia and Siam, and you can easily see no harm will be done. It will please our Canadian friends for some time, while it will hurt neither you nor me. Now, Mr. President, I am sure you will be good enough to help us play the game." President Wilson, heaving a very audible sigh of relief, says: "Oh! That's a different thing; I thought you were in earnest when you put up such a strenuous fight. I thought you meant to give the Dominion a real and serious part in the game." "Mr. President," says Mr. Lloyd George, "you are from across the water and you don't know the game of diplomacy quite well. Be a sport, and play the game," he adds, playfully poking the President in the ribs. President Wilson, a kindly and obliging soul, replies: "Now that you put it that way, Mr. Lloyd George, I can really see no harm in it." Then, Mr. Lloyd George informs Mr. Wilson that there are a lot of committees and sub-committees which do not meet very often. "We can distribute the Dominion men all over these," he says. "For instance, we can put one man on a committee to inquire into the assigning of the boundaries Boriabolla-gha. You know the Canadians; they are your neighbours, splendid chaps; but they are not bothering themselves about this business at all. They are going on sawing wood and paying taxes, and doing other chores. It is just a few politicians—not a bad lot you know—who want to put on frills, and it would be awfully nice of you to help us help them."

Well, this thing has become so palpable that it cannot escape notice. Our friends the ministers were fortunate enough to have with them a most capable press agent —indeed, one of the ablest journalists in

Canada—and if there was any business to do over there that concerned Canada and that needed explanation, no man could do it better than my friend Mr. John W. Dafoe, of Winnipeg. But you cannot make bricks if you have neither straw nor clay; and as there was no Canadian business to transact, what in the world could Mr. Dafoe do? Day after day he sent telegrams explaining this, that, and the other thing, and the very multitude of his telegrams became confusing. Well, we got occasional glimpses from other sources. Among the gentlemen who have been in Paris in connection, not particularly with the Peace Conference, but with various surrounding matters, a couple of gentlemen were sent from among the hard-headed farmers of Western Canada, to look after the wheat business. One of these gentlemen was Mr. Norman Lambert, the secretary of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, a very capable man. As far as I can see, he is an absolutely disinterested witness. I do not see that he can have any possible object in picturing things other than they really are. My friend the President of the Privy Council has tried to paint a picture of the grandeur of this work in which our ministers are engaged over there. Well, he has not been over there himself, and consequently must take things on hearsay. I desire to read a passage or two from the pen of a man who has been on the other side, a capable and reputable witness. I have not the pleasure of knowing Mr. Lambert personally, but I believe he is a gentleman of absolutely good repute. He has referred, in a public letter he wrote not long ago, to this story of the Council of twenty-five—the body that does not meet. He says:

"This spendid vision of a council of Twenty-five, however, suddenly vanished, and out of it sprang the indomitable Council of Ten, comprised of the Prime Ministers and Foreign Secretaries of the five great allied powers, in reality the Supreme War Council of Versailles. No meetings of the Twenty-five have been held"—

that is the body on which we do not get any representation; but if we have no meetings, we need not cry over the absence of our members.

"No meetings of the Twenty-five have been held, and the great Britannic Commonwealth has been represented entirely by Mr. Lloyd George and Mr. Balfour. As one crestfallen Canadian delegate expressed himself to me"—

Mark you, a Canadian minister.

"As one crestfallen Canadian delegate expressed himself to me, the proposed Council of Twenty-five was just so much eye-wash."

I would like it to be observed, Mr. Speaker, that the word "eyewash" is not

[Mr. Fielding.]

mine; it is not even a word of the correspondent whom I am quoting. It is the word of the Canadian minister, the crestfallen minister, given to the correspondent.

Now, if we have to rely upon our English dictionaries for an explanation I admit that there may be some difficulty in quite understanding the application of the word "eye-wash" to this particular state of affairs. But I believe I am correct when I say that the word "eye-wash" is French for camouflage. Mr. Lambert proceeds:

The reason for such eye-wash—

Camouflage.

—is not quite clear as yet to anybody outside the Ten, least of all to the Overseas Ministers.

So, Mr. Speaker, I hope you will see that I am giving you a fairly good authority for the picture I am trying to present to you of the true inwardness of this Canadian representation at the Peace Conference. He says that the thing is not satisfactory to the Overseas Minister and he goes on:

In order that the members of the British Peace Delegation from Overseas and the delegates from the nineteen small nations should have something to do, the Conference very graciously appointed them to a number of investigating commissions and special committees.

I described that to you a moment ago.

The Hon. A. L. Sifton, for instance, was made the principal British delegate on the Commission to report on international claims in connection with ports, rivers, and railways. Sir Robert Borden was asked to be a member of a commission to go to Prinkipo to deal with the Bolshevists, and also to join another body in determining the claims of Greece to greater territory. Hon. C. J. Doherty was named as a member of the British Sub-Committee on the League of Nations, but for some unexplained reason, no meeting of Mr. Doherty's Committee was ever called. He finally issued a statement to the press setting forth his views on the organization of a League of Nations, and thus was able to let the world know that the representative from Canada at Paris at least was thinking about the League of Nations.

In that little picture of our busy ministers overseas we have taken into account the Prime Minister, with his eyes towards Prinkipo, we have Mr. Doherty showing that he is thinking about the League of Nations, we have Mr. Sifton who seems to be looking after claims in connection with ports, rivers, railways and various other things which are not ports, rivers and railways over here. But there is a missing man. What in the world has become of our good friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster)? The only explanation I can offer of it is

that our good friend the Minister of Trade and Commerce was too old a bird to be caught with chaff of that sort. I think that when he came to size up the situation he said to himself: "Now, I think that instead of waiting around in the anteroom of the Conference Chamber for something to turn up I had better go down and take a stroll on the boulevard, have an occasional sip of pink lemonade and watch the passing show." If the Minister of Trade and Commerce did that, I commend his judgment, for I think it would be more profitable as well and more agreeable than sitting around the Conference Chamber doing nothing. I have said that this humbug became really so patent that it could no longer be concealed. I have shown you what the opinion of Mr. Lambert was. Now, let me look at Mr. Dafoe's official correspondence. Mr. Dafoe made a brave effort to put the best face on the matter and I commend him for it. He is a master of the art of making much ado about nothing. But he said: We cannot keep up the game any longer, the Canadian people will see through it, and so one day he sent out this despatch—I have not the date of it but it is some time in February:

There is undoubtedly a good deal of feeling at the concentration of the Conference powers in the hands of a small committee of the Great Powers, and it is also a fact that this feeling is shared to some degree by the Dominions which recognize that the assumption of the right of control by the Council of Ten has limited their participation in the affairs of the Conference, as provided by the original plan of organization. This feeling found expression at the last Conference and there is likely to be further evidence of it at the coming meeting.

They could not keep up the game any longer, they had to admit that all this was humbug and they entered this protest. I have not the date of that despatch but on the 19th February I find a later telegram from Mr. Dafoe. You will remember that the 19th February was only a short time ago and that our ministers have been away since November last and have been in Paris days, weeks, months, looking after the Peace Conference. On the 19th February Mr. Dafoe says:

For the first time a representative of the Overseas Dominions has served on The Supreme Council of Ten, the governing body of the Peace Conference. The British Empire's representatives at this afternoon's sitting were Mr. Balfour, the British Foreign Minister, and Sir Robert Borden.

So you see that after long and weary delays, after days and weeks and months sitting around looking for a chance to do something, at last, long last, Sir Robert Borden is asked to go in that day, that sunny afternoon, on the 19th February. Of course, this was a great day! Of course, some great big thing was going to be done, some grand thing, something of importance to Canada, and that is why Sir Robert Borden was invited to be present! Now, listen:

The matter before the Council was Serbia's claim for enlarged territory.

Far be it from me to underestimate for a single moment the talents of our respected Prime Minister. We all know him here as a gentleman who is well equipped, a lawyer of high standing, and we all know that if there is anything to do, any real business falling within the scope of his professional attainments, he would do it and acquit himself well. But, is it any discourtesy to him to say that if anybody was needed to consider the boundary lines of Serbia there are twenty clerks in the British Foreign Office who could do it better than the Prime Minister of Canada? Surely all this pretence of Canada having a great part in this Conference is largely humbug. When Canada accomplishes anything in the way of constitutional reform we should be glad to know it and to express our gratitude to those who bring it about. If Canada should acquire any dignity anywhere we should be pleased to know it, but, seriously, does it bring any dignity to Canada to be nominally connected with the Peace Conference under the circumstances described in these statements which I have presented to you—not my statements but information coming direct from headquarters in Paris? No, sir.

If my feeble voice could reach those gentlemen over there I would dare to say to them: "Good friends, come home; there is real business to be done in Canada. If it were not so, we would not hurry you. You Ministers are a hard worked lot; we would not begrudge you a holiday amid the pleasant surroundings of gay Paree, but there is too much real work to be done at home." If the Prime Minister still hungers for the society of the Bolsheviki down at Prinkipo, I would suggest that he read the description of them given by the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) the other day. My hon. friend pictured them very eloquently indeed and told us what kind of people the Bolsheviki are. Although I have no right to speak for the House generally on many things, I am going to assume that I will have the right on this question to say to Sir Robert Borden: "In the name

of the Parliament of Canada do not have any truck or trade with those Bolsheviki." And if anybody is needed to settle the bounds of Serbia, or any other question of that kind, important as it may be to some people, there are a hundred persons over there who can do it much better than our respected ministers, and so I would beg them, "Come home, come home, there is lots of Canadian business to be done."

This idea of Canada being a nation seems to have seized the imagination of some people. They like to talk about it, they usually get the notion into their heads that it is a great big thing, that it is elevating Canada. Now I am not able to see it in that light. There is too much talk about Canada being a nation, loose talk; there is too much disposition to magnify our own importance without just cause. There was a report laid on the table of the House a week ago, a remarkable report, giving us some information as to the management of a large branch of the public business of Canada, and in that report the Commissioners said: "The art of doing nothing and making it look like real work seems to have been highly cultivated." Well, Sir, I think that somewhere in the departments here there must be a school of instruction for that sort of thing, and I think our ministers when they went overseas must have been taking lessons in that school, because ever since they have gone, there has been an effort to make it appear that they are doing wonderfully big things, and making of Canada a big nation, when, if I may dare to quote the words, the classic words, of a Canadian statesman no longer with us, "There aint nothing to it." Canada a nation! There is a sense in which Canada is a nation. The British Empire has been happily described as a galaxy of nations, and in that sense Canada is a nation. But in world affairs Canada is not a nation, and I for one am not inclined to look with great joy when I find the ministers over there setting forth a claim that hereafter Canada is to be known as a separate state. I quote these words from Lord Curzon, speaking in the British House of Lords. In his statement he uses the words that the place of the Dominions in the Conference was an admission that these countries were henceforth to be regarded as separate states by themselves. By themselves! That is to say that the Canadian ministers, and the other Dominion ministers, have put forth the claim that these Dominions are separate states. I do not like that, Mr. Speaker, I think it rather makes more for the separation that we used to be warned against than for the unity which we all desire. If our present state of affairs is not satisfactory—I know there are men who tell us occasionally that it is not—I would like to say to those who have any change to propose, "Give it to us in plain terms and let us see what it is." Imperial federation is a magnificent dream, and we are all better for dreaming it. I cling to the hope that one day—I do not know by what process—not by radical measures, not by revolution, but by that process of evolution under which the British constitution has developed "Where freedom broadens slowly down from precedent to precedent," by that process I hope and believe we will bring about some closer union between the Mother Country and the various portions of the Empire. There is an Imperialism and an Imperialism. There is an Imperialism which has been happily described as "jingoism," an Imperialism which blows the horn, and beats the drum, and waves the flag, and shouts about its own loyalty and questions the loyalty of other men who do not agree with it. If that is Imperialism, from it, good Lord deliver us all.

But there is another, and I think a truer Imperialism, to which I am proud to subscribe. If to be a loyal subject of the Crown—at this time when crowns are tumbling all around—if to be proud of British citizenship; if to feel that the British Empire is the greatest force, under divine Providence, for the spread of freedom and the extension of civilization throughout the world; if to desire all portions of that grand empire to come into harmonious co-operation, and into as much unity as is consistent with the maintenance of our own autonomy—if that be Imperialism, then I am proud to call myself an Imperialist. But I would earnestly beg that those who want change, those who are dissatisfied, will tell us plainly and squarely what their grievance is. I know of no grievance that Canada has. Canada has no difficulty in regard to her foreign relations. She has no need of asserting herself as a separate state—I am quoting again the words of Lord Curzon that these Dominions now claim themselves to be separate states. We have had occasion to deal with international affairs, but we never up to this moment had any minister of our Dominion set forth the claim that we were to be a separate state. We have long, Sir, had the right, with the co-operation of the British Government, to deal with international affairs when they concerned Canada. Go back a few years

to 1872, to the time of the Treaty of Washington. Go back earlier. No doubt in the olden days there was a time when Canada was not consulted; when the colonies were not consulted, when the colonies had not advanced to the status which they have since obtained, when treaties were made by Great Britain and they bound the empire whether we liked them or not. But that has all passed away. By the legitimate, constitutional development of Canada we long ago acquired the right to be heard and consulted in our international affairs. In 1872 when the Treaty of Washington had to be negotiated, Sir John Macdonald went to Washington along with the Imperial Commissioners. He did not say, "I come as representing a separate state." He said, "I come as representing the British Empire." And when, a little later, the fishery question came up, and when Mr. Joseph Chamberlain and Sir Charles Tupper went to Washington to deal with matters from the Canadian point of view, the Canadian representative did not set up any claim that Canada was a separate state; he went there as a commissioner of the Empire, empowered by the British Government. A little later a small treaty, not a big treaty—a lopsided and unfair treaty, by the way—was made at Paris on behalf of Canada by Lord Dufferin, the British Ambasador, associated with Sir Charles Tupper, then High Commissioner for Canada. But Sir Charles Tupper did not put forward any plea to be considered as the representative of a separate state; it was enough for him that he represented the British Empire. Come down a little later. It fell to my lot to be associated with my friend—not now in politics—now Mr. Justice Brodeur to negotiate what I believe we may call the most important commercial arrangement with a foreign country that was ever transacted on behalf of Canada—the Franco-Canadian Treaty of 1908. Well, Sir, when my friend Mr. Brodeur and I went to the conference, went to the office at Paris, the very place where the Council is meeting to-day, the Foreign Office at the Quai d'Orsay, we were received with respect as the representatives of Canada, because our French friends knew we had come to do Canadian business. But I do not hesitate to say that we were received with greater respect, and whatever we had to say and do had very much greater weight, because my colleague and I were able to place before the Government of Mr. Clemenceau—for the old Tiger was then as now Premier of France—and because we were able to place in the hands of Mr. Pichon—who was then and is again to-day, in the whirligig of French politics, Foreign Minister—because we were able to place on the table of the Foreign Office at Paris our credentials as the plenipotentiaries of His Majesty, signed by King Edward. That was the thing that gave us weight, and strength, and power, in addition to whatever power and authority we had as ministers of Canada. That is the way these negotiations have been conducted in the past. What more could we ask? What more can we ask by way of liberty from the British Government than we have to-day? I do not hesitate to say, Sir, I can think of no change that we can ask in our relations to-day which will be at the same time of advantage to the Empire, and acceptable to our Canadian people. There have been schemes of Imperial federation devised, worthy, I am sure, in their purpose, devised by people who are very patriotic and thought they were doing good, but which one of these schemes has ever been found acceptable to the Empire, or even to the Canadian people? Not one of them, Sir, down to this moment.

The President of the Privy Council (Hon. N. W. Rowell) said the other day that the present condition was intolerable, inconceivable; that we could not go on as we are. "Inconceivable"—Sir, the word is not new; there is a familiar ring about it. For a generation and more men have been telling us that things could not go on as they were; that conditions were intolerable, inconceivable. Fussy but well meaning men in the Mother Country have been devising schemes for reorganizing the constitution of the Empire and have been telling us that it is intolerable and inconceivable that things should go on as they are. But the thing which was inconceivable and intolerable persisted in going on. When the South African war came, hundreds and thousands of Canadian boys volunteered and went to South Africa to fight for the flag; out of the intolerable and inconceivable conditions sprang the splendid movement which brought honour to Canada and honour to the flag. Then, we had the same cry; things were intolerable, inconceivable. And what happened? The great war came on. We had been told by these worthy but well-meaning people that if their particular fad or constitution were not adopted, the British Empire would go to the "demnition bow-wows." But when the great war came on, without any demand from anybody, by the free voice of the Canadian

people supported by the Canadian Parliament, we raised half a million men to fight for the flag. Intolerable? No, Sir; these things are not intolerable; they are not inconceivable.

True, there is an anomaly in the position. I grant you at once that if we had been obliged to take part in the war, having no voice in the making of it, the condition would be inconceivable and intolerable. But under the principles of our constitution the only power which in reality could carry Canada into the war was the power of this Parliament; and I see nothing inconceivable, nothing intolerable, in that situation so long as the thing that we do is the result of our free voice. I have said that I should be glad if some scheme of closer union could be devised. So far, I have not seen any, and until some better scheme is devised may it not be wisdom that we should rather "bear the ills we have than fly to others that we know not of"?

What is it that Canada wants that she had not to-day? I do not think that Canada has any grievance in her relations with the Mother Country, and I see no particular reason why we should distress our souls over the situation. I fear that out of this glamour of a separate nation, out of this glamour of Canada playing a part of her own, will come some scheme by which we shall grasp for the shadow of a vague imperialism and lose the substance of the autonomy which we already possess.

I want to touch now on a more material question, that of the tariff. We have heard a great deal about it; no doubt we shall hear much more about it in the days to come. There is alarm and surprise in Canada on the part of a large section of our respected fellow-citizens, the manufacturers. They are very much alarmed at the outlook, especially in the West. There is just cause for their alarm. When they see the movement in the West; when they see these many meetings of agricultural organizations; when they see the legislatures of Manitoba and Saskatchewan unanimously passing resolutions demanding great tariff changes; when they find hon. gentlemen on your right, Mr. Speaker, demanding great tariff changes in general terms; when they find hon. gentlemen on your left declaring that there is no line of cleavage between them and the West and that they are prepared to act with the West—then, there is a very grave situation, and the manufacturers may well be alarmed. For their alarm there is much reason; for their surprise there is none. The situation which meets the manufacturers to-day is one which any reasonable man might very easily have anticipated. At times there are great movements of which you cannot get warning; there are tides which come without warning. I was much impressed by a passage in the speech of President Wilson at New York a few days ago when he was warning his people against some of the dangers which were presenting themselves to his mind. He said:—

> And I want to utter this solemn warning, not in the way of threat. The forces of the world do not threaten; they operate. The great tides of the world do not give notice that they are going to rise and run. They rise in their majesty and overwhelming might, and those who stand in the way are overwhelmed.

These are wise words, wise in their relation to many things in our country and in all countries to-day. But of the tide that is rising in our western country there was no lack of warning.

What was the condition of the western country and of Canada generally a few years ago? Shall I dare speak of the year 1911? Generally, Canada was prosperous, more than prosperous in her western territory. While the whole country was doing pretty well, a careful observer might have noticed that the greatest prosperity was coming to Canada in the West; that the greatest growth of Canada was in the West, and it would not have required very much wisdom and sagacity to look ahead and see the consequences which were to follow from that condition. Unfortunately, our manufacturing friends did not seem to see it. I should not speak of manufacturers generally, because there were many sane exceptions—I will not be invidious and say honourable exceptions, because they were all animated by what they believed to be their own interests. I am making no reflection on the motives of any, but the manufacturers were solemnly warned. I am going to read to you some words—they are worth something, though the one who spoke them may be of no significance—from an address that was delivered in the midst of the manufacturers in Montreal in March, 1911. The speaker was a Liberal, supporting reciprocity. He made an allusion to a speech that he had made on a previous occasion, and then proceeded to enlarge his idea. He said:—

> I ventured to point out to the manufacturers of Canada—

That was in the previous speech.

—that it was a mistake for them to array themselves in antagonism to the people of the Western Provinces. That opinion I want to express again to-day. There is the danger that East and West may be brought into antagonism. The danger is not to be found in Reciprocity itself, but the danger is that the manufacturing interests of this country and their allied moneyed interests will array themselves in hostility to the growing feeling of the Western farmers. Don't make any mistake about it—the day is within sight of the younger men here, and of some who are not so young, when there will be more people west of the Great Lakes than east of the Great Lakes. The West is going some day to dominate Canada and we, who live in the East, if we are wise, may as well look ahead and see this. What kind of a West is it to be? Is it to be a wise and prudent and sympathetic West; or is it to be a rash and reckless and dangerous West? The answer can be made by the manufacturers of the Dominion and the allied moneyed interests to-day. I do not hesitate to say that with proper care, with fair treatment, with reasonable argument, we can bring the Western farmer to be sympathetic and to be willing to work in harmony with the people of the Eastern country, who have done so much for the building up of the West.

And further on, the speaker continued:

But suppose you do not do that. Suppose the manufacturers should organize to-day with their money to defeat this agreement. I want to tell you, my brethren, that there will grow up in that western country a dangerous feeling. Don't make any mistake about it. I beg the manufacturers of this country—I always talk frankly to them and I am doing so now—I beg them not to range themselves up against the farmers of the West. The manufacturers are not hurt; they are more frightened than hurt. I give it to you as my opinion, worth much or worth little, that if by the forces of the manufacturers this agreement be destroyed, there will grow up in that western country a feeling that will be dangerous to the manufacturing interests of Canada and dangerous to the welfare of this Dominion.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Whose words were these? I did not catch the name.

Mr. FIELDING: I do not think that is of importance. The words are of value; it is of no importance who spoke them. The very condition that is spoken of in those words is facing us to-day. It did not require any great sagacity to make that prediction; it was the observation of the signs of the times. In the West we find that every prediction made at that time is coming true. The manufacturers, who were looking out for number one, unfortunately did not observe what was coming. I do not blame them for looking out for number one. I am not questioning their motives; I am questioning their wisdom. A person has to look out for number one to a certain extent, because if a person does not look after his own interests, nobody else will look after it for him. But there is an intelligent selfishness and a clumsy selfishness, and I think our manufacturers indulged in a clumsy selfishness when they ranged themselves against that reciprocity agreement. What is to be the outcome of all this? We have seen in the meetings in the West; we have seen in the resolutions of the legislatures of Saskatchewan and Manitoba, and we see elsewhere all through the West, the evidence of a deep feeling of unrest, of discontent, a determination that the West will no longer allow itself to be dominated by the East. We see it in the expressions of hon. gentlemen here to-day who, in their earnest desire to help the Government, are refraining from saying things that they would like to say. What is going to be the outcome of it all. Some of our Liberal friends from the West have, somehow or other, had the besetting sin of failing to adequately recognize and appreciate the measure of tariff reform that they received from the former Liberal Government. I am afraid that I shall have to include my eloquent friend, the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) in that remark, and also our respected friend, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders), who spoke last night. When he condemned all the old political parties, and then when he told us of the splendid things he expected to get in the way of tariff reform from the present Government, the mental comment I made was: "I have not seen such great faith, no, not in Israel." I do not know how much tariff reform my hon. friend is going to get from the present Government, but I know there are, in the West, conditions which will press themselves upon us all. But we are told that the old parties were no good; we are told that the old Liberal Government did not do anything, and that is where lay the besetting sin of my hon. friends, that they were not ready to proclaim how much the Laurier Government had done in times past. And when some Conservative critic said that we had made no material change in the tariff; that we had simply continued the old National Policy, sometimes our Liberal friends who should have sprung to their feet and answered the question, held their peace and let it be assumed that there was something in the charge. There is nothing in the charge. The Laurier Government did great things in the way of tariff reform for the people of Canada. This is susceptible of proof by figures. If you consider only the saving of money by way of taxation at the Custom house; that is to say, if you look at what was paid in Customs taxes during the period of the

Laurier Government, and then if you ascertain what would have been paid if the old rate of duty under the former Conservative Government had remained in force, you will be able to establish by actual figures that the actual saving on that item used to be a good deal of money those days, approached one hundred million dollars. That even when men were accustomed to think in millions, and not in billions. But my hon. friends who are interested in tariff questions will bear me out in this, that when you increase the tariff on a class of goods that are made at home, not only do you get the increased duty which you collect at the Customs house, but for every dollar that you collect at the Custom house for increased duty, the consumer pays to the manufacturer two dollars which does not go into the public treasury. Per contra, when you reduce your tariff to the extent of a sum representing in a given period something approaching $100,000,000 in the savings of Customs taxes, you, at the same time, give to the people of this country $2, in saving on the cost of their manufactured goods as against the other one dollar, and the money that is saved to the people is not $100,000,000, but, in all probability, $300,000,000. That would have been a good statement for my Liberal friends from the West to make, instead of some of the statements that have been made in this House. I think my Liberal friends did not support us as much as they should have done on this question.

There is another argument that might have been used with a great deal of force. If we made no change in the tariff, if we continued the old National Policy, how did it happen that the Conservative party, under the leadership of one of the fathers of the National Policy, attacked us bitterly for our new tariff, declaring that we were going to ruin the industries of this country? As a mere matter of reason and logic, that would have been an excellent argument for any of my hon. friends from the West. There is another point. The Laurier Government gave up its political life for the cause. They had given the West and the nation a great measure of tariff reform, but they were not content to rest there. They knew that there were conditions in the West which required more thoughtful consideration. They knew that if they could meet, to some extent, the feeling of the western people they would be doing a great deal for the country and a good thing for the manufacturers too. So they devised the reciprocity agreement. Sir, I have some reason for regret to-day. In these days when men who did not support reciprocity are proclaiming every day that it is the thing which the country needs, I have to regret that a noble Canadian who was associated with me in that work is not here to-day to hear the vindication of his own policy. I am sorry that some of our Liberal friends in the West have not thought more over these things. I should not speak of gratitude for favours. There should be no favours in public life—nothing but rights. Unfortunately, in almost every walk of life gratitude is a somewhat scarce commodity. But if I may not speak of gratitude I may speak of justice, and I say that the intelligent and fair-minded people of western Canada when they look over the record and think of these things will not conclude that the Laurier Government failed in its effort to please the western people in its fiscal policy.

Now, the question is coming up again, and how is it to be dealt with? We are told by some of my Liberal friends: "You must not have anything to do with politics; the wicked parties must be pushed aside." Later on, I wish to say something about party politics. We are told there should be no Grit and no Tory—stand up by yourself and blaze your own trail. I say, with all due respect, that that is very bad advice. I want to say in all sincerity that if our western or eastern friends or any other people imagine they are going to accomplish any great reform in this country except through the instrumentality of one or other of the two great parties in this country, they are cherishing a delusion. This country has been ruled by parties and it is my humble judgment that this country is going to be ruled at no distant day by parties again. The best place for a man to show his independence is within his own party ranks. An independent man within his own party ranks can do a great deal in keeping his party straight, but if he, owing to his peculiar views, stands outside party lines and tries to play his game alone he very soon finds that he can do precious little in this House alone. He may carry some measure, not of vast importance, but of some degree of interest. He may be able to play the part of a pioneer and say: "I know I can do nothing to-day, but I will plant the seed and by and by my grandchildren will see its fruits." Men have done noble service for humanity in just that way, but nothing can be accomplished early by that method. Even if you have a par-

ticular measure to which nobody seems opposed and in which you seem to have got so much of the virtue of life that everybody says it is all right, only once in a blue moon does your independent man get a measure of that kind carried through Parliament. It may be an interesting measure, but it certainly will not be a big measure. You cannot accomplish any large measure of reform, as you very well know, Sir, without having some money, and if your independent man or group of independent men comes forward with some measure of his own which he thinks is absolutely good, your eagle eye, Sir, will detect a coloured man in the fence or a dollar of expenditure involved and not only can he not have his Bill passed but you will not allow him to move or discuss it. You cannot do anything big alone. A man does not live to himself alone. We must co-operate with others. The farmers are being advised to have nothing to do with parties, and the same advice is being given to soldiers and to labour men, but I say—and I have the farmers particularly in mind now, although it applies to the others as well—that the so-called independent group which stands alone and snaps its fingers at parties will never get anywhere; it will never accomplish anything. That is self-evident. Under our system of government you cannot do anything except by identifying yourself, not slavishly, but in a manly, independent way, with one or the other of the great political parties in this country. So I say to my farmer friends of the West: If your idea is that all political parties are bad, and if you will have nothing to do with these wicked people but are going to stand alone and play a lone hand, you will have lots of fun in playing it, but you will never take a trick in the wide world.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: May I, not in any spirit of hostility, suggest that Cobden is an instance to the contrary?

Mr. FIELDING: If my hon. friend can tell me that as an independent man so-called, he could get through this House any measure of great importance without the intervention and support of the Government, he will give me a valuable piece of information. I want to say in all sincerity to my farmer friends that if they want to accomplish anything in this great work they must look over the ground and see which of the two great political parties—and there are going to be two; I am not speaking of immediate action—comes nearest to his views. Neither party will do all he wants. I should not like to subscribe to-day to all the opinions that have been set forth in the claims of our respected western friends. I should prefer to have a free hand so that I might deal with any question that comes up in the light that Heaven may give me at the moment. I do not see the wisdom of committing one's self to a thousand and one details in advance, but this I will say: For the greater part of their programme, for the general trend towards lower taxation, for greater freedom of trade, for reciprocity and all the things Liberalism has battled for in the past I shall stand in the future and help my farmer friends to get them.

I would say, with all deference to those advising them to keep out of politics, that until they are able to pursue that course they will accomplish nothing. I do not suggest slavish support to his party by any hon. member, be he Grit or Tory; but I do say that the party system, with all its faults, is after all the best system that statesmen have been able to devise for the government of the affairs of the people. Nothing can be accomplished in a large way except through the instrumentality of one party or the other. Choose you which you will serve.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. FIELDING (resuming): Mr. Speaker, just before the Deputy Speaker left the Chair at six o'clock, I was endeavouring, necessarily in a somewhat hurried way, to present a review of the tariff policy of the Laurier Government, particularly in reference to the western country, and with some reference to the future tariff policy, and particularly as to the manner in which any great reform must be accomplished in this country. I do not wish to enlarge on that subject now. It is enough to say that I realize that it is a question of very great importance and that upon whomever may fall the responsibility of dealing with the question, he will have to approach it with a sense of its immense importance in relation to a great many interests in this country.

There is only one point I care to add. I have noticed a revival of the movement to establish what is called a permanent tariff commission. Several years ago the Conservative Government introduced a measure to appoint such a commission. The meas-

ure failed to pass the Senate, and for the session it was abandoned. The Government did not revive it. I judge from that fact that on further consideration they came to the conclusion that the policy was not a wise one. If that was their conclusion I desire to endorse it very warmly, because I am persuaded that the appointment of a tariff commission is not the best way of dealing with tariff affairs in the Dominion of Canada. There is such a commission in the United States, it is true, but the methods of dealing with these things in the United States are not the same as in our country. I need hardly remind the House that in the United States members of the Government have nothing to do practically with the tariff question. The tariff is dealt with by a committee of Congress. The argument in favour of a tariff commission is that members of the Government cannot, with the thousand and one things they have to do, understand fully the tariff question and deal with it in the best way. Therefore, it is argued, they should have a body of experts to deal with it. I noticed quite recently in the Montreal Gazette, a very influential Conservative paper, revival of the argument in favour of a tariff commission. I want to quote a passage from that article in order that I may answer it. The Montreal Gazette of March 5 says:

> What a permanent tariff commission may recommend, and what the Government may accept, are not necessarily the same thing, and, in any event, Government, and not the commission, must stand or fall by its tariff policy.

That is a very plausible statement, Mr. Speaker, but when we come to analyse it it absolutely fails to carry conviction. See what the situation is. We are told that there ought to be a tariff commission because the minister, the members of the Government, with the thousand and one things they have to do, cannot sufficiently attend to the tariff question. In other words—I do not say it offensively—the theory is that the Government, and the Minister of Finance, who is usually the officer of the Government dealing with such matters, are incompetent to deal with the tariff question. Therefore, they say, we will appoint a tariff commission which is competent. Then, we are told, after the tariff commission has reported, it is for the Government to say whether it will or will not adopt the recommendation. See how strange the situation would be. The Government are, according to the argument, incompetent to deal with the question; therefore, you appoint competent men, and after your competent men have been sitting in judgment and have made a report and decided what we ought to do, you are going to leave it to the incompetent men to decide that they shall set that report aside. The thing is preposterous.

Under our system of government responsibility for the tariff, the greatest taxing machine we have, must rest with the Government and for it they must be responsible to Parliament. Under the custom of our Government the Minister of Finance becomes the proper person to deal with that question. It is certainly to be desired that he shall surround himself with competent help. If he has experts to-day, by all means let him have the benefit of help. If they are not the right ones he will get others. If he needs more help get it by all means; let him surround himself with the best possible help and advice he can get in order that he may do justice to the tariff question as a whole. When that has been done let him take that advice and apply it as he thinks best, bring down his measure to Parliament, but not try to set up any tariff commission between himself and the Parliament of Canada. With that I shall pass away from the tariff question, although it is a very broad and inviting one.

So much has been said about the evils of party politics that I want to say something of the good of party politics. So many hon. gentlemen have told us of the dreadful things that have been done by party politicians. Well, the party system is not perfect. When you say that you only admit that it is a human institution. I am persuaded that those who say that have not fully realized the purpose of the party system. Undoubtedly you can point to harm that has come from party government, but on the other hand, after coming to a calm judgment upon the question, I say you can get better results from party government than from any other kind of government except under certain special circumstances, such as, I frankly say, have existed very lately.

I am going to ask the House to permit me to indulge for about three minutes in a little personal reference. I do not like to intrude my personality upon the House. But I have frequently seen in the public press references to the circumstances under which I had the honour of being elected to this House, and the statements have not always been quite accurate. It seems to me that the point is not important, but if it is

worth while discussing in the press at all perhaps we might as well have the information correct. I was nominated by a Liberal convention. If that is not clear enough and you want something more explicit, I was nominated by a straight Liberal Convention. I was nominated by the same kind of convention, and largely by the same men, as those who had honoured me with nominations for many years before. There was no Unionist convention held or called. My Conservative fellow-citizens held a convention at the same time. They nominated a gentleman as their candidate, and he declined to run. I am advised, and I think I am correct, that they then nominated another gentleman, and he declined to run. Then the convention adjourned. A few days later two gentlemen prominent in the Conservative party did me the honour of calling upon me, and they said that they had been instructed by their party to say that they would be glad if I would agree to accept a nomination from them. They knew that I had already been nominated by my Liberal friends, but they proposed that I should be the nominee of both parties. I told them that it would not be wise that I should accept the suggestion. I appreciated very much their courtesy in intimating that they were not likely to oppose me. We take our politics pretty seriously in Nova Scotia, but however seriously we take our politics down there I am glad to say that in all the years I have had the honour to represent that same constituency my personal relations with my Conservative friends have always been agreeable and I have received a great many courtesies from them. I confess that I was pleased with the intimation I received from them, that they were not likely to give me any opposition. For that courtesy I gave them my warmest thanks, which thanks I repeat here to-day, but I told them that I thought it was best, as I had already been nominated by the Liberal convention, and had accepted the nomination, that I should stand by it. That is the whole situation. Before I was nominated, and after I was nominated, and before I accepted the nomination, I had a heart to heart talk with my Liberal friends. I told them that I was obliged to differ with my leader and with a great many of my friends of the Liberal party on the question of conscription. I told them, whether I was wise or not in doing so, that I supported conscription and that I must take the same position then. I told them that while I thought Union Government had come too late to effect most of its purposes, I realized the difficulty they had in appreciating the situation. While I felt that Union Government would have been much better if it had come three years before, yet, now that it had come, I was disposed to give it an independent support, especially in all matters in any way dealing with the war. One friend of mine in the convention, with that desire for clear and explicit information which I think is characteristic of Liberals, rose and said: "Mr. Fielding, I want to ask you a question: suppose when the elections are coming on —and, of course, this was before the elections—"it turns out that there is a pretty equal division of the parties up there, and the leader of the party moves a vote of want of confidence in the Government, what will you do?" I said, "I will vote against that motion. I feel it to be my duty under the circumstances to give the Government a fair chance to bring forth their measures." That was the situation, Sir, under which I left my constituency. That was my position then, and that is the position which I desire to take to-day. I think the time has not come to bring about a change of Government in this country. I am prepared to-day to play the part of an independent supporter of the Unionist Government. How many hours, days, weeks or months that condition may continue I do not presume to say; but I think I have good reason, satisfactory to myself, why it would not be wise to press for a change of Government at this moment.

In the first place, Sir, the Unionist Government has brought forth a large number of measures designed to meet the conditions which the country is obliged to face. I am willing to admit, Sir, that these gentlemen are honestly and sincerely endeavouring to make the best they can of these arrangements. I do not for a moment believe that these gentlemen have any other desire than to do the best they can in the face of the difficulties which present themselves; and for that reason I would not desire at present to have a change of Government take place. On the various questions that may come up in the House I desire to hold myself free to vote according as my judgment may lead me, and according to the merits of the issue presented. But I say now that unless some new conditions present themselves, unless there is some new situation not visible at this moment, no vote that I shall give will have for its object the turning out of the Government at the present time. There is

another reason which I desire to give. I think it not advisable to make a change of Government now, because I take it for granted that a change of Government will involve a general election, and I do not think it is in the interest of the country, or of any party, that we should now have the strife of a general election. We are too near the last election to permit us to indulge in the hope that an election to-day would be carried on quietly and smoothly; the echoes and the passions of the last election would remain; we would have a bitter contest, and I am not prepared to say which side would win. I do not think, even for the interests of my friends of the Liberal party, that it is wise for them to press to-day for a change of Government. If my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) or any of his friends should to-day move an amendment to the Address I should be obliged to vote against the amendment; I should take the ground that the Government are entitled to carry their Address. That is the first step to be taken in the management of the affairs of the country, and I should be willing to have that done, and to give them a chance to produce their measures.

Another reason, Mr. Speaker—not the highest reason, not the noblest reason—is that I do not think my Liberal friends have yet brought about that degree of unanimity and unity in the party which I believe to be essential to success. Now, I believe that unity is necessary for any party; a party naturally wants unity in order to carry on its organizations; I am sure that desire must be in the minds of my Liberal friends. Surely, we will all agree in that? Then there is a further reason. With all due respect to my Conservative friends—and I speak of them with great respect, because although we differ from them we try to differ as becomes men—I am persuaded that in the conditions which exist to-day, or which will exist very soon, while any Government will have a troubled time, the only Government which can have any hope of meeting the progressive spirit of this country will be a Government dominated by the Liberal party; and that being the case my desire is that we should bring about that unity which seems to me to be essential for all good ends. We will all agree on either side, I am sure, that that unity is desirable. How is it going to be brought about? I have no special prescription to give as to how it may be done, but perhaps I can be helpful in offering some suggestions how not to do it. Unity in the Liberal party is not going to be brought about by the men of either section—for there are two sections—throwing rocks at the other, or calling the other names. Unity in the Liberal party is not going to be brought about by either party assuming towards the other a holier-than-thou attitude; nor by either section assuming that they are in exclusive possession of the ark of the covenant of Liberalism, and that all who do not agree with them are worshipping at the shrine of Tory idolatry. None of these things will bring about Liberal unity.

Lastly, may I say that unity in the Liberal party is not going to be brought about by any kind and generous offer to give Christian forgiveness to the wandering brother. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition made a speech which was admirable in its tone, and moderate throughout; there was hardly anything in it that anybody could take exception to. If I had to take any exception at all it would be to the passage which has been so much talked about, as to the light in the window and the latch string hanging out. My hon. friend I know extended that invitation in the true spirit of Scottish hospitality, but if he will read it carefully again he will find that there is running through it that note of Christian forgiveness to which I referred, as though he were saying, "Poor wandering boys, we are sorry you made such a huge mistake, but if you will come back—we do not say, like the Master, go and sin no more, we say, come and sin no more; and if you will just be good and not do this thing any more you will be welcomed back to the old home". Well, Sir, although I admit that this is all done in the kindest spirit, it jars upon the ears of some of us. If there was a suspicion of something of that kind in the speech of my good friend the leader of the Opposition, there was more than a suspicion of it in the remarks of two or three other hon. gentlemen who spoke. Now, Mr. Speaker, the men who wandered away, if that is the phrase, we are not sure they did wander away; but these men who, for conscience sake, for empire's sake, for what they believed to be right, separated themselves from the friends with whom they were associated, separated themselves from the leader whom they loved—these men are not asking any forgiveness; they have no apologies to offer, they have no regrets to express. They felt that they were right; they feel now that they were right. But I do not wish to insist that they alone were right. They recognize that the question of conscription was a large

one upon which men might differ. They realize that the men who supported conscription and the men who opposed conscription might be equally loyal and patriotic. We who supported conscription did not for a moment, and do not now, question the loyalty or the patriotism of the men who opposed conscription. They were within their rights. If we give them that credit, and do not for a moment question their loyalty or their patriotism, is it too much to ask that similar consideration shall be given to the others? Is it too much to ask now that we shall consider that question one upon which men may honourably differ, and no longer feel that it should be a cause of quarrelling between us? If some of my Liberal friends want to proclaim that the man who supports conscription cannot be a Liberal—and I have heard that almost said in the course of the discussion—then we shall be obliged to point out that if we erred in that respect we erred in good Liberal company. We have already been reminded that we supported conscription along with Mr. Herbert Asquith, the distinguished leader of the Liberal party in England. We supported conscription along with Mr. David Lloyd George, who, though he may be criticised to-day, has surely been a large contributor to the upbuilding of Liberalism in Great Britain. We supported conscription along with five-sixths of the Liberal party in the British House of Commons. We supported conscription along with Lord Crewe and Lord Bryce—James Bryce as we know him better—and all the Liberals in the House of Lords.

We have supported conscription, Sir, in common with the great mass of the Liberals of the Mother Country; we have supported conscription along with the most distinguished figure in the Liberalism of the world to-day, President Woodrow Wilson. If we are able to point to these examples; if we are able to show some reason for what we believed to be right, though we do not insist that we only were right; may we not ask my hon. friends of the Liberal party to revise their judgment on some of these questions? May we not ask them, not to admit that they were wrong, but simply to admit the possibility that the other fellow may have been right; that there may have been two sides to the question? And when my hon. friends invite us to return to the home, when they tell us that the latch string is hanging out, perhaps they would do well—the Scripture says: "Let a man examine himself"—to give a little consideration to the question whether or not the home to which they invite us is really the old homestead; whether it may not be that they, rather than we, have wandered away. The point is worth considering; and with a very old and hackneyed story, which is very appropriate, I will close this portion of my remarks. It is the story of an Indian who was found wandering in the forest. A passer-by stopped him and said: "John, what is the matter, are you lost?" "Lost?" was the answer; "No, Indian not lost; Indian here—wigwam lost."

The speech from the Throne, Mr. Speaker, deals with several matters which, strictly speaking, are of local concern. Legislation is foreshadowed with regard to technical education, to housing schemes, to highways and to public health—all matters which are largely, if not entirely, within the field of the local legislatures. Some of my Liberal friends feel so strongly on the question of provincial rights that they have objected to the Government legislating on these subjects at all. Well, I do not care to go quite so far as that; I would rather have these things done with the help of the Dominion than not have them done at all. The Fathers of Confederation, who are often so highly praised, especially by those who know least about their work, made a sad mess of the financial relations between the Dominion and the provinces. For years efforts have been made to straighten them out, but even yet these relations are hardly satisfactory. The provinces gave up to the Dominion the power of taxation in respect of customs and excise. There is this curious difference between the eastern and the western provinces: the western provinces were created by the Dominion, whereas the eastern provinces created the Dominion; the provinces are the fathers in the East, the Dominion is the father in the West. The eastern provinces, then, surrendered their right of taxation, thus enabling the Dominion to gather into the Federal treasury enormous sums of money. The theory of the scheme was that there was a reservation of a sufficient sum to enable the provinces to carry on their work efficiently. Time very soon proved, Sir, that the provision made for the provinces was entirely inadequate. For some years nothing was done; Sir John A. Macdonald was so proud of the Confederation scheme that he would not permit any change of it, he would not listen to any suggestion of change from the provinces. When the old chief passed away and other people came to the front, somehow or other they listened to the claims of the provinces and once or twice material

changes have been made by which the provinces have been put in a better position to handle their affairs. But, even as it stands to-day, the provinces have not sufficient means. If, then, technical education is desirable; if housing is desirable; if the public health improvement is desirable; even if roads and bridges are desirable, I say at once that while I regret that the provinces are not able to do these things, I am prepared to help the Dominion Government do them rather than have them not done at all.

As to the question of highways, there is a danger. The matter has been before the House in time past, and the impression has seemed to grow that the Dominion Government wished to get control of the highways for party purposes. All I care to say about that is this: if the Dominion Government are to provide money for any given purpose and are to put it in the hands of the local governments, the Dominion Government may reasonably ask assurance that the money shall be applied to that particular purpose. That is a fair provision. If the Dominion Government are to provide money for roads, they should require of the provincial governments the assurance that the money will be spent on road schemes. Beyond that, I do not think that the Government should interfere; they should let the province handle the business and be responsible for it.

And that same principle would apply to other things. In regard to public health, may I say a word? I do not know whether the project of the Government contemplates the creation of a department of public health with a minister at the head of it. We have a good many ministers now; we have been splitting up departments in order to appoint more, and I rather think the Government could arrange this thing without increasing the number of ministers. However, the argument is commonly used that a department of public health will be created at the head of which an eminent medical man will be placed. There are on both sides of this House quite a number of eminent medical men; I have no doubt that there are a dozen men here any one of whom would honourably fill the position of head of a department of public health. At the beginning, then, you would get your medical man. But how long would he continue as head of the department? Unfortunately, we have not arrived at that condition of unity in Canada which enables us to select a man for a department of government irrespective of race, of creed, of province or of division. A vacancy occurs in the cabinet. The question is not, who is the best man for the position? It is: who is the best man for the position within the ranks of the party—necessarily he has to be of the same party—and within the particular division from which he comes? The vacancy may be in respect of a position—I am speaking very frankly—that had been held by a gentleman of the Roman Catholic faith—when you come to fill his place and you are inclined to put a Protestant in the position, you discover that the balance of power would be disturbed if you did that. It may be a case where a vacancy exists out in the western country and there is a medical man somewhere down East, where the wise men come from, whom you would like to put there. But you discover that his province is already occupying all the space it can in the Government; so you cannot take him in. The truth is that under your scheme of putting a medical man at the head of a department of public health, you would have him at the beginning, you might get him once or twice, but by-and-by you would discover that the head of the medical department was probably some respectable farmer, or, more likely, some lawyer—who, I hope, would be respectable.

Now, names do not always mean what they seem to imply. We have a Minister of Agriculture; how often has he been a practical agriculturalist? For many years the Department of Agriculture was presided over by excellent gentlemen who had no particular connection with agriculture. We have a Department of Railways; but when was there a railway engineer at the head of it? Never. These names mean nothing, and the result in this case will be that although you start in with an eminent medical man, in a few years, owing to conditions of party politics, divisional politics, racial politics, religious politics, you will have great difficulty in keeping that man in. It seems to me that if you want to have an eminent medical man preside over that department, the better plan would be to have him act as the head in some other form—as deputy minister, for instance—then he can be there and give the country continuous service. If you put him in as minister of the Crown he may be there a few months, and then he may pass away altogether. I offer that suggestion to my hon. friends in all good faith.

Now I am going to say something on a thorny question—prohibition. I may be told by my friends on your left, Sir, that this is a thorny question which the Government will have to worry over, and that we had better let them do the worrying. I have no desire to treat the question in that way; I would rather be helpful and constructive,

if I could, in the matter. What is the situation to-day? By an Act of the Parliament of Canada—because the Order in Council is equivalent to an Act of Parliament of Canada—supplementing the Acts of the provincial legislatures, we virtually have prohibition over the Dominion to-day. We have actual prohibition in all the provinces save one, and in that province I understand we shall have prohibition on the first day of May. I think it never was, and is not now, the duty of the Government and of this Parliament to take any initiative in legislation on the question of prohibition. I think that is a question on which we might have due regard to the principle of provincial rights. In the olden days, just before Confederation, there were grave difficulties over the form which our constitution should take. There were men who held that we should have a legislative union, one centralised power at Ottawa, whereas, the other side of the question was that we should have a federal union wherein each province should have its own legislature. This idea of a centralized union was a very fascinating one, and I am not surprised to learn, as I do from various sources, that Sir John A. Macdonald, that masterful man, wanted to have a centralised union. He wanted to have everything here at Ottawa under his own thumb. I have rather a liking for that suggestion of a one-man power, under certain limitations, the putting of one man into some central place to do something, taking care to see that you get the right man and then supporting and helping him. That is the way to get things done, that is the way in which the war was won, when Marshal Foch was made the one-man power for the whole of the Allies. So, I rather like this notion within certain limitations. It would, however, never do in Canada. Our territory is too vast; you cannot undertake to deal with all the affairs of this country from the centre at Ottawa. Moreover, there are the differences of race and creed and other things. So the Fathers of Confederation, in their wisdom, determined that we should have a federal union. I think it is right that the question of prohibition should be viewed largely from a provincial standpoint. It was not and is not the duty of this Government to take the initiative in legislation on that question, but it was and is their duty to supplement the legislation of the provinces by such measures as will make the prohibition thoroughly effective. We have at present a Dominion law which provides that prohibition shall exist until the end of the war which, I presume, means until peace is signed, and for one year later. We are told that the Government are now considering what they will do after that. There is a current rumour as to what they intend to do. It is because I think that is a mistake that I am going to venture and presume to offer them advice not to do it. Punch's advice to those about to marry is good here, "Don't." It is presumed that the Government intend to have a referendum or a plebiscite. That statement is not made in the speech from the Throne; we do not have it in any official form; it comes to us by way of leakage, I suppose, from the caucus; and I know leakage from the caucus is very unsafe as basis for argument. But one or two members of the House, perhaps unconsciously, have disclosed the fact. The hon. member for Brandon (Mr. Whidden) and, I think, the hon. member for Macdonald (Mr. Henders) told us that we are going to take a vote on the subject, so we really know what the Government is contemplating. But as the Government have not yet really committed themselves to it, perhaps there is still time for the thought I am offering for their consideration. My view of the matter is that we should not take the responsibility of initiating legislation, but that we should recognize the rights of the provinces. There is a strong movement amongst our temperance friends everywhere to induce the Government to bring forward very stiff legislation. I have no doubt all the members of Parliament have received various circulars on the matter. I have one pamphlet which I will read, because it seems to me to indicate the correct situation. This comes to me from Hamilton, from the International Order of Good Templars, which we are informed is the largest temperance organization in the world. I quote this passage:

> As every province in the Dominion has shown a desire, by the enacting of provincial laws, to prohibit the liquor traffic to the full extent of their constitutional powers, we believe that the time has now arrived when the expressed will of the people should be enacted into Parliamentary laws, and that at the present Session of Parliament, the "Order in Council" legislation, covering importation, manufacture and interprovincial shipment, should be enacted into Parliamentary legislation.
>
> We think that no further vote of the people is necessary, other than that expressed by the various provinces.

That seems to be sound reasoning. If the various provinces of this Dominion, through their Governments and legislatures, see fit, in their wisdom, to adopt a prohibitory law, and if, as is the fact, they find that, owing to constitutional difficul-

ties, they cannot make that law effective, it is the duty of the Dominion Government and Parliament to give them such supplementary legislation as will make the law effective.

There was a time years ago when there was a great deal of difficulty over this temperance question. Both the Dominion Parliament and the local legislatures claimed the right to deal with it. We had the Dominion License law. This was one of the things over which those two gladiators, Sir John A. Macdonald and Sir Oliver Mowat, fought, with the usual result that Sir Oliver Mowat won and the Dominion License law was declared to be ultra vires. The Dominion courts have established the fact that in respect to importation, exportation and manufacture, the Dominion Parliament will control, but as respects the retail sale the local Parliament will control. Let me give the House an illustration how this works. There is a prohibitory law in the province of Nova Scotia. There are a number of brewers in the province. The Halifax brewer cannot sell his beer to the consumer in Halifax, but he can ship it over to an agent in St. John, and then the Halifax consumer can write to the St. John agent and order it sent back. Thus he can get the Halifax beer if he wants it, but he has to pay the price of the beer and two railway freights in order to get it. The thing is preposterous. Seeing, therefore, that we should make prohibition effective, my advice to the Government is this: Do not take the initiative; make our legislation supplementary to the provincial law. I agree with the statement made by the International Order of Good Templars that there is no need for a referendum. I respectfully advise the Government that if there is to be a plebiscite or a referendum, they should leave that to the provinces. I do not believe there is any need for a referendum at all. There is no need for one in my constituency nor in my province. There is no question down there. My constituency stands for prohibition; the province of Nova Scotia stands for prohibition; they do not want any referendum, they do not want any plebiscite. My impression is that if the Government adopt the system of a referendum, they will cause further difficulties. I think it would be sound and safe for them to say that so long as any province, by its legislation, desires to have prohibition and to give the full effect of prohibition which its local constitution will permit, the Dominion Government will supplement that by such Dominion legislation as will make that prohibition thoroughly effective. That is a policy which is consistent with this demand of the temperance people. It is consistent with the doctrine of provincial rights to which so many people attach importance, and it is an easier solution of the question than any other method which could be adopted.

I want to speak about three or four other subjects but I am afraid I am occupying too much time, so I will ask your attention to only one or two. We are to have legislation respecting the franchise. I do not know what that means. It is a deplorable fact that every franchise Bill introduced into this House has been the subject of bitter party strife and contention. The impression seems to exist that a Franchise Bill, no matter who introduces it, is always designed to serve the interests of one party or the other and consequently it is always resisted by the people on the other side whether it be in a provincial legislature or in this House. Why should this be? We all ought to agree that the franchise is something sacred, and we all ought to be willing to agree that every man and woman in this country entitled to vote should have his and her name placed on the voters' list. We should not create a condition of affairs which will tempt men to make a struggle not only to get on the lists the names of their friends but to keep off the names of those who might vote the other way. There has, unfortunately, been trouble over this question in times past. Why should we have two franchise lists? In most of the provinces, practically all, one might say, there is practically manhood and womanhood suffrage to-day. A man with any pretence to doing almost anything is entitled to vote, and I am glad to say the women also have that right to-day. Why should we go through the form of making up one list for the provinces and another for the Dominion? The voters have to be the same set of people, and why should there not be co-operation between the Dominion and the Provincial Governments to try and agree upon a common list? This is not a new hope of mine. Thirty-four years ago, in the early days of my premiership of Nova Scotia, I saw the trouble in having two voters' lists, and I ventured to send a telegram to Sir John A. Macdonald suggesting a conference between the Dominion and Provincial Governments in the hope of agreeing on one common list. In those days representatives of the Dominion and Provincial Governments never met

in conference. There always seemed to be friction between them, even when both were of the same political party. I am glad that a better condition has prevailed in later years. The Dominion Government has repeatedly invited the premiers of the different provinces to come in consultation, and I commend them for doing so; I think it was a wise thing. Then why should we not bring them together to consider this question of the franchise, and let them meet on common ground without any partisanship at all? I think the offer is worth making at all events, and I earnestly commend that suggestion to the consideration of the Government.

That brings me to another question on which I cannot hope to have my views endorsed generally. I want to agree with those gentlemen who have urged that the War-time Elections Act be repealed as quickly as possible. It is an amazing thing that men can permit themselves to stand up and support a measure of that kind. We talk sometimes of alien enemies in connection with the franchise. There are no alien enemies in that connection. The men to whom protection should be given, the men who have been unjustly treated, are British subjects, and if they were of foreign birth that is all the more reason why they should be treated justly, because they are guests in our house and a guest is always entitled to protection. How did they come to us in Canada? We sent out agents and literature into the highways and byways of continental Europe, begging men to come to Canada and settle on the land. We pictured an alluring situation where land was open for all. We assured these people of every privilege; we told them the land could be had cheaply, and that if they came here and after a certain time took the oath of allegiance to our gracious Sovereign, they would become Canadian citizens and British subjects. They came and settled here and served their time of probation. They did everything a decent citizen could do. Suddenly they wakened up one day to find that they had lost the highest prize of citizenship—the right to vote. Why? There was no concealment about it, there was no pretense of there being any other reason for disfranchising these people than that the Government believed they would vote against them. Surely, that was no reason at all.

Mr. Speaker, we shall need these men and others like them. There is one great asset of any nation, of any people, and of any individual; it is character, reputation, good faith. I made a little tour of the West Indies a few years ago, and as I went from island to island I was much impressed, as any thoughtful men must have been, by the condition I found there. The population everywhere was black or coloured, except for a handful of white people on each island. In some cases the number of whites would be larger than in others, but in every instance they constituted a small minority. And yet this handful of white men were directing and governing these islands in the midst of peace, progress, and prosperity. I asked a very intelligent coloured man with whom I was conversing how his people got along in such a situation. "Oh," he said, "it is very simple. These white men are Englishmen." I know he used the word in its broadest sense, not in the narrow sense in which we sometimes use it. "Englishman" means more than England —"What do they know of England who only England know?" The Scotchman, and the Irishman too, is sometimes offended at the use of the word "Englishman" in its narrow sense, but it was Thomas Campbell, himself a Scotchman, who wrote "Ye mariners of England who guard our native seas." England means more than one part of one little island; it means the Motherland, and sometimes the Empire at large. Well, this coloured man said, "The reason we get along so well is because these white men you speak of are Englishmen, and our people have learned that we can trust the honour and faith and justice of an Englishman." Thank Heaven for that reputation of Englishmen which is the inheritance of Britons everywhere—except in Canada.

A few months ago I heard an address delivered in the Canadian Club of Montreal by a clergyman who had spent much of his life in Eastern countries, particularly in Egypt and amongst the tribes of the desert. He told with much pride and satisfaction of the achievements of Englishmen in that region and of what England was doing to further civilization in the East. Speaking of the reputation which Englishmen possessed, he said that among one of the tribes which he knew very well it was a common thing for a man, if he wanted to give you the assurance that he would do a certain thing, to say, "By the word of an Englishman I promise it." A few days ago I heard a statement very much like that by a gentleman from South America. He was telling of the opportunities of trade down there, where we hope to do a large amount of business, and he said that Englishmen are doing a big business there and are going to keep it, "because our people trust the Englishman." And he used the very words of the clergyman, "It is a common thing for a

man if he wants to give you an assurance that he will do a certain thing to say, 'By the word of an Englishman I promise it.'" Sir, we ought to be proud of that reputation which Englishmen—and Englishmen means Britons—have won throughout the wide world. Who can say to-day with fairness and justice, "By the word of a Canadian I will do it." The word of a Canadian, tried by the War-time Elections Act, is a word of trickery, a word of deception, the word of a cheat. We shall need immigrants in our country, more backs to bear the heavy burden that is coming. From what countries are we to obtain them? We want as many as we can get from Great Britain for the more British people we have in the country the better. No doubt there will be many immigrants from the United States.

No better immigrants come to Canada than those from the western United States But with all that, we are not going to have enough, and shall be compelled to send our agents abroad again. In such an event, I can imagine the agent going to one of the continental towns and talking about emigration to Canada. He has a group of men around him, and one man, who has paid particular attention to all that he has said, declares that he knows all about Canada, his brother having come to this country. The agent will suggest that perhaps he would like to follow his brother's example. "No," the man will say: "an agent like you came here a few years ago to our house and told precisely the same story you are telling now, about the attractiveness of Canada as a country of great opportunities where land could be obtained very cheaply if not free. I could not go, but my brother went, taking with him his little family. He built a home, settled down, took the oath of allegiance, and did all in his power to become a good citizen. With what result? You robbed him of his franchise. Let us pray, Mr. Speaker, that the time may soon come again when a man may be able to say, "Upon the word of a Canadian I can depend!"

One further thought only will I intrude on the House. Sir, I want to say in conclusion that I would like to see a strong plea made for a free parliament. "A free parliament?" you say; "have we not a free parliament now?" No! We had not a free parliament last year; and if the same policy of the Government be again adhered to, we are not likely to have a free parliament now. What was the situation at the opening of the first session of the new parliament? My conception of the situation was this: I felt that on matters relating to the prosecution of the war, the Government ought to be strongly supported, certainly by their friends; and I thought they might even claim support from their opponents. But I believed that on all questions not connected with the war every man in the House of Commons should be at liberty to act according to the dictates of his conscience. Was that an erroneous conception? Was there anything unreasonable in that? I think not. Yet, what happened? Before the session had advanced very far, I discovered that my conception of political freedom, as I have just indicated, was one in which my right hon. friend the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) did not share. On several occasions, on matters in no way connected with the prosecution of the war, the Whips were used to rally men to the support of a particular question; and then in the conclusion came that extraordinary scene in connection with the question of titles. The question was not important in itself. Whether a man votes for or against titles, is not, to my mind, of very great moment; but the manner in which this Parliament was strangled is unquestionably a matter in which we are gravely concerned. A motion was before the House presented by one supporter of the Government; and there was an amendment by another supporter of the Government. These matters were discussed for days and weeks, and every hon. member thought he had a right to freedom of action. Then one night the Prime Minister announced that if a certain course were not followed he would resign. This, Sir, in the midst of war, and at a very critical stage of it, too! On such a trifling pretext the Prime Minister of Canada was prepared to precipitate a political crisis that might have thrown the country into the throes of another general election. I ask my hon. friends on both sides of the House to stand up for a free Parliament. In a democratic country such as this, we may not all be able to agree on every question. I know I differ from some of my friends on this as well as the other side of the House; but I always endeavour to respect their views and opinions when I feel that they are acting conscientiously; and I ask them to do the same by me. One thing I do very earnestly ask them to do, and that is, to insist on freedom of debate, freedom of speech. We might have seen in England, about the same time, a fine example of a free, as contrasted with a strangled, Parliament. The Government had an important Bill before Parliament. An amendment

was made by the House of Lords—rather an important amendment—and when it came down to the House of Commons there was displayed the true spirit of British parliamentary liberty; for the Government said on this question of the amendment: We do not regard it as vital, and we leave it to the very open judgment of the House. And the amendment which the House of Lords desired to make to the Government Franchise Bill was rejected. There, Sir, you have an example of a free parliament as compared with the parliament which we had in Canada. I trust that both Grit and Tory—if there are such people—will hereafter have the satisfaction of knowing that above everything else hon. members will stand for a free parliament representing a free people.

9 p.m.

Mr. ROBERT KING ANDERSON (Halton): Mr. Speaker, perhaps I may be permitted to preface my remarks with a reference to the distinguished statesman who has so recently passed away, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier. From the time I took any interest in political affairs he was a dominating figure in Canadian public life. Although not his follower politically, I always gave to him a large measure of admiration and respect. I admired him for his rare gift of oratory, for his outstanding ability, for his commanding figure, and for his courtly presence. He carved his name enduringly on the period in which he lived. Full of years and honours, in the evening of manhood's day, when the thread of life was growing thin he passed away. Already he is like a fragrant flower that has faded and gone. His passing marks the close of a period in Canadian history. We are now writing the title page of a new epoch in our national life, an epoch full of great promise and pregnant with the most wonderful possibilities. I feel I voice the sentiments, irrespective of their political affiliations, of the people of the county. I represent in this House when I express their appreciation of the great service which Sir Wilfrid Laurier rendered to the State. I also feel that I voice the unanimous sentiment of the citizens of the county of Halton when I extend to the widow of the departed statesman their deepest, their most profound sympathy.

I was somewhat nervous in rising to follow so eminent a gentleman as the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). I must confess, however, that the hon. member is a puzzle to me, and I am sure he is a puzzle to the hon. members of the Opposition. During the first part of his speech he received considerable applause from the Opposition benches. Hon. members on that side were prepared to rejoice more at the return of one sinner than over the ninety and nine who had no need of repentance. Mr. Speaker, I thought the hon. gentleman was going to step off the fence, but I see he is still in the same position he occupied at the last session of this Parliament. I heartily concur in the remarks which he made during the latter part of his speech, but there are some inconsistencies in the first part of it. He asked the question, what business had Canada at the Peace Conference? For answer to that question I would refer him to the speech of the hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell). The hon. gentleman claims that Canada has no right to representation at the Conference. Now, his attitude is rather inconsistent in view of the fact that he upheld the Union Government in the prosecution of the war. He approved of the sending of soldiers to France and Belgium, and if we took part in the conflict, is it not reasonable that we should have a right to have some say at the Conference? Surely the hon. gentleman will not contend that although we sent soldiers to fight the enemy we should have no voice in the discussion of the peace terms.

The hon. member said that Canada had not gained one cubit. It is not one cubit but many cubits that this country has gained because of the glorious action of our soldiers in establishing this country in such a prominent position among the nations of the earth, a position which it would not have attained otherwise in fifty years. That is one of the results of our taking part in the European conflict. In regard to our taking part in the Peace Conference the hon. gentleman made mention of the boundaries of the nations of Europe, but he thinks that we should not have any interest in that conference because we have no interest in these various boundaries. I would submit to him that disputes over the boundaries of Europe have been the cause of deluging that continent for a thousand years with blood. If by going into this conference and assisting in bringing about a certain measure of satisfaction with the boundaries that are established we can in the future prevent wars, we shall have done a great deal not only for the Dominion of Canada but for the whole world.

I should like to compliment the hon. gentlemen who moved and seconded the Address in reply to the speech from the Throne. I compliment them on the very

eloquent and efficient manner in which they performed that very responsible duty. Their remarks were most happy and reflected great credit upon themselves and upon the administration for making the selection. Their sentiments in regard to our gallant soldiers will find an answering echo in the hearts of all true Canadians. The heroism, sacrifice and glorious achievements of our citizen soldiers is a theme to inspire some Canadian poet to perpetuate their memory in immortal verse. But, our soldiers do not want to be immortalized. They want to be repatriated in the most effective and speedy manner possible. The Union Government was elected for that purpose. In their wisdom the people of Canada chose this Government to perform that duty. There is no lack of confidence amongst the members of this side of the House in the ability of the Government to live up to the expectations of the people. Liberal Unionists and Conservative Unionists alike gave up their party affiliation in order to come together on common ground in support of a coalition Government. We did that in the stress and turmoil of a great war brought together by a common interest, a common bond and a common danger that raised us far above the petty issues of political strife.

There is not any doubt that in the estimation of the people of Canada a non-partisan government is the best form of government to settle the many vexed questions which will come up for settlement during the reconstruction period. The tariff issue, that bone of contention between the East and the West, can undoubtedly be settled better by a cabinet which is representative of the two great political parties in this country than by any other form of government. If a non-partisan government cannot settle that question to the satisfaction of the people no partisan government can. If the members of this House will view that question with reference to what is in the best interests of Canada as a whole, and not from the point of view of any sectional interest, the path of the Government will be strewn with roses instead of thorns.

The hon. member for Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. J. Read)—and I give the hon. gentleman credit for stating many plain truths in his own inimitable way—expressed a wish for a commission to inquire into the tariff and bring in a policy that would be satisfactory to all political parties. I would like to ask the hon. gentleman if he is not satisfied with the present Government composed, as it is, of the leading members of those political parties. Surely, that ought to be satisfactory to any man, even the most exacting.

Possibly the hon. gentleman meant a commission representative of the Opposition in this House, but I reply that the Opposition in this House is not representative of true Liberalism. It is the personal following of the late, lamented leader whose vacant chair so eloquently reminds us that he is no more. It is a striking tribute to his great worth and personal charm that so many gave to him their undivided allegiance. I would like to tell the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) whilst congratulating him on his elevation to that honourable post, that he cannot expect to lead a National Liberal party on a provincial policy dominated by a single province. It is a significant fact that the dividing line between the parties in this House is the defence of our common country. The light is in the window indeed, but it is sadly dimmed by the mists of political prejudice and narrow provincialism. Under such circumstances it becomes the red light of danger giving due warning to all true Liberals to seek congenial companionship elsewhere.

In this country we have quite a large number of defaulters, conscientious objectors and deserters. I have classed the conscientious objector along with the others because a great many of the conscientious objectors were not aware of their objections until the passing of the Military Service Act. The sincere conscientious objector whose objection to military service is based upon his religious faith is entitled to some consideration, and I believe the Government have given that class of man certain consideration. I think it may be laid down as a principle that he who receives and accepts the protection due to a British subject has placed upon him the obligation to defend those institutions that give him protection. Those institutions are founded on the ballot; by force of arms they have survived. They have descended to us from preceding generations and are consecrated in the blood of a long line of noble ancestors. Their defence is the common duty of all. The conscientious objector or defaulter who refuses to defend his country in time of war has no right to the exercise of the legislative function in time of peace. The vote is essentially a legislative act. By it laws are enacted and laws are repealed. He who

refuses to defend this fundamental principle of democracy has no right to the exercise of its privileges.

I would therefore suggest to the Government that since the war is over the imprisonment of the conscientious objector, the defaulter and deserter is expensive and ineffective. The system of meting out punishment by means of a fine has more to commend it. But I think, Mr. Speaker, that, taking everything into consideration, the best punishment is disfranchisement for life and I would recommend that respectfully to the consideration of the Government. I would make a plea also for more uniformity in the punishment of the defaulter. It is not very edifying to see a defaulter in the province of Ontario given a large fine or a long term of imprisonment when a defaulter in the province of Quebec, equally guilty, is let off with a nominal fine or a few hours imprisonment. In this connection I would cite a case that occurred in Hull just a few days ago. This is from an Ottawa paper, I think the edition of Wednesday:

> Twelve absentees under the Military Service Act who came before Magistrate Goyette in the Hull Police Court yesterday escaped with the exceedingly light penalty of six hours in jail each.
>
> In view of the recent passage of an Order in Council which provides a minimum penalty for this class of offender of $250 or three months in jail, the presiding magistrate was asked for an explanation.
>
> "These twelve men were brought before me over two weeks ago," stated Magistrate Goyette, "but for various reasons their cases were not ready to be disposed of until this morning. In view of these circumstances I did not deem it would be fair to impose a new penalty on them, when, if their cases had been disposed of when they were first arrested, they would have gotten off with the usual fine of $50 or $75.
>
> "I therefore imposed a term of six hours in jail on each of them, without the option of a fine. You must remember that even one hour in jail, to any one with any self respect, is as big a punishment as a longer term. In future, absentees and defaulters coming before me will be treated under the new Order in Council."

I am sure, Mr. Speaker, that the average defaulter and deserter has not very much self-respect, and a punishment in the shape of six hours in jail is altogether inadequate for his offence. I would call the attention of the Government to the fact that the Orders in Council which have been passed for the purpose of dealing with this inequality of punishment do not meet the case. I have not seen any Order in Council providing for a minimum punishment of three months in jail. There was an Order in Council modifying the first Order issued in December, 1917, with regard to defaulters, which was amended on the 12th February, and later on the 24th of February. If any other Orders in Council have been promulgated since that date, I have not seen any copy of the Canada Gazette which contains them. The last Order in Council provides for a minimum fine of $250, and a maximum fine of $5,000. The term of imprisonment is to be up to two years. Now, Mr. Speaker, I submit that that leaves entirely too much to the discretion of the magistrate, and there consequently is too much room for discrimination in the punishment of defaulters in different parts of the Dominion.

With regard to aliens within our country, there are something like two thousand in internment camps. I am in accord with the policy of the Government that these men shall be returned to their native land at the first opportunity. But I would go further, and possibly the Government intends to do so; I would confiscate the property of those aliens, and even their earnings, leaving them only sufficient to start in a small way in their native land. There are other foreigners, however, in our country who are not enemy aliens, and these men, when they measure up to the standard of Canadian citizenship, should be given a chance; but in every instance, where their interests conflict with the interests of the returned soldier, they should give way to him.

I am pleased to compliment the Government on bringing in a Bill providing for a new franchise, and giving the women the full right to vote. But I am not in accord with hon. gentlemen on the opposite side when they claim that enemy aliens should be given a vote as before. I hope to see it provided that the enemy aliens, whether they are in this country now or come here later, shall not get the vote for at least a generation. With regard to foreigners who are not enemy aliens, I think they should be given the vote after a certain time, but not until after seven or ten years' residence in this country, and that an educational test should be applied to them; they should be required to write and read the English language and to have some knowledge of our institutions, to comprehend what the flag stands for and to understand the responsibility of Canadian citizenship. If they cannot master these things in ten years they certainly are unfit for Canadian citizenship.

The pensions which are given to our soldiers at the present time, particularly the

pensions to the totally disabled soldier, are entirely inadequate, with the cost of living as we have it to-day. It is possible, Mr. Speaker, that when this country has got back to more stable conditions of peace that indadequacy may disappear. I think if there is one very definite thing in this country it is the fact that the people, the members of Parliament and the Government are desirous that the Canadian soldier shall receive the highest amount of pension compatible with his disability. I think the people of this country intend to be generous in this respect, and they are desirous that the totally disabled soldier shall receive a pension sufficient to keep him well above want during the remainder of his life. A pension of $600 is certainly not sufficient for that purpose under the present scale of living.

I would like to draw the attention of the Government to the attitude of the Pensions Board toward the average soldier who comes before them for a pension. The returned soldier claims that the attitude of the Pensions Board toward him is to keep the pension down as low as possible compatible with his disability. That is rather a parsimonious attitude. That is not the intention of the Government. It is possible that the returned soldier mistakes the attitude of the Pensions Board, but I bring this matter to the attention of the Government in order that they may inquire into it if they deem it necessary. I believe that it is better the Pensions Board should err on the side of generosity than that any soldier should be unfairly treated.

The soldier suffering from pulmonary tuberculosis is in a class by himself. In discussing that question I shall approach it from the viewpoint of the physician. I have seen something of the terrible ravages of this disease on the human organism. I know something of its deceptive character, its tendency to become latent, and its tendency to recur. The contention of the soldier is that the Pensions Board rather treats these cases from a mathematical viewpoint. The tubercle bacilli attack the lung and cause a certain part of it to die and slough off. If the patient is strong enough to resist the sloughing process the lung heals by a process of cicatrization and contraction. This places more work on the heart and causes a lessened power of areation of the blood. The soldier is not as strong as he was before, and is liable to break down under strain. The Pensions Board, after this disease has become latent, measures the disability of the soldier by the amount of cicatrization of the lung. I contend that the disability is not always in proportion to the amount of cicatrization of the lung, because in some instances the soldier may be more liable to other diseases; he may not have a strong constitution, and so will break down more easily under strain, and will show more constitutional effects from the same amount of cicatrization of the lung than another person. These soldiers are first treated in a sanatorium, and when the disease becomes latent are sent up before the Pensions Board, and given temporary pensions for six months.

That, I believe, has latterly been extended to one year. At the end of that time, if they remain healthy, they again come before the Pensions Board and are re-examined. The condition of the lung is then stated and the amount of permanent pension apportioned accordingly. If they again have an attack of the disease they are entitled to go to a sanatorium for free treatment, receiving during the period of their treatment pay and allowances the same as if they were on active service. When they are finally cured there is no readjustment of the pension. I think there should be a readjustment of the pension after each attack, because the lung is in a worse condition after each attack than it was at first. I bring this point to the attention of the Government in the hope that they will look into these statements and see whether they are accurate. They are given to me by the tubercular soldiers themselves.

Up to 31st March, 1918, 3,648 soldiers had been treated for tuberculosis, and at that time there were under treatment 1,619 men, distributed all over Canada in 21 sanatoria.

The Civil Service Commission has been attacked by the member for West Toronto (Mr. Hocken) and has been defended by an hon. minister (Hon. A. K. Maclean). At the last session of this Parliament an Act was passed under which the Civil Service Commission was given charge of appointments to the Outside Service. In passing that Act Parliament's express purpose was to do away with the evils of patronage. It was expected that these duties would be carried out by the Civil Service Commission efficiently, expeditiously, without suspicion of wrongdoing. In my opinion, the placing of appointments in the hands of a Civil Service Commission does not entirely do away with patronage; we simply centralize it in Ottawa. The work of many is put into the hands of the few. It does not require the mind of a statesman to understand that if this work is not carried on in a proper and honest manner the gravest abuses may re-

sult. An army of something like 50,000 men and women are under the control of the Civil Service Commission at Ottawa. This commission is composed of three members, who are supposed to do all that work. I submit that the number of members of the commission should be increased. They have a secretary, who is not a member of the commission, but its servant. The secretary should have nothing whatever to do with appointments made under the commission; I assume that he has nothing to do with them. If the commission delegate their authority to him or to any one else, then there is no need for the commission and they should be removed from office.

The members of Parliament have some interest in this commission. They created the machinery under which it is operating, and if there is anything wrong with it they should be taken into the confidence of the Government in regard to the matter. The charges that were made by the member for West Toronto were replied to by the minister, but not all of them were refuted; the gravest charge of all, that with regard to the sale of examination papers to prospective candidates, has been admitted. At the trial in Ottawa a few days ago the person who was responsible for the sale of these particular papers was convicted and fined $100. I must say that it was a surprise to me to see that the commission or the Government were not represented at that trial. It is reported in the press that Mr. Foran, the secretary of the commission, expressed surprise at the verdict; apparently he did not know that the trial was taking place. I should think it was his duty and the duty of the commission to have known and to have been represented there by a lawyer who would see that all the facts were brought out. For the sale of these examination papers the commission is directly responsible. The sale of examination papers is certainly a very reprehensible act, and it is the duty of the commission to make every effort to discover how the leakage came about and who the guilty party is. Parliament demands that the truth be known. No one will be hurt by the truth except the guilty party, and he should be exposed and punished.

I compliment the Government upon its intention to institute a Federal Department of Health. The member for South Toronto (Mr. Sheard) placed the matter so well before the House that there is not much for me to say. I should like to associate myself, however, with the remarks of that hon. gentleman on this subject, and to impress upon the Government the advisability of having this department placed under a qualified medical man. Many medical men may be found in Canada who are eminently qualified to fill that position with satisfaction to themselves and with credit to the Government.

While on this subject I should like to make a few remarks with regard to the wonderful advance of medical science all over the world. Great advance has been made in other branches of science, particularly in the manufacture of destructive agencies of war—the only marvel is that flesh and blood could stand up against these great engines of destruction. Great advance has been made in the science of transportation, both on water and in the air. But, Mr. Speaker, I submit that the advances in medical, surgical and sanitary sciences have been equal to those made in any other branch of science. This war could not have taken place successfully on the western front had it not been for the wonderful advance in preventive medicine. By virtue of the discoveries in that branch, almost all kinds of infectious disease, such as typhoid fever, smallpox, diphtheria, and so on, have been eliminated from the armies. The deaths on the battle front from disease have been remarkably small; our returning soldiers who are casualties suffer principally from the effects of wounds, and very little from the effects of disease.

Mr. Speaker, I should be scarcely doing my duty if I did not give some little voice to my feelings with regard to our gallant Canadian soldiers. The day after England declared war on Germany the young men of Canada commenced their steady tramp, to the recruiting offices all over the country; from the east to the west, from the north to the south, they came offering their services in defence of the Empire. It was the most inspiring spectacle ever presented to the world by the colonial possessions of any country; it was a wonderful concrete evidence of the mighty colonizing power of England. For a thousand years the sons of Britain have been going out from her shores to the farthermost corners of the earth, carrying with them the principles of truth, justice and liberty; carrying with them the tenets of the Christian faith and the foundation principles of democracy; until now, in the twentieth century, at the call of the motherland, the descendants of these adventurous Britishers rushed to her defence in the most stupendous conflict of history. Five hundred thousand of the sons of Canada answered that call, and fighting side by side with the soldiers

of the British Isles, gallantly upheld the best traditions of British arms. Sixty thousand of those sons of Canada, in the dawn of their manhood, gave up their all, in order that democracy might live. They are sleeping the sleep that knows no waking on the vine-clad slopes of northern France, and the blood-sodden fields of Belgium, a silent army whose memory will remain green in the hearts of the Canadian people so long as we cherish British ideals. It is the duty of the Canadian people so to live and act as to be worthy of the great sacrifices they have made. It is our duty to divest ourselves of political prejudices and selfish motives and stand solidly behind the Government in its efforts to do all that is possible for these returning heroes. It is our duty to restrain fanaticism and war-time hysteria and stand steady and firm in support of the Allied Conference now holding its sessions in Paris; so to support their hand against enemy aggression that the glorious victory which our soldiers have won in the field may be followed by a diplomatic victory commensurate with the sacrifices they have made. Unless we do that, we shall be unworthy of those splendid men now returning to their native land, secure in their confidence of a duty well performed, and with a fond expectation in their hearts which we at home fail to understand.

Mr. DUNCAN CAMPBELL ROSS (West Middlesex): Mr. Speaker, at this hour it is not my intention to weary the House with a long speech. I intend to cut my remarks as short as I possibly can, consistently with what I consider my duty to my people.

I have much pleasure in joining with the other members on both sides of the House in complimenting the mover and the seconder of the Address. They have conducted themselves with great gallantry on the field, and they have spoken very eloquently and well in this House, dealing in a most statesmanlike manner with the public matters that were mentioned in the Address.

I must also compliment the hon. and gallant member for Skeena (Lt.-Col. Peck) upon the delightful and instructive address he delivered in this House this afternoon. He has performed for me a task which I had intended to perform and has done it much better than I could possibly do it myself. He has military knowledge from which to gather his conclusions. He has knowledge which comes from being present almost when these occurrences which are spoken of in this House happened, and he is here as a representative of the people, and trying, and I have no doubt successfully trying, to do his duty by his brother officers who have carried themselves so nobly in this great struggle. As a Canadian I was very sorry to hear aspersions cast on officers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House in this debate. These men are not here to defend themselves. It is very easy to cast aspersions or to put blame on any person, and it is very hard to overtake these aspersions once they have gone amongst the public. The hon. member for Skeena took up the defence of my fellow-countryman, Sir Arthur Currie, and I think there is no doubt in the mind of any hon. member in this House, nor do I think there will be any doubt in the mind of any man in this country, in regard to his action, his gallantry, his courage, his solicitude for his men, after hearing the remarks that fell from the lips of the hon. member for Skeena. The hon. member spoke of Sir Arthur Currie as a soldier; I have known him for years; I can speak of him as a man. The insinuation was made that Sir Arthur Currie wantonly sacrificed the lives of Canadian soldiers for his own glorification and to satisfy his own ambition. As an intimate acquaintance of that gallant gentleman I resent any such insinuation. Sir Arthur Currie is the last man in the British Empire who would be guilty of such conduct. I know him well, almost from boyhood. There is not a gentleman with a more kindly heart in this great land. That is the last thing he would do. As a matter of fact I know from eye-witnesses, who have been with Sir Arthur Currie after the victorious onslaught of our Canadian boys, who have seen him viewing the death and devastation that onslaught has occasioned, and I can say with confidence, believing it is true, that that general who is blamed here to-day for being heartless in regard to the use of his men, was so affected by the sights he saw, by the lives of Canadians that had been sacrificed, that he could not suppress his grief and openly burst into tears. Selfish ambition and self-glorification are made of sterner and coarser stuff than that. I believe, if a public investigation is held, or if this matter is further discussed in this House, Sir Arthur Currie will be absolutely cleared of all these suspicions, and I believe he deserves nothing but praise and thanks from this great Canadian people. It would be a strange thing if this gallant soldier, who has been honoured, not only by Britain but by France and Italy with the highest

military distinctions that have been given, should not have been worthy of those honours. Casualties may have happened amongst the Canadian troops. We know they did happen. You cannot win a great victory without such things happening. But we must not forget, as was pointed out by the hon. member for Skeena this afternoon, that Sir Arthur Currie was only a cog in the big machine; that he had not charge of the forces of the Allies; that he was not the generalissimo; that he was only a sub-general; that he had to take his orders and had to obey them, just as he had to give orders and they had to be obeyed. I contend, with a considerable feeling of resentment, that it is not fair, in the absence of this man, who has covered himself with glory, to have attacks made on him in this House.

The Address speaks of our duty to our soldiers. The appreciation and gratitude of the nations cannot be too earnestly and sincerely expressed to the gallant members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force. I wish to join with the members of the House who have tried well and successfully to express their gratification at the honour and glory the Canadian soldiers have brought to this country of ours. The glory has been not only the glory of the officers, but the glory of the soldiers. Some one has said that this war was a war of lieutenants, and it is true that these gallant, heroic young Canadian officers have paid an immense toll in order that liberty may prevail in the world and in order that Canada may be a free nation.

But the glory of winning this war is not due to them alone; it is not due solely to the officers nor to Sir Arthur Currie. I quite agree with what was said by the hon. member who seconded the Address (Mr. Manion) that the greater part of the glory for winning this war belongs to the infantryman in the ranks—the man who went over the top and grappled with the Germans in no man's land, and after taking the Hun trenches marched on to his objective, the German front. He is the man who suffered most, who underwent the greatest hardships, who risked most, and it is to him the greater part of the glory for winning this war should go.

We cannot do our duty by merely expressing our gratitude and appreciation of the services of these men. The men themselves and the people of this country want deeds, not words, in dealing with our returned soldiers, and one thing which the soldiers want and which the people of this country want is their return to the shores of Canada as quickly as possible. The soldiers are quite right in wanting to get back home as quickly as possible. I appreciate as keenly as any hon. member in this House the difficulties in the way due to the shortage of shipping, for instance. I appreciate the necessity of other troops also getting home, and I appreciate trade necessities in connection with this problem. But what I say is this, and I feel I shall be backed up by the whole country: It is a strange thing that during the four or five months since the armistice was signed only about one hundred thousand men have been brought back to Canada whereas, if I am correctly informed, the American Government has been successful in bringing back from the front about a million of her men. We have been engaged for almost five years in this struggle. Some of our boys have been over there ever since the war began; many of them have been there two or three years. The Americans only went into the war on the 6th of April, 1917, and have therefore been at the front a comparatively short time. They have not been subjected to the hardships our boys have undergone, nor played the part our noble boys have played, and I say it is the bounden duty of this Government to make efforts much more vigorous than they have made up to now to see that our soldiers are returned to this country and to civil life at the very earliest opportunity. It should not need a mutiny in a camp with disastrous results to life and limb to wake up the Overseas Minister of Militia in regard to this matter. As the speech from the Throne intimated the Government had known for some time that an armistice would be declared so they had plenty of time in which to prepare for the return of our soldiers. I attribute the lack of speed in this matter to the absence of unity of command in our military affairs. I think that if the return of the troops had been handled by the Minister of Militia in Canada instead of by these gentlemen overseas the men would have been returned much more quickly. I fear the reports we read in the papers are only too true, that the knights we send over to England to look after our officers as High Commissioner and as Overseas Minister of Militia are likely more concerned, as Canadians going over there are apt to become, with pink teas, social functions, dinners at the Mansion House, and their own self-glorification, than attending to the duties they are sent there to perform.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) the other day made the startling statement that in the coming year this country

would have a deficit of $100,000,000. It this Government wants to save money I can conceive of no better way than by getting our boys back from overseas at the earliest possible date. That is one reason why they should be brought back more speedily. For the 250,000 or 300,000 of our men it is costing this country $3 a day each which amounts to an expenditure of from half to three-quarters of a million dollars a day. Every day that brings their discharge nearer is going to save this country anywhere from a quarter to three-quarters of a million dollars a day, according to the number of men demobilized. With the finances of the country in the state described by the Minister of Public Works, it seems to me that is one good reason why demobilization should be speeded up.

In the second place, it will mean contentment among the men. They want to get home and continue their education or go back to their ordinary vocations, and it is desirable that they should be allowed to do so at the earliest possible date.

In the third place, the earlier we get these men back the earlier they will get to work. There is going to be a great call in this country in the coming spring for men not only for the farms, but for all the building trades. Once these men are back they will be able to help build up the country instead of being an expense to it.

For these three reasons I humbly submit that the Government should do everything in their power to expedite the demobilization of these men, and I would say further, that if they have to charter ships at most exorbitant rates it will pay them financially to do so.

I am heartily in favour of vocational training for the soldiers. Any man who has fought our battles abroad and been injured so that he cannot carry on the occupation he was engaged in before the war should receive ample assistance from the Government to enable him to learn some other vocation, so that he will not be handicapped in the race of life. Vocational training is the very least this country can do for our boys.

I am also in favour of adequate pensions, and I am glad to see that the Government is not treating the matter this session with the same indifference they showed last year. The committee on pensions, I am glad to see, has already got to work, and I am sure they will go thoroughly into the matter and discuss it from all points of view. While I know that the pensions granted to Canadian soldiers to-day are the highest in the world, I feel that the members of this House and the country generally will back the Government and see that absolutely adequate pensions are paid. I am glad also that the committee on pensions is considering the cost of living in relation to pensions, and if they report to the House that the scale of pensions is not high enough I am sure the House will back up the Government in any legislation providing for adequate pensions. Furthermore, I would urge that the committee's report be presented to the House in sufficient time to allow of a free and open discussion of the whole matter, in order that the men who have served this country so faithfully and well may have justice done to them.

I am also in favour of land settlement for the soldiers, or, rather, for such of them as are qualified to go on the land and desire to do so. I do not think that every soldier who has a notion that he would like to settle on the land should be encouraged to do so unless he is fit and has some knowledge of farming, or is given some practical education in agriculture. But if these pre-requisites are carried out, I think it is in the interest of the country that soldiers should, under these circumstances, be placed on the land. I believe that it is the duty of the Government to take radical steps, and to take them at once, to see that all land held by railway companies, held by speculators, and held for grazing leases, especially near railroads, shall be expropriated at reasonable rates in order that these men may have suitable farms. I suggest that they go further if they really want to help the soldiers. If they wish to make them successful farmers, they should do what they did a year or so ago in connection with the farming industry, when they were endeavouring to promote greater production. At that time they bought for the farmers, as I am informed, a thousand tractors, and brought them into the country free of duty. It was a very laudable action on their part, and one that resulted in considerable benefit in increasing production. Now, I would suggest to the Government that if they are going to put soldiers on the land, it is only fair to them, and it is in the interests of the country, that they should take the duty off such agricultural implements as the soldiers require in order to work the land, if it is not their intention to remove the duty from these implements for all classes of the community. I think the Government should make these implements as cheap to these men as it is possible to make them, so that they will not be handicapped in their start in a new life-work.

In regard to the franchise question, I am glad to note that a new measure
10 p.m. is being introduced. I wish to associate myself with the ex-Minister of Finance (Mr. Fielding) in his views in regard to the War-time Elections Act. I do not know of any legislation in any British country which was more iniquitous. I say that, not because I was particularly injured by it myself, but I know of other members or candidates at the last election who were certainly subjected to the gravest injustice by reason of that Act. It was not British, and it was condemned not only on this side of the House. I remember distinctly what the hon. member for Halifax (Mr. A. K. Maclean) said in reference to the War-time Election Act, when he was on this side; and I remember also the hon. Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) rising in his place—I was next to him—and addressing the Chair when the Act was introduced, deploring the measure and asking the indulgence of the Chair in the remarks he was then about to make. He said he was ashamed of the fact that he came from the same part of the Dominion of Canada as the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) because of the iniquity of the Act. It is incomprehensible to me what the Government is thinking of, or what the Liberals who joined the Government are thinking of, if they allow that Act to remain on the statute-book.

I welcome the extension of the franchise to women. They have earned it, for they have been the civil soldiers of the war. They have done as nobly at home as the men did abroad, and I think they should have been given the franchise in 1917. At any rate, they deserved it just as much then as they do now; and I believe that at the first opportunity which is given them to register their votes they will indicate in no uncertain way the sentiments which at the present time rankle in their breasts against the action of the Government in 1917, the unfair manner in which they were treated in regard to the franchise at that time. If we are to have a new Franchise Act, I appeal to this Government to make it a fair, an honest, and a just measure. Upon the franchise all our liberties are based. As the franchise has been extended since the Reform Bill of 1832, our liberties have grown. There is only one fair franchise system, as far as I can see, and that is a system such as is followed in the province of Ontario. This was pointed out by the hon. ex-Minister of Finance. I refer to the municipal system. The franchise is based primarily on the voters' list; and if that list is fair and equitable, the representation will be fair. I appeal to the Government to adopt that system. The municipal list in the province of Ontario is prepared by the assessor in the first place, revised by the clerk, posted for thirty days, and appeals are heard by the county court judge. None of these officials are politicians; they are non-partisans. The clerk understands who are entitled to vote. He is neither a Liberal nor a Conservative. If he were either he would not long hold office. The result is that the voters' list is fairly prepared, and every one who is entitled to vote, if he desires to have his name on the list, can rest assured that his name will be on it. This is the fair, the British method. On the other hand, the method adopted at the last election was anything but fair or British. How were matters conducted? A host of enumerators were appointed, many of them Conservative ward heelers, who had only one interest at heart, namely to see that voters were on the list who were favourable to the Union Government, while those who were favourable to the Liberal party were excluded. These enumerators were supposed to be recommended by both parties. But what is the practice? We all know what happens. These people are all human; candidates are human, governments are human, enumerators are very human and sometimes very wicked. What happened in my own riding, for instance? I do not wish to be local, but I dare say the same thing happened elsewhere. We heard the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) make the deliberate statement that he would have a fair election. The War-time Elections Act, he said, would be fair; the enumerators would be non-partisan, each candidate having the privilege of naming half, so that politics would be eliminated. That statement was not only made by the Prime Minister, but ministers of the Crown assured me that such would be the case. What happened, however? There were sixty-nine polling subdivisions in the riding of West Middlesex. Now, I had a right to believe the statement of the Prime Minister made publicly in this country, and to expect that he would keep his word; and I had a right to believe that a minister of the Crown making that promise would keep his word. I repeat the question, what happened, and what will happen again, if this system is allowed to continue? I was never consulted; no member of the Liberal party was consulted. A Tory was appointed and he in turn appointed sixty-nine, or at least sixty-six, Tory partisans. Did they carry out the law justly

and put on the voters' list all who should have been put on? Not at all. Some were fair, but by all means the majority were not; and on election day, instead of attending the polls, as was their duty, to put new voters on that had been left off, these men in some cases were out bringing in voters in Conservative rigs to vote against the Liberals. That is not the kind of thing that will appeal to the Canadian people and inspire them with confidence in their representation in Parliament; and that is certainly not the way in which a Parliament may be made free and honest.

Now, just one remark in reference to the Dominion Health Department. For my own part, I do not believe in it. I think it is an unnecessary duplication of office and will only entail additional expense. Everybody knows we have a sufficiency of cabinet officers at the present time, and a Civil Service that is giving enough trouble. I do not see that any good will be attained through it, and I think it is an encroachment on provincial rights. The followers of this Government will get berths and places, while the public health will not be benefited one particle. I am absolutely opposed to it. I believe it is an unnecessary and extravagant encroachment on the rights of the provinces.

There are one or two matters to which I wish to call the attention of the Government in regard to my part of the province of Ontario. Some of them may seem parochial, but most of them will affect the Dominion at large. At the present time there is a great wave of unrest all over this country. It prevails among the labouring people and the agricultural community. It prevails particularly amongst these two classes and it appears to me that it is more than justified. One thing I regret, Mr. Speaker, is that in the speech from the Throne, apart from a mention of land settlement which, to say the least, is very illusory, and apart from the assistance which the Government promise towards good roads, there is not one particle of encouragement held out to the great agricultural community. We, on this side, have listened until we almost doubt the sincerity of the hon. gentlemen on the other side about the great basic industry of the country, about the importance of agriculture, how our prosperity and the future depend upon its succcess, how it must be fostered, and how the agriculturist must be helped. But we do not see any evidence of putting these high-sounding platitudes into operation and there is nothing in the speech from the Throne to lead us to believe that at this session the Government intend to give any relief to the agriculturist.

Some people in the big cities of the country would have us believe that the farmer is a profiteer, that he is getting wealthy, that he is making untold money out of the consumers and the men in the cities. Only recently a report was published by the Ontario Minister of Agriculture. He is a lawyer. I think he is a pretty consistent Tory. I do not think he would have any prejudice in favour of the agricultural community. I have no doubt that his report is absolutely accurate. And what does he find in regard to agriculture in Ontario and in regard to its fortune-making opportunities? He tells us that there are a million men engaged in agriculture in Ontario. He estimates, after a very careful inquiry into all their resources, an income of $250,000,000 divided among them. In other words, for each man, woman and child there is an income of $250 per year; or for a family of four you would have $1,000 or, to make a generous allowance $1,200. Thus, a farmer with a family of four makes $1,200, and this calculation is based on the returns during the years 1914-1917. The farmer has $1,200 to support his family of four. He buys his farm implements, repairs them, puts in his crops, buys clothes and shoes at the exorbitant prices at which they are selling to-day, pays his taxes, educates his family and incurs all the other expenses incident to domestic life on $1,200 or $1,000 a year. Yet he is claimed to be a profiteer and to be making millions out of the people of the country. After the labouring man, the farmer gets less attention than any other class of the community. As a matter of honesty and frankness I feel compelled to say that the labouring man gets less attention than any other class of the community from the Government at Ottawa. I think he deserves more. But, what have the Government done for the farmer? How have they helped him? It is true that during the war he got larger prices than ever before but we know that this is the first time since the Crimean war that the farmer ever had prices such as he has to-day and this is the first time he ever got prices that came within any proportion of the cost of producing the things he had to sell.

Did this Government help him? Not a bit of it. This Government said: You are making too much money; we will have to check you and put the hobbles on you.

What did they do to him? When you have any grain to sell you must sell it at so much a bushel, and no more. Did they say that to the miller, the munitions maker, the bacon king or the banker? On the contrary they allowed all these classes to run riot. The miller has made his millions. My hon. friend from Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) proved that conclusively the other night in regard to the big millers, and, as a matter of fact, I know that the smaller millers in this country never made as much money in their history as in the last two years. They made more money out of the bread of the people in the last two years than in the fifty years preceding. We know that the shoe manufacturers are making large profits, with the result that it is almost impossible for a poor man to supply his family with shoes. The same condition exists with regard to clothes. We know what the munition manufacturers have made. They were not interfered with; in fact, they were helped and given capital with which to start their business. But when the farmer seeks to get the price that the demand for his produce would entitle it to, he is immediately checked up and a maximum price of $2.24 or something like that is placed upon his product. It is not fair to this man representing as he does a part of the community upon whose prosperity the welfare of the country so largely depends.

There are several things that the agriculturist at the present time is insisting upon getting, which he says he deserves and which I think this Government will be obliged to give him. If this Government does not give it to him, another Government will be placed in power that will be obliged to do so. The first thing that the farmer is asking in my part of the country may appear somewhat petty, but I think he knows his business as well as any other man, and it is that the daylight saving farce of last year shall not again be put into operation. We consult other men in regard to what they want for the carrying on of their business to the best advantage. I do not see why the farmers, representing sixty per cent of the people of Canada, should not be consulted in regard to this matter. In the western part of Ontario they are determined, as far as they can effect their purpose, that this system shall not be in vogue again. The farmers in the United States are of the same opinion, as are also the farmers in Manitoba and the West. This daylight saving scheme of last year interfered with many things on the farm. It interfered with their work, it interfered with the transaction of their business in town, it interfered with their children's going to school, and it interfered with the hired help of the farmers; and did no good. It is true that it may have been of some advantage to the man who wanted to go out in the afternoon and play a game of golf, or tennis, or run out into the country in his motor car, but we should consider business first rather than pleasure and the farmer's interest should be taken into account in regard to the daylight saving measure.

There is one argument against the position which the farmers take in regard to daylight saving. We are being told that the people of the United States have adopted it again and we must therefore do so. I protest against any such philosophy. It seems to me illogical and unnational. In the olden days when we tried to have reciprocity with the United States—and some of our friends across the way were not wise enough to vote for it but are clamouring for it now—we were told that if we had trade relations with the United States we were going to become an adjunct of that country, going to be its back-yard. That was not true. We were going, by reciprocity, to put ourselves right on the front street. But it seems to me that if we have to follow them in regard to the daylight saving system, and if we cannot regulate that matter for ourselves, we are certainly becoming an adjunct of the United States and are going to be their back-yard. Is it more important that the railway time tables in this country should not be reprinted, and the railways be put to a little expense, or that the farmer should be able to carry on his great agricultural operations without the embarrassment which this matter brings to him? It seems to me that the whole thing has come down to that, and I for one, coming from the agricultural part of the province of Ontario, protest against any continuation of the foolish system in question.

There is another thing to which I call the attention of the Government. In the western and central parts of the province of Ontario, there is a pressing and most insistent demand from the agriculturists for an interior terminal elevator for their grain. Not so very long ago the Minister of Agriculture for Ontario, Mr. Henry; the president of the United Farmers of Ontario, Mr.

Halbert; and the president of the United Farmers Co-operative Company, Mr. Burnaby, and other gentlemen, experts in the grain trade and in farming, sent a memorial, I believe, to this Government asking for the establishment of an interior terminal elevator. They asked that such an elevator should be built at some place in the province which would give a central location, and they urged the necessity of this on various grounds, being guided by the experience of the West in connection with terminal elevators. They had evidently studied this matter, they were men of eminence in the agricultural world, and must know that what they were asking was in the interests of the farming community, and they pointed out that in Ontario, unlike the West, there was no elevator where the grain of the province could be collected, where it could be weighed, where it could be cleaned, and where it would get an official stamp, and they urged the need of this elevator in the interest of the farmers of the province. From their representations I would judge that there are about two hundred million bushels of grain grown in Ontario. A great part of this is used in the feeding of stock, but much of it could be used for interprovincial trade, for local trade, and for export trade, and they urged these reasons for the terminal elevator. The advantages may be summarized under the following heads:

It would provide facilities for the storing, cleaning and grading of different kinds of seed and in this regard, would be of great advantage to the farmers of the province particularly with reference to grass and clover seeds.

It would be of much advantage to the livestock industry of the province by facilitating the distribution of feeding stuffs from one section to another in the case of short crops in the local districts in the province as a whole.

It would be able to perform a distinct service in preventing the deterioration of certain crops in the province in the years of too much moisture, as is illustrated in the bean crop in recent years. The crop of buckwheat this year has had to be dried because of the wet weather which prevailed at the time of harvesting.

Special emphasis is laid on the fact that such an elevator would be a public elevator and certificates issued would be official Government certificates, both of which are advantages affording great protection to the public and not available in the same sense from private enterprise.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it seems to me that these men know what is in the interest of the farming community of Ontario, and that their request is very reasonable. They point out, moreover, that although this grain elevator may not pay as a commercial enterprise from the start, later on it would pay and consequently in that regard there would be no loss to the Dominion. They point out another thing which is very important in view of the observations recently made by the Minister of Public Works,—that the erection of this grain elevator, which would mean a considerable outlay, would provide employment to a great many men which the Government at the present time think is so desirable. The Minister of Public Works announced that he is erecting certain Custom House buildings in certain cities for the purpose of employing labour. It seems to me that this one form of construction will be more useful than the erection of Custom House buildings which he may be able to dispense with before long. It is one form of enterprise in which labour can be advantageously employed. I leave the suggestion to the Government and hope they will give it their most serious consideration.

There is one thing in the West that the farmers are clamouring for and that is rural credits. The farmers of Ontario, I know, would also like to see rural credits established. They feel the monopolistic tendencies of our banks, and that they would be assisted by the establishment of rural credits throughout the farming district. I have only to recall to the House that in 1913 the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) brought down a proposition in regard to rural credits which was not only accepted by the Finance Minister as a sound financial proposition, but also received the approval of the House. I think the Government might very well at this time take into consideration the establishment of rural credits throughout the West and in the province of Ontario.

But after all, Mr. Speaker, the vital question to-day is the tariff. I am not going to discuss it at length to-night because we shall have other opportunities of doing so. The Minister of Immigration (Mr. Calder) has said that there is a cleavage between the East and the West in regard to this question. For my own part I do not wish to contradict the hon. gentleman, but I believe he is making a mistake which he will find out before many months go by, I believe there is no longer a cleavage between the East and the West in regard to the tariff question. At one time it was thought that we might say that "East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet" in regard to the tariff. But that day has gone by. The people of Nova Scotia and the people of Alberta are joining hands in regard to this question. The people of Quebec and the people of Saskatchewan are also joining hands; and in the province of Ontario the people are

meeting on common ground. The consumer on the farm, and the consumer in the town to-day are in favour of tariff reduction; and in this connection I know that we are going to have the support, and the farmers are going to have the support, of the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) who has just taken his seat, because I remember that hon. gentleman in 1911 advocating in this House, in the skilful way that only he possesses, and analysing with that clean cut analytical mind of his, the policy of relieving the farmers of Canada of the duty on agricultural implements. Upon that occasion I think the hon. gentleman convinced the House, and almost convinced his own side. I maintain that the farmers and the consumers to-day are one on this question, whether they come from the East or from the West. There is no cleavage in Canada as between the East and the West in regard to the tariff, but there is a cleavage between the people of Canada as a whole—between the consumers on the one side and the great protected privileged interests living in the great cities on the other side. That cleavage has got to be bridged, or partially bridged, by this Government, or the people of Canada will put another Government in power that will do the bridging. These cities seem to think that they occupy the position of old Imperial Rome, and that the whole country should pay tribute to them.

They seem to think that on the clothes on the labourer, on his foodstuffs, on his building material, on everything he uses, tribute should be paid to the manufacturer, to the monopolist, to the combinester, in order to let him live in luxury and plenty. That conviction will be shattered before very long. I for one—and I have always been in favour of this: it is no new advocacy on my part; it is no new faith that I am expressing—I for one am in favour of a considerable reduction of the tariff. I want to see free farm implements for the agriculturist. He is entitled to them, and I believe that the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) thinks that he is entitled to them. I want to see what the farmer needs for his out-buildings—building material brought in free. I want to see cement, fertilizers, lubricating and fuel oil brought in free. As a matter of fact, I am heart and soul in favour of that resolution which was moved in the last Parliament by Hon. Frank Oliver and so ably seconded by the present Minister of Public Works (Hon. F. B. Carvell). The people are looking for some relief from the burdens of taxation imposed upon them by the tariff. There is a great outcry as to where we shall get our revenue. It does not seem to me to be well founded. I do not believe a prohibitive tariff of 42½ per cent is going to bring in a great revenue. I believe that a more reasonable tariff will bring in a larger revenue; that is the history of tariff changes. It is due to the consumer that the Government bestir itself and bring down such a tariff policy as the people are calling for.

It was brought out by the Finance Minister (Sir Thomas White) that there is a certain amount of stagnation in manufacturing enterprises because the Government has not the courage to move in connection with the tariff. The manufacturers know that there is a cry for a change. They know that the Government does not know what to do. They know that they are badgered on the right by their friends the monopolists and on the left their friends the people from the West. They are standing still, afraid to take the plunge. Capital is unsettled; business men do not know what orders to place. Let the Government come out in the open and do something. Let them announce a policy; let them convince the manufacturers and the business people of Canada that they have some courage in this matter, and let business get settled in the land.

As a word of warning to the Government, I quote the following from an address recently delivered by President Wilson in the United States:

> Any man who resists the present tides that run in the world will find himself thrown upon a shore so high and barren that it will seem as if he had been separated from his human kind forever.

This tide of tariff is running so high that these words of the President can be very properly applied to any Government that resists it.

The Minister of Immigration and Colonization speaks also of the cleavage in this country caused by the variety of the races and religions therein; and this he deplores. I say to him in all sincerity that such words from him do not have the right ring. Hardly more than a year has elapsed since the party which he is now supporting and then supported did everything in my province not only that men could do, but that perverse men could do, to make the cleavage between the races and religions of this country as wide and as impossible of healing as could be done. No Liberal following the Grand Old Chieftain in my part of the country was a loyal British subject; he was branded as a traitor and a pro-German, and classed as being unfit to take

a place in the Parliament of Canada. These things may be forgiven, but, Mr. Speaker, they cannot be forgotten. The hon. gentleman's friends did more to undo the life-work of our great chieftain to bring harmony and unity among the races and creeds of this country than they can neutralize in the next generation, and soft words and pious advice from the hon. gentleman at this time are not at all in keeping with the conduct of his friends only a short year ago. I hope that my hon. friends will take to heart what that greatest of modern newspaper correspondents recently said. Everybody in this House was electrified by the reports of Philip Gibbs on the war—by their colour, by the manner in which he painted the heroism of the British and Canadian soldiers, by the humanity they expressed, by his love of justice, by his denunciation of the barbarity of the Hun. A short time ago he made a speech in New York in which he pointed out what men had done in America to bring about hatred and feud between the two great English races: how they had spread dissension; how they had disseminated ill-feeling. He said:

> Only bad men among us, or them, will sow seeds of suspicion or distrust and raise the rank weeds of hatred.

That expresses a very appropriate thought. The Anglo-Saxon races have cemented their friendship on the battlefields of Europe, and I hope that that friendship will be as enduring as the ages. But it seems to me that the words which I have read have some application to this country. Only bad men among us, either on this side of the House or on the other side, at election time or any other time, will sow these seeds of suspicion and distrust and raise the rank weeds of hatred between the French and English in this great land which is our common country. We might all better learn the lesson of the life of the great Canadian statesman who is now departed, and follow his example by endeavouring to build up a feeling of harmony and unity and tolerance, and thus make of this country what Providence intended it to be, one of the freest and noblest and greatest democracies of the world.

Mr. H. A. FORTIER (Labelle) (Translation): Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted, following the example of the elder members of this House who have taken part in this debate, to pay my humble tribute of affection and of respect to the memory of our great deceased chieftain, Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

The pathetic accents with which these parliamentary precincts have resounded for a few days past, tell eloquently of the deep sorrow caused to the nation by the irreparable loss of that great personality, of that incomparable statesman, of that great Canadian, of that beloved leader of our party.

It seems to me that, as the day of his sudden demise recedes from us, the loss resulting from his mournful departure grows on our minds. Sir, it would be impossible for me to say, on this lamentable subject, anything which might interest this honourable House; I cannot add a single word to the pathetic tributes which I have listened to from the eloquent lips of those who have preceded me. I still hear the funeral knell dolefully resounding from the church steeples in our parishes, and announcing the universal grief of our population. I fully realize the fact that all honours were rendered to him up to the place of his supreme rest. Our mother country of old, always loved as she is, seems to have intended, adding thereby to the homage of those vested with the royal functions in this country, that one of her illustrious sons, in the person of general Pau, the glorious maimed soldier of 1870, should come to Laurier's grave and lay on it the flowers of remembrance and of affection. "I have the honour to offer, in the name of France," said he, "this tribute of affection and of respect to the great Canadian statesman in whose veins the French blood did flow."

Laurier was, for more than thirty years, the leader of our party in this Dominion. He was the living incarnation of the principles of Canadian Liberalism. We have laid him in his grave, but his soul lives with us, and we may well cry out: Long live Laurier!

Mr. Speaker, alluding now to the speech from the Throne, I protest with force against the policy of the Government, who undermine the constitution of this country by threatening provincial autonomy, who administer the common weal by Orders in Council and vexatious measures savouring of autocracy.

With regard to those new departures in the shape of bills relating to schools, hygiene or public highways, it is easy to see that a public spirit which one may call spirit of centralization, is being introduced to the benefit of the federal power and to the detriment of the provincial governments.

Adding to the attributes of the federal power and reducing those of the provincial powers is a thing much to be lamented, it

is exactly the crime which makes of constitutions as many scraps of paper. Imperial Germany was declaimed against and the German kaiser was inveighed against to the utmost for having inaugurated in our time the abuse of power which turns treaties into scraps of paper. One of the reasons given by the Allies to all nations whether actors or spectators in the great war, was that they were fighting for civilization by crushing those by those who commit such abuses of power.

Canada boasts of having made great sacrifices in the fight for civilization against the perpetrators of these high-handed acts. But it breaks any patriotic Canadian's heart to see that the "scrap of paper" policy is not a subject of aversion for a great many citizens of this Dominion. We are sorry to find ill inspired and thoughtless people trying to lead Parliament into improper debates, which necessarily involve legislation conflicting with the autonomy of the provinces, and will consequently tear up slowly the covenant by which the provinces have been granted such autonomy, thus making of these agreements between the Dominion and Provincial Administrations as many scraps of paper.

Therefore, as a member of this House, I disapprove as much as I can of these debates and I blame the Government for permitting them to take place, because, from a federal point of view, they are not only out of order and not to be allowed, but also mean confusion which threatens the stability, and will soon lead to the violation of the political fabric of this Dominion.

I have another objection to that idea of centralization expressed in the debate on questions affecting provincial autonomy. I suggest that such a spirit brings about autocracy in a kingdom.

Absolute monarchy which was the system of government in every country in the world some centuries ago, has disappeared rejected by new generations which were won over to democracy. Now democracy can exist only through autonomy. The more you leave the initiative open to the people in the care of their interests, more or less of a local character, either in agriculture or industry, the nearer you get to real democracy. It is a system of the greatest freedom for the people under the authority which protects them. Caesarism, the old system of absolute monarchy and that of the modern Cæsars in Russia and Germany, has just been crushed in Europe, for the people bear with difficulty that kind of Government which is holding in leash all the liberties. Such an arbitrary system of government must disappear and ought to be kept out right now of Canadian politics.

Now, Mr. Speaker, when I consider another phase of the Governor General's speech I find that this Government are practising absolutism in time of peace, because they keep on administering public affairs by means of Orders in Council, which are nothing else than ukases. It is true, Mr. Speaker, that the system of dictatorship was established for a certain time with the consent of the Opposition, but that was in war time, when it was thought that the majority should hold such powers if the people are to receive the necessary impulse to ensure victory to the Allies. But now the war is over, and our country is rejoicing over the complete victory that was achieved. Since the armistice in November we are living in peace. Therefore we have a right to proclaim that we revert to the constitutional system we so long enjoyed. The time has come when dictatorship has ceased to exist and must not prevail. We have a right to say, Mr. Speaker, that we have come back to the time when the Government must carry on the affairs of the country with the assistance of Parliament and conformably to the wishes of the people as expressed by their representatives.

Dictatorship, Sir, is unconstitutional and we are not justified in prolonging such a system, even though there are factions in this country urging the Government to govern in that way. For instance, with dictatorship abolished, no particular class of citizens would be permitted to compel the Government to pass Orders in Council which are nothing else than ukases, because it would be the duty of the Government to consult the members of this House who represent not one but all classes in this country. Therefore, I contend it is the duty of this Government to consult Parliament before they pass any Order in Council. It is also their duty to submit to the majority vote of Parliament. Such is the system of constitutional and democratic government, the government of the people, administered not by factions but by themselves.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I am coming to another subject. I reproach this Government with enacting even lately vexatious legislation through Orders in Council providing for degrading punishment of innocent people.

I am speaking particularly of those young drafters who were not at fault, who did not wittingly disobey the law and yet to-day find themselves hounded by the authorities and, very often, dragged before the courts all through the country, to receive sentences of either a huge fine or imprisonment.

In this country, Sir, I believe the people are not well disposed towards militarism and that we can feel sure of ourselves in saying to-day, what was moreover recently asserted by the Prime Minister of England himself, that conscription is dead and buried. Besides we have been accustomed to believe in this country that we would never have conscription and we had heard from the lips of the hon. Prime Minister; we had read also in the Government's own press during the last election; and we had heard from the lips of members of this Government who had assured us, especially a certain class of society—the agricultural class—that conscription would never come. So, it was clearly understood, right up to the time of the last election, that we were not to have conscription in this country, and the people had become accustomed to the belief that the Military Service Act would never be passed. But, Mr. Speaker, once the election over, the Government, with its Order in Council, as usual, passed a measure abolishing the exemptions granted a certain class of our farmers. Still, the Government let it be understood to these folks that those who were thus deprived of their right to exemption would however not be called to the colours under the conscription law. The proof of this is seen in the large delegation of farmers who waited upon the Government, from Ontario and the other provinces asking the Government to redeem its promises made during the election of 1917, and to make them immune from the Act. Their motives were very patriotic. They had heard from the lips of the Prime Minister, in those days, it was hard to decide just who contributed most to the success of the Allied arms, the man who went across to fight in the trenches or the man who stayed behind on his farm working to increase the production of foodstuffs; our farmers, hearing this, thought it their duty to stay where they were, on the land, and strive patriotically to increase production.

And that is exactly what has happened since last April; these farmers whose services were absolutely necessary as producers, had of course been told to report for military service, but on the other hand they had been given to understand that if their occupation was genuinely such as to be essential to food production they would be exempt. Exemptions for this very reason were numerous. And if it so happened that a number of these young men did not report for exemption they nevertheless remained steadily at work on their farms, while the police and the Government know they were there, and they felt that they were entitled to the same treatment as those who did report and were exempted because they were performing the identical task of food production.

Well, Mr. Speaker, what do we find to-day? We find these young men, all over the country, arrested wholesale and brought before the courts; what is their crime? Their crime consists in having failed to report; they are looked upon as defaulters. However, I do not think that these young men are at all to blame; they did just what was being openly done by those of their companions who had reported and been granted exemption; they remained on their farms striving patriotically to increase food production.

It is time to call a halt to these vexatious proceedings. They have been going on for a certain time, but to-day it appears as though the Government were seeking deliberately to defy public opinion. The Government was not satisfied with the Order in Council which permitted the court to make the sentence fit the crime—if such can be called a crime—and in certain cases be content with imposing a fine of $10 or a few days in jail; no, that was not enough, and now we learn from the papers and in the Official Gazette that a new Order in Council has just been passed fixing the fine for these young offenders at from $250 to $5,000 and the term of imprisonment at a maximum of two years, I think it is.

What do we find in most of the cases of these young men who are haled before the court? First of all, a great many of them never received their notification to report. This military service law was enacted in this country with such precipitous haste and I must say, with so little precaution, that the Government sought to call young men to the colours by means of a notice served through the mails. Hence in a great many cases, and this has been admitted by the courts, the notice was either not received or received too late, and even addressed to places where the subject did not reside at all.

Now, the Government has annoying ways of doing things in other matters also. For my own part, representing as I do an agricultural district I deemed it my duty when these orders in council were passed by the

Government last spring, to help these young men, as best I might, to obey the military law, to report and obtain exemption, when they were entitled to it, by reason of their being engaged in the essential industry of food production, and thus be allowed to remain on their farms.

What do we see to-day? These young farmers, these young draftees who had been granted exemption—after the same had been approved by the representative of the Department of Agriculture—were obliged to have their leave extended from time to time. Thus, the men who reported during the month of May last were granted leave until June, those reporting in June until August, and from August these exemptions —before the amnesty which granted a pardon to all those who reported before the 24th of August—were continued until the 21st of September. When this date came the Government, mindful of the pressure which had been brought to bear in this matter and of the promises it had itself made to the farmers could hardly do otherwise than extend the leave of those who were absent until October 30, and on October 30 this leave was extended to November 15.

Now notice, Mr. Speaker, that from the month of September when one of the first leaves expired, these farmers remained at their work with the assurance of the military authorities that they would not be disturbed because the leave granted them until the 21st of September was renewed from time to time without their being obliged to obtain a new leave.

Can you believe that these young farmers, who are very numerous in our country districts, and who were granted leave of absence by the military authorities should to-day be the victims of the police employed by the Department of Justice, that they have even been arrested and thrown into prison while awaiting trial? I really cannot believe that this is so. I think that some mistake has been made. Rather than believe that this thing is being done deliberately I prefer to think that the Government is not aware that these young men have exemption papers.

This thing has got to stop. More than ever it is time to stop sending these policemen into our country districts there to arrest young men who are guilty of no offence. When the amnesty was promulgated in November they were assured by the military authorities that they would obtain their final discharge, that papers for this purpose would be sent them by the commanding officer or that they could appear in person before the tribunal.

What happened? A great many of them heard the call and reported to General Headquarters and obtained their discharge. As for those others who were in remote country districts who had no knowledge of this latter call, who had in their pockets the papers entitling them to exemption, they are not at fault, they did not purposely commit any breach of the military law.

However, Mr. Speaker, I repeat, and it pains me deeply to say this,—it may be an error on the part of the Government, or of whatever department has the thing in hand, that is responsible for these doings—but I bitterly regret to find that these peaceful folk are still being arrested by officers of the law. It seems to me that a general amnesty should be proclaimed and that this persecution on the part of the Government should cease. To my mind, during these times of reconstruction the Government needs the good-will of all the country's citizens, needs especially the good-will of these young farmers who are very numerous and who did not disobey the law.

It seems to me that those should be the first ones to enjoy the benefits of an Act of amnesty, and that the Government ought to present forthwith a Bill to that effect.

The provinces showed themselves to be generous; they answered the call of the Government; they subscribed to the Victory loan and to every possible funds.

It is that same population, it is those young men who gave vent to their patriotic feeling that are given as criminals to be brought before the courts and to be heavily fined.

Mr. Speaker, I now conclude. Since the truce, the Governor General is visiting the provinces and the thought disclosed in his replies to addresses is that we British citizens should gather around the flag being thoroughly convinced that it is a flag which protects vested rights and promotes the grouping of nations. Such is what its name implies: "Union Jack" as also the motto of the people it shields: "Dieu et mon Droit." Let that thought and that spirit inspire the Dominion Parliament and the ministry which heads it; consequently, let us put aside the lash of penalties which breeds hatred and let make use instead of peaceful and kindly measures which develop a widespread love of country. Let us also keep up in this Parliament a jealous love of autonomy, eagerness to uphold it instead of trampling upon it, and all sec-

tions and individuals will hasten to hoist, hail and defend the British flag.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Meighen, the debate was adjourned.

On motion of Hon. Mr. Burrell the House adjourned at 11.05 p.m.

Monday, March 17, 1919.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 20, to incorporate Canadian Merchant Service Guild.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 21, respecting the English Valley and Hudson Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 22, respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company.—Mr. Cronyn.

Bill No. 23, respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cruise.

RIOTS AT KINMEL CAMP.

STATEMENT BY THE ACTING PRIME MINISTER—CABLES FROM OVERSEAS MINISTER OF MILITIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I desire to read the following cable which I have received from the Overseas Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp) respecting the Kinmel Park disturbance:

Answering your inquiry further information Kinmel Park disturbance, my cable March 7th should be read in conjunction with this, covers the ground pending thorough inquiry which is being carried on. Difficulties have been encountered but discipline amongst Canadians has been considered at least equal to that of best Imperial troops. Unrest in Canadian Camps is accounted for by fact that the men have been away from their homes in Canada for periods ranging up to four years or more, have suffered great privations and are thoroughly homesick, a fact which is fully appreciated. It will be easily understood that men who have endured such hardships and monotony would when they reached Kinmel Park, the last stage in England before embarkation, if held owing to shipping difficulties, become impatient. Everything possible is done to interest the soldiers while they are waiting to be repatriated. Information on this point will follow. Armistice came at beginning of one of most severe winters England has experienced. Weather has been continually cold and wet with absolute lack of sunshine. Had we been fortunate enough to have been able to proceed with demobilization under more favourable weather conditions there would have been less cause for complaint. There has been general shortage of fuel which has added discomfort. Men have lived in camps, for most part in huts, which is only accommodation. Non-combatant troops coming from different parts of France, also lines of communication troops, have doubtedly suffered hardships owing to unavoidable and uncomfortable transportation to England, resulting in colds and in many cases influenza. Discomforts which soldier is willing to put up with when engaged in fighting assume different aspect now that war is over. Labour troubles and general unrest in British Isles and on continent have had some effect upon men. In my cable to you February 25th I pointed out that we were short nine thousand in our shipment of troops to Canada for first fifteen days of February. This was caused by Ministry Shipping not being able to deliver ships which had been specifically promised for certain dates. In some cases ships offered were upon examination refused by us because they were not suitable for carrying troops. In other cases sailings of ships have been postponed four, five and six times and such postponements or cancellations of sailings causing vast amount of extra work in re-forming of sailing parties and re-opening of documents and correction of nominal rolls, etc. Delays and cancellations also lead to rearrangement of flow of troops as far back as Belgium. Men who have been over here for long periods but who have served in corps were embarked for Canada in large numbers before March first. It was not until this date that any corps troops were embarked. Men who have served in corps who are casualties in England so far as possible are collected and drafted into units of corps which go to Canada according to dispersal areas. Difficulties arise in connection with maintaining permanent cadres owing to specially trained or technical personnel desiring to be returned to Canada in their order of priority and their replacement by efficient personnel causes great difficulty. Too much cannot be said on behalf of men engaged in this work as well as staffs in general, including clerks all descriptions who though anxious to get home and in many cases as much entitled as any one to return, are loyally and patriotically supporting me in endeavour to get troops back. I cannot speak too highly of men who are patiently and patriotically carrying on necessary work to demobilize and embark soldiers for Canada, many of whom have served for long periods and in many cases will be last to be demobilized. This work has been greatly hampered by influenza epidemic. Also work of demobilization has been interfered with through demands of Imperial authorities for necessary accommodation in order to carry out their demobilization, many Canadian reserve units in England having had to be moved at same time under great difficulties in the carrying out of their functions of demobilization. Staff difficulties are also very heavy on account of vast amount of documentation requiring to be carried out in England to meet wishes of authorities in Canada. More men have to be provided for in England than at any time since beginning of the war. Necessity of inaugurating a special system for dealing with corps troops and educating of staffs in accordance with systems prevailing in England. There are also difficulties in carrying out two forms of demobilization side by side, this being unavoidable. Disposition of surplus war material in France and England, horses, etc., is big task in itself. Never since war began has there been such an amount of work to be done in so short a period. Took some time to reverse machine which had been in operation for four and a half years and set it going in opposite direction back to Canada. All practical suggestions for improvements to assist in camp life are readily adopted. Notwithstanding all difficulties with

which we are faced we will have succeeded by end of this month in moving from France to England eighty-five thousand soldiers and from England to Canada not less than one hundred thousand, which is considered here at any rate a remarkable achievement considering all circumstances.

I cabled recently to the Overseas Minister of Militia with respect to certain press reports which had reached Canada alleging that the girls' quarters at Kinmel Camp had been attacked by the men. Sir Edward Kemp replied to my cable as follows:

Cannot anticipate findings of Court Inquiry. Times, however, on March 8th stated with respect to girls employed in camp as follows: "The manageress responsible for girls declares that not the slightest attempt was made to interfere with any of them."

Lloyd's paper, March 9th, says: "No attempt was made by the rioters to interfere with them. The girls were treated with the utmost chivalry."

The Telegraph, March 8th, says: "The girls' camp was not attacked, and as a matter of fact the girls were treated with the utmost chivalry."

There is indignation here among all Canadians at exaggerations which appeared particularly in earlier reports in British press. I have expressed indignation of Canadians to newspapers privately and publicly. Some have apologized. No Canadian, however, believed that Canadian soldiers would be guilty of conduct as reported in press respecting girls working in canteens with which they were charged. Cannot say at moment when findings Court Inquiry will be ready. Do not want to create impression that haste is of primary importance. What is required is thorough inquiry.

Kemp.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING BUREAU.

STRIKE OF PRESSMEN—STATEMENT OF HON. MR. BURRELL.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): I should like the attention of the Secretary of State (Hon. Mr. Burrell) for a moment. I see by the press this morning that there is some hope of an early settlement of the trouble in the Printing Bureau. We should like to know whether that is so; also when the printing of the Hansard in the ordinary way will be resumed. It is important to members that they be supplied with the usual number of copies of Hansard; its suspension has interfered very much with the ordinary run of business.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): I cannot hold myself responsible for the non-printing of Hansard at this time. As to the press report that appeared this morning, I am, of course, not responsible for that either. I interviewed a committee of the striking employees this morning, and the questions involved were discussed very generally. The position at the moment is about as it was. I explained that I did not consider, in view of all the facts, that there was any justification for the strike, and that if the men came back—as I think it desirable that they should, from their own point of view—proper consideration would be given to any grievance that they believe they have.

As to their position after March 31, $2.00 a week has been given to them from April 1 last to March 31, and I shall recommend that the most sympathetic consideration be given to settle things justly as between March 31 and June 1, when the new agreements will be entered into.

CANADIAN ARMY MEDICAL SERVICE.

ALLEGATIONS BY BRIGADIER-GENERAL SMART IN QUEBEC LEGISLATURE.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): May I ask the Acting Prime Minister if the Government has given consideration to the charges made in the Quebec Legislature by Brigadier-General Smart, regarding maladministration of medical services overseas, and, if so, whether we may expect an announcement in this House with respect to Government action in connection with those charges?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I have some doubt as to whether my hon. friend is in order in asking a question founded upon charges made in another legislative assembly; but as he has raised the question, possibly a little more than usual latitude might be allowed to me in replying. I saw the report of the statements made by General Smart in the Quebec Legislature. They referred to a situation which existed in England in 1916, when Colonel Bruce was there and when a commission was appointed by the Government, on the recommendation of Sir George Perley, for the purpose of making a thorough inquiry into conditions affecting the Canadian Medical Service in Great Britain, and, I think, also on the continent. The matter has been discussed in this House on many occasions. I desire to say just this: that from time to time statements are, and no doubt will be made by those returning from England giving but a fragmentary and, in many cases, an exceedingly distorted view of facts. Men returning may be disappointed in their expectations; they may have some grievances of their own; they may make statements which are not founded in fact. I have no hesitation in saying that if the statements in question were made as reported in the press, they are absolutely not founded in fact and are not to be depended upon. I was in Eng-

land in 1916; I was associated with Sir George Perley in connection with the creation of a commission of inquiry; I say that the action which he took was the sound action; that it had the commendation of those who knew the situation in England. And I say further in regard to Sir George Perley that I do not know of any civilian whose record shows more valuable service to Canada during the period of the war and since than that of the High Commissioner of Canada. He is a man of most superb executive ability. I have had much to do with him; I have been in continual cable communication with him on the utmost variety of subjects and he has always been prompt and exceedingly efficient and effectual in dealing with the highly important matters which I have brought to his attention from time to time. His services have been, in my opinion, simply invaluable to this country. I do not believe the charges made against him have the slightest foundation in fact.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): May I ask the Minister of Finance how soon we may expect the remaining volumes of the Auditor General's Report? When I drew attention to this matter some days ago, I was informed that they would shortly be laid upon the Table. Since that time one volume has been laid on the Table. I should like some explanation as to why volumes I and II have not reached the House while volume III has been distributed.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I shall be glad to make inquiry from the Auditor General and give a statement to-morrow regarding the matter. One volume has already been laid on the Table. The circumstances relating to the delay were explained by the Auditor General in a letter which I laid on the Table.

Mr. MURPHY: Has a new Auditor General been appointed?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Major Sutherland, the Assistant Auditor General, has been appointed in place of the late Auditor General.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East), for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the session resumed from Friday, March 14.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of Interior): Mr. Speaker, the definite object I have in rising is to endeavour to make reply to some features of the address delivered in this House on Friday last by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). Since the conclusion of that speech, however, the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) has delivered a very well phrased and well condensed speech on various subjects that have been under review. His remarks consisted mainly in a pilgrimage into problems of tariff, a pilgrimage in which I shall not venture to follow him at present, preferring rather to pursue the advice so often given by my hon. friend (Mr. Fielding) when he was Minister of Finance, and refrain, as a member of the Government, from a discussion of questions of tariff until the Budget is brought down.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Ross), however, indulged in the practice which is somewhat frequently pursued in this Parliament, of referring to an address I had the honour to make and a resolution I had the honour to move in this House in the early months of 1911. The resolution asked the House for a substantial reduction in the duties on implements. The remark I wish to make is this: that the hon. gentleman, in his efforts to criticise what I said at that time and myself now in relation to it, followed the habit of making a summary, or rather a very rough and hasty interpretation of what I said at that time instead of quoting my remarks as they were uttered. All I ask of him is: that whenever again he seeks to found any argument upon that speech or that resolution, he be good enough to give the text of the remarks I made or the text of the resolution, because I can assure him now that though something over eight years have gone by there is not a paragraph of that speech by whose principles I am not prepared to abide. The hon. gentleman appears to be at the present time a convert to the arguments I then adduced. I am very glad to know that. I cannot recall, however, that I got much assistance from him then when he was supporting the Government in office. He is an example of the very numerous class of men who are much easier of conversion and much more receptive to new platforms and new policies while enjoying the freedom of opposition and of private life than they are when confronted with the responsibilities of Government.

I am sure that the members of this House Sir, both to your right and to your left, will share with me in congratulating the

hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) on the vigour both of mind and body, of which he gave such ample evidence in his speech of last Friday. It is a matter of encouragement to us all, and indeed of inspiration, that a man of his years and of his long register of public service, a man who when very many around him now were in their cradles was Prime Minister of his province, can at this time rise to as high a level of controversial skill as at any period of his career.

There are many positions in the long range of subjects over which he traversed with which I do not care to take issue. Indeed, with much that he said I am in substantial accord, and my references this afternoon will be rather to contentions he brought forward and positions he took up in respect of which it may be said that the skill with which they were defended was very much better than the care with which they were selected.

First of all; in the latter part of his address, he took the ground that this was no longer a free Parliament; that this was a strangled and shackled Parliament and he ventured to appeal to hon. members to shake off the shackles and restore the pristine freedom of this House. Well, any hon. member or any one looking down from the gallery who has watched the proceedings of this Parliament for the past ten years during which I have been a member, or, indeed, for any ten years preceding, and noted the healthy atmosphere of independence and freedom and the extraordinary latitude of criticism exercised by hon. members on both sides, will have some difficulty in conceiving how any reflective mind could come to the conclusion that this Parliament, of all parliaments, is shackled.

In attempting to establish his case the Ex-Minister of Finance enunciated certain precepts as to what should be the duty of the supporter of a party, and particularly of a supporter of a government, under the constitutional conditions of parliamentary government under which we live. With the principles he enunciated I want to take issue—and indeed the sharpest possible issue. He proclaims himself an adherent of the party system. Generally speaking, I have no fault to find with that position. I am not able to conceive how our parliamentary government can possibly be continued save under some form of the party system. A party system necessarily involves the concession of individual opinion to the will of the majority. It necessarily involves the tempering of individual aspirations to the average will of the entire body, with the result that though the final policy to which the party man eventually adheres may not meet the individual opinions of many, it will at all events fairly represent the average opinion of all. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), while supporting the general principle of party support, states that it must be confined to one class of subjects only, and that a wholly different relationship exists between the members of a party and the Government in office, or the members of the opposite party and the leader of the Opposition, in another class of subjects. These are his words:

> I felt that on matters relating to the prosecution of the war the Government ought to be strongly supported, certainly by their friends, and I thought they might have claimed support from their opponents even in matters relating to the prosecution of the war. But I believe that on all questions not connected with the war every man in the House of Commons should be at liberty to act according to the dictates of his conscience. Was that an erroneous conception? Was there anything unreasonable in that?

There is just this much unreasonable in that. I should like to inquire why the operation of conscience should be excluded from the consideration of subjects connected with the prosecution of the war? Why should conscience reign only in the sphere of the trivial and the secondary, and be wholly excluded when it comes to the sphere of the important and the vital? If an hon. member of this House is asked to support some article of policy relating to the prosecution of the war which he believes to be not serving the interests of the country at all, which he believes will be a dishonour to his country and result, in part at all events, in disaster to his country, is he to be told that his conscience must not be allowed to speak or to affect his vote, and that on all such matters of great and imperious concern he must bow to the party will and support the Government in office? And is he at the same time to be told that in matters wholly secondary and trivial and inconsequential to the State, in order that his conscience may be kept alive, he is to be allowed to give it free play and to vote just as he likes?

I have stated, in plain language, I am sure, the principles which the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's deems to be sound. Those principles need only to be stated to be condemned as wholly unsound and wrong.

I said a few moments ago that the very existence of party, necessary as it is to the continuity of governmental authority and

to the efficiency of government as government, necessarily involved unity of action and support by party, save in certain extraordinary circumstances. But it would appear to me that the time when a member might see his way not to support the Government in office which he was elected to support would be an occasion, not of minor, but of major consequence—an occasion when the most vital interests of the State were concerned, and when he would determine that rather than support a policy of far-reaching consequence that he deems to be wrong, he would prefer that the Government of the day should change, or that there should be an appeal to the higher court of public opinion. On many such occasions hon. members of this House have seen fit to break from party and take a place by themselves, voting against the Government which generally they were desirous to support. That is a statement of the principle as it has operated and as it is recognized both in the Old Land and in this.

The hon. member, however, went on to give a special instance, and he said in that special instance a grave error was made which resulted in the shackling of this House by the Prime Minister of Canada. I wish to refer to that instance. It was on the occasion of the titles debate of last session. On that occasion the Prime Minister, in the name of the Government of this country moved a certain amendment to a resolution that was before this House. The circumstances were these: The subject of titles had engaged a very large share of public attention for some time and had been under discussion in the press of Canada. In view of that volume of public attention, and in view also, and particularly, of the fact that the question, important or unimportant though it might be in itself, involved our relationship with the Crown and with the Imperial authorities, the Government of this country felt it its duty to come to a definite decision of policy with regard thereto. They came to that decision, and embodied it in an Order in Council; and, more than that, communicated their decision with regard to this subject to the Government of Great Britain

In that position the Government found itself when the question came under discussion in this House, and in such circumstances the Government was bound to take its place as a government, where it had taken it in the Order in Council, and as thus communicated to the Imperial authorities. Now, I know of no case in British history, or in our own history, where a government, having finally taken up a position and having communicated that position to the authorities to whom it had to be communicated under the circumstances, could permit that policy to which they were committed to be overthrown by parliament, and thereafter continue to carry on the government of the country. There must be a consideration on the part of Government, as regards each individual case, of its general bearing on the whole body of public legislation. That consideration a government is bound to give, and the Government having given that consideration and come to its decision, were it to be overthrown, the authority necessary to its efficiency is impaired—and a long series of British precedents has taught us that a government in that position serves the public interests best by retiring from office and giving place to those who better represent the people in Parliament. It is not that a government is afraid to carry on, nor that it seeks anything for itself. It is merely in deference to the well-established rule—established through a thousand years of experience—that a government whose authority is so challenged or impaired cannot with advantage legislate in the public interests. Furthermore, there existed this circumstance in connection with the Titles situation; that the Government of Great Britain, after communication of the position assumed by the Government of Canada, had, in the most respectful and urgent terms, asked this Government to defer further consideration of the subject, pending a conference upon it in England in the summer of 1918, and in view of that special communication, the stand taken by the Prime Minister in this House was inevitable and necessary. So that the Prime Minister—whether our stand previously had been right or wrong—in speaking as he did in Parliament on that night, was not making anything of a threat to Parliament; he was merely laying down a constitutional principle, by which constitutional principle he deemed himself to be bound.

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) referred to an Act, passed not by this Government, but by the Government which preceded it, known as the War-time Elections Act. The language which he applied to that legislation was by far the strongest language which he used in the course of his address—language which later I shall quote, and for which he will have to take full responsibility. He made the attack knowing, as he well knew and as no one knew better, that on the subject of

the merits of that Bill on the merits of the legislation which that Bill put into effect, there was necessarily a difference of opinion on the part of ministers who now compose the Government of Canada. He approved of the principle of those men coming together and uniting for another and a higher purpose, and he knew as well, in making his attack upon it, that that Bill of itself goes out of existence automatically on demobilization, and that the Government of the day has no contemplation of its being exercised before demobilization. Consequently there would not appear to be very much practical object to be served by the stand he took.

Inasmuch as the attack which he made was certainly of an extraordinary character, and placed, at all events half of the members of this Government in a position that justifies vigorous defence, I wish to offer a little serious comment from the point of view of a member of this House, and of the late Administration, and in no way affecting to speak on behalf of the Government as constitued now. The hon. member stated that under the War-time Elections Act, a class of the population of this country was disfranchised. That is true. He stated that these disfranchised persons would have voted against the Government of the day had they not been disfranchised, or would as a rule have voted against it. That also I do not deny. I believed that to be true then, and I believe it to be true now. But he went on to say that the only reason given for their disfranchisement was the fact that they would vote against the Administration. Now, I introduced that Bill myself—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I prepared that Bill myself.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am very glad to hear my work approved by hon. gentlemen opposite. I stated the grounds of that Bill to the House. Many other hon. members of this House, both in the Government and out of the Government, stated the principle behind that Bill and the reasons for it; and no one of them—myself or any other—ever stated, as the hon. gentleman claims we stated, that the reason for that Bill was the fact that the persons disfranchised would otherwise vote against the Government. It is one thing to believe they would; it is wholly another thing to base a Bill on that belief. The fact that they would would be no reason whatever for such legislation. The reason they were disfranchised, as has a hundred times been repeated—be that reason sufficient or be it not—was that these men, bound as they were by ties of blood and kin, and by ties of a very freshly severed citizenship to the enemies of this country were not in a position, freely as Canadian citizens, to decide an issue that involved the conduct of war with the nation from which they came. That, briefly stated, was the reason given; that, briefly stated, was the reason behind the Bill. It was either sufficient or it was not. In my judgment it was good; in my judgment any other course would have been wholly unjustifiable.

But more than that: the hon. member states that the honour of the British name, the honour of the Canadian name, suffered a very serious defamation by the passing of that Act. I will quote his words. He went through a prolonged homily on the value of reputation and of character; on the value of the British name throughout the world, and he proceeded to say:

> Who can say to-day, with fairness and justice, "By the word of a Canadian I will do it"? The word of a Canadian, tried by the War-time Elections Act, is a word of trickery, a word of deception, and the word of a cheat.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Now, hon. gentlemen venture to "hear, hear" again. It may just be possible that that invective, bitter as it is, extraordinary as it is, may in a few seconds be brought back and laid at the door of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's himself. Is it to be argued that because a person is given the rights of a British subject he is guaranteed forever the franchise? Is it to be argued that an alien coming to this country and acquiring the status of a British subject thereby enjoys a higher guarantee of citizenship than a British-born subject? Nobody would venture either assertion. It cannot be supported. It is not contended by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's, or even suggested. He enjoys the same securities as the British subject born, no more and no less. But it is argued that to disfranchise British subjects born, or to disfranchise these others, is to indulge in trickery, deception and cheating. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was for a long time Premier of the province of Nova Scotia. He came into office about the year 1883, and while he was a member of the Government of the

province he introduced a Bill into the legislature of Nova Scotia by which Bill he would disfranchise within that province British subjects in the persons of all within the confines of Nova Scotia who were in the employment of the Government of Canada. That was a clause which was in the Act before, and when he brought it into the Legislature of Nova Scotia and pleaded for its reintroduction into law a motion was made by a member urging that the clause providing for disfranchisement of all these employees of the railways, post offices, inland revenue offices, lighthouses and other services of the Dominion Government in that province, should be struck out. That motion in amendment was resisted by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's,—his resistance prevailed and the clause was retained. That clause reads as follows:

> It shall not be lawful for any person to vote at any election for a member or members to represent the people in the general assembly of this Province, who at any time within fifteen days before the day of election, was an employee, or in the receipt of wages or emolument of any kind as such employee, in the Post Office, the Custom House, the Inland Revenue Department, the Lighthouse service, on the Government railroads, in the Crown Land Office, or the Local Public Works and Mines.

Then it goes on to except those who are merely supplying material and the actual postmaster and mail courier himself. And the class of men disfranchised, born British subjects, bore just about as large a proportion of the electorate of the province as those disfranchised by the War-time Elections Act bore to the electorate of Canada. He himself reaped the fruits of this disfranchisement during five provincial elections in that province.

I am not arguing that the disfranchisement was wrong. I am not questioning it. It is not necessary for my contention to argue that the disfranchisement was wrong. It was put upon the ground that these persons, being employees of the Federal authorities, would be under the influence of their employers and would not be free voters in the contest. It is a little difficult to understand why that argument would not equally apply to any person in the service of any other employer in the province of Nova Scotia. But, assuming that the argument is good and putting it on the highest plane you can, what is it? It is that by reason of external influence these British subjects were not free in the determination of questions appertaining to the province of Nova Scotia. Will anybody tell me that the influence, the stress, the power of the ties of blood and kin; the groanings and tears of brothers overseas fighting against this country would not be a thousand times more powerful than would be an influence of that kind? If British honour, if the British name, if the Canadian name has suffered a catastrophe in this country by reason of the exercise of the power of disfranchisement, that catastrophe is a whole lot older than the War-time Elections Act, and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was himself a participant in the wreck.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not sure about the date of the Act to which the hon. gentleman refers. Is the introduction of this not very much older than the coming in as Premier of Nova Scotia of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I stated so. It was introduced in 1871, three or four years after Confederation, but does the hon. gentleman argue that if men had been wrongfully disfranchised for thirteen years the continuation of the wrong is justified?

Mr. McKENZIE: The Liberals repealed the Act in Nova Scotia and it is out of date long ago.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They repealed the Act in 1909 long after the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's had ceased to be interested in Nova Scotia politics. If the War-times Elections Act is absolutely wrong;—though passed only for one election—how could the legislature of Nova Scotia support an Act and keep it on the statute-book for 38 years as the law of that province, founded on the same principle but on a far weaker case?

Now, I come to that feature of the address of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's in which he criticised the representation of this country at the Peace Conference now in session at Paris. The argument of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was that there were no subjects under discussion at this Peace Conference in which Canada had any special concern or in which Canada had any interest distinct from the interests of the British Islands, and that our representation there should be merged in the representation selected by the British Parliament. His line of thought first of all was that unless we had subjects under discussion there in which we had a purely Canadian interest, as distinct from the interest of Great Britain, we had no right to representation and he said that President Wilson was sound and logical when he resisted representation on the part of Canada. It is very difficult for me to com-

prehend how an hon. gentleman of the long experience of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) could possibly do justice to his intellect and come to the conclusion that there were no subjects under discussion in which we had a very distinct and very vital interest.

We do not fully know what is taking place; that is to say we know nothing more than is communicated to us through the regular channels. The deliberations will subsequently be made public to the extent that the conference decides, and then we will know what has been under discussion. But it seems to me that we can come to a conclusion as to the subjects that are probably under review. First of all there are the fourteen point of President Wilson on the basis of which the terms of settlement are finally to rest. There are those points that will be under discussion, and what is one of them? One of them says something about an economic arrangement as to trade between the powers of the world. That must be under discussion. I would not like to undertake to define what was in the President's mind but I presume there was something, and will anybody venture to suggest that this Dominion should not be represented and that we have no distinct interest, aside altogether from the interest of the British Islands, in the determination of the question of an economic arrangement as to trade between the Powers?

Furthermore there is under discussion there the question of the purchase, the transportation, and the disposition of food stuffs as between Allied and enemy countries. Will any one suggest that our interests with regard to that are identical with the interests of Great Britain? Our interests are by no means identical; they are distinct, and the problem for us is wholly a Canadian problem. And there could be nothing more vital, and nothing more important, than that representatives of this Dominion of high standing and authority should be there to safeguard the interests of Canada. There is nothing that bears more on the prosperity of this country at this time than the share of trade obtained by this country in the reconstruction of the desolated parts of Europe, and the share of purchases made by this country for foodstuffs and for other supplies for Allied and enemy lands. It is all right to have a trade commission, but the principles that bear on these problems are under discussion at the Peace Conference, and in the determination of these principles it is essential to this Dominion that it should be represented.

Then there is the matter of transportation, pending, at all events, the conclusion of the terms of peace. Will any one suggest that the problem of transportation is the same for Canada as it is for Great Britain? It is a different problem altogether, and it is Canadians who must have a say in the solution of that problem so far as we are concerned. I could pass from subject to subject, but there will scarcely be a matter within the deliberations of that conference in which we have not an interest, and a distinctive interest. But assuming again that on no single topic have we any concern or any special interest that may be separated from and made distinct from the interest of Great Britain, I affirm here as a Canadian citizen that as a distinct entity within the British Empire, and as a distinct self-governing entity, we are entitled to a voice in the attitude assumed by Great Britain in the disposal of every question that pertains to the terms of peace.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) referred to the fact that only on one occasion was the representative of Canada seated at the inner council of Ten which, he states, and rightly states, is so powerful in the determination of the problems of the Conference. He made some fun of the reference in the despatch to the fact that the subject under discussion at that meeting was the fixing of the boundaries of Serbia, and intimated to this House that the determination of that question should be left to clerks in the Foreign Office in England, and that in it we had no concern whatever. Well, sixty thousand soldiers of this country have come to early graves as a result of this war, and you do not trace very far back the causes that led to the war until you come to the boundaries of Serbia. Bosnia, and Herzegovina filched from Serbian control! the Serajevo massacre! the flame that lighted the world. And on the proper solution of the boundaries of Serbia, as of every power, on the certainty that those boundaries will be delimited in accordance with rightful principles of race and nationality and of self-determination, on the certainty that they will be based on the general consent of nations and in fundamental equity as between nations—on that depends the peace and prosperity of mankind for generations to come.

It is no flattery to the Prime Minister of Canada, no flattery to the Government of Canada, to say that Sir Robert Borden at

this time, removed as he is from local or European prejudices, wholly divorced as he is from the ties and understandings that may have bound countries in days gone by, and possessed as he is, of lofty judicial temperament, high legal endowment and strong personality and will—it is no flattery to him to say that his services may be inestimable in the determination of the question of the boundaries of Europe.

Let me assure Parliament—it needs no assurance I hope—that the Prime Minister did not go over to take part in that Conference, and in the negotiations that led to the Conference and that decided its constitution, he did not go over merely as a matter of his own convenience, or to satisfy his pride; he went over there on the earnest and repeated solicitation of the Prime Minister of Great Britain himself, on his earnest and repeated appeal—praying him to come not at the end of November, or at the
4 p. m. beginning of the Conference, but praying Sir Robert to come and give his services early, not to great Britain, not to Canada, but to the whole Empire, in the determination of the constitution of the Conference, in the determination of all the arrangements leading to it, and in all the problems with which the Government and the Empire were confronted leading to and before that Conference.

I do not think that the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's was doing quite justice to this Dominion when he pictured the Prime Minister of Great Britain and the President of the United States as feeding out candy to this country, endeavouring to flatter us, and, as it were, to tickle the vanity of Canada in deciding whether we should have representation or not. He even went so far as to say that President Wilson was sound and logical in his position when he took the ground, as in fancy he pictured him taking it, that we had no more right to separate representation than had the state of New York over and above the representation of the United States. Could a more preposterous thought be addressed to a deliberative assembly. Has the state of New York no say in the determination or the government of the United States? Has it no voice in the selection of the delegates of the United States? Has the state of New York any option as to whether or not it goes to war if the United States goes to war? Now let me read the words of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's. He says that he can conceive of an anomaly—he can conceive of something that would be wholly inconceivable and intolerable, and this is what it would be:

> True, there is an anomaly in the position. I grant you at once that if we had been obliged to take part in the war, having no voice in the making of it, the condition would be inconceivable and intolerable.

Well, there may be a sense in which, on a declaration of war by Britain, we have a constitutional right to determine whether we will take part in the conflict or not, there may be a constitutional sense in which we have a right to say whether we will take part in the conflict or not; but assuming there is, assuming the hon. member is right—that it would be inconceivable and intolerable that we should be bound by Britain's decision to go to war if we have no say as to whether she goes or not—then I want to put to him this question: are we not to be bound by the Treaty of Peace? Is the Treaty of Peace that binds the British Empire not to bind this country? Yes, we will surely be bound by every line and letter of that treaty that affects the Empire of Britain. And, if such be true, then on what principle under Heaven are we not to have any representation or any say in the making of the Treaty of Peace? If therefore it is inconceivable and intolerable that we should have to go to war on the declaration of war by Great Britain because we have no voice in the declaration, surely it is inconceivable and intolerable that we should be bound by the Treaty of Peace if we have no voice or say in the terms of the treaty at all.

Now it is quite true that the Council of Ten is the principal body, and very likely the initiating body of the conference. And it is very likely true as well that only on rare occasions can Canada have her actual representatives sitting at that council. But what I contend is this: It is absolutely vital that in the determination of the position that the representatives of this Empire shall take at the conference, be they Mr. Lloyd George, Mr. Balfour or anybody else, the representatives of this country must sit on the British delegation and have their voice. It is true that those representatives cannot be dominant on the British panel. It is just as true that the representatives of Nova Scotia or of my province in this Parliament cannot possibly dominate this Parliament; but here they are represented and can make their influence felt, and so long as they can do that, they have their rights. Similarly, we must be represented on the British delegation in order

that the influence and the opinion of this country may be reflected in the action taken by the delegates of the Empire in the Council of Ten.

I do not know by what title the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) describes his new faith. It certainly is not the old Liberalism; it is certainly not anything to which this Union Government can possibly subscribe. The idea that our representation in the concerns of Empire must be merged in representatives selected by the Parliament and Government of Britain and that we can have no say outside of that—surely that is not the Liberalism of to-day. The member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) shakes his head, but I think I heard him applaud and I heard a great many hon. members opposite applaud when the member for Shelburne and Queen's was enunciating these extraordinary theories.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Not at that juncture.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I noticed also that the member for Rouville (Hon. Mr. Lemieux) observed a discreet silence; he did not like the new dogmas that were being placed before him by the member for Shelburne and Queen's. If the attitude of the member for Shelburne and Queen's with relation to our representation at the conference—a compound of colonization and imperialism gone mad—is to be taken as an indication on his part of a return to the lighted chamber of Liberalism, he emphatically has taken to heart the advice of the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and has taken his provisions with him. I say this to hon. members who so vigorously applauded the remarks of the member for Shelburne and Queen's on this subject; after they go out from under the magic of his eloquence and mingle with their own peoples, they will not hear many plaudits of heresy like this, especially in the strongholds of their faith.

Mr. MURPHY: Hear, hear.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In this we have the imprimatur of the member for Russell (Mr. Murphy) and so we may take it for granted that hereafter Canada will be conceded to be properly represented in the councils of the Empire and that we shall no longer hear it suggested that the Prime Minister and his colleagues should return to Canada and not continue their work—a work they have so far performed so well in the greatest conference of all time.

A word more, and I have done. I have heard it stated more than once during the progress of this debate, that the Government is seeking shelter from criticism under the shadow of war and that the freedom of criticism of the old days is denied. Well, there was a time, when the war was in progress, when the fate of this country was in peril, that we did ask from hon. gentlemen greater care in the attacks they levelled against the Administration and greater efforts at unity in this House than are ordinarily made under the party system. That was not for the protection or for the good of the Government; it was, as we deemed it, in the vital interests of the country. We felt that the advantages of union were greater than the advantages, however important they were, of the full and free play of party criticism in Parliament. We felt it was important that there should not be an encouragement of disunion in the country by unnecessary disunion in Parliament. But the war is over now—at all events, the peril is passed—we want no favours; we ask for no quarter; we seek no shelter. If the opponents of this Government have any batteries in reserve, let the heavy artillery come on. We shall exhaust every effort to learn and to understand our duty, and by the courage and the efficiency of its performance, we are quite prepared to be judged.

Mr. JULES EDOUARD PREVOST (Terrebonne) Translation): Mr. Speaker, whoever in this House rises to take part in this debate, cannot help noticing with deep sorrow the vacant seat once occupied by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Hon. members who preceded me were anxious to lay their tribute of sweet remembrance and praise on the grave of that illustrious Canadian. As the days pass away, we realize more and more that a great voice has lapsed into silence, but within these precincts we can still hear the echo of the golden words with which Laurier used to express the great Liberal principles which always guided his life and illuminated Canadian politics.

Just as the stars project their rays over the boundless space long after their fires are extinct, the splendor cast on our national life by Laurier is not about to fade away and will be continued for a long time in our history. He is still alive, first in our heart then in the Liberal policy which was his own and which cannot die. We do not see him among us and his pleasant smile and intelligent eyes shine no more in this House, but his spirit is still present, I mean the vivid inspiration which created,

maintained and developed in his mind the wise political doctrines of the golden mean, the only one that may apply to this country.

Some people have disdainfully called that policy opportunism. Truly, it was opportunism, but the right kind of opportunism. There are two sorts of opportunism; one, woeful and vile, which consists of changing heart and soul according to the time and chances of personal benefit; the other, a well comprehensive policy, which leads you to accept unavoidable but honest compromises in order to go as far as possible toward the end in view which it would be difficult to accomplish all of a sudden.

Laurier's science of conceding was always guided by the most sincere Liberalism. His idea of Liberalism hovered always very high; it was most attractive because it appealed to all indiscriminately and solicited the support of every man in the heart of whom, as he so well described, are enshrined the principles of eternal truth and unalterable justice.

It was Liberalism in its most extensive form, that which Laurier advocated and practiced, opposing action to reaction, the reasonable emancipation of the mind to its bondage, progress to stagnancy, education to ignorance, and including claims for all legitimate liberties, tolerance, war on fanaticism and the firm respect of the rights of mankind.

Thus placed at the apex, Laurier's idea of Liberalism prevailed over the races, the creeds and even the parties. That is why he had so many supporters and explains how he leaves so many sincere admirers on all sides, in all groups. But he believed, and we believe with him, that the Liberal party is the political organization which is most capable to carry out the ideal of Liberalism.

We are the trustees of Laurier's doctrine. It is our duty, as much as our best claim to glory, to work for the triumph of that ideal of Canadian Liberalism. The whole of Canada is proud of Laurier and surrounds his memory with praise and regrets as a halo the brightness of which nothing can ever impair.

But we, his adepts, his political followers, have greater cause than any others to pride ourselves on such a leader and to mourn his death. Should Laurier come back in our midst now I believe he would say to us, in pleasant and fervid tones: "My friends, men amount to little; what counts is the ideal. The ideal of Canadian Liberalism did not disappear with me and when I bequeathed it to you, I gave you the best of myself."

By the light of our late lamented leader's political doctrine, allow me to consider for a few moments the policy, or rather the lack of policy of this Government. It is a well known fact that this Union Government has been the greatest enemy of union in Canada. Unionism has divided the country, the souls and hearts of its people, the Liberal as well as the Conservative parties, and the Government to which it gave birth is divided against itself. The Union Government will destroy itself like the scorpion which bites off its own tail. That party whose policy was embodied in the one cry: "Win the War," has not even succeeded in administering safely the affairs of this country in the actual interest of the war.

The sensational disclosures made in this House, a few days ago, by the hon. member for Victoria, ex Minister of Militia, are adding to the substantial evidence already secured.

Those whose mission it is to wash the Government of all impurity may reply that the hon. member for Victoria did not go in the trenches and, therefore, is not well acquainted with what was going on at the front; they may also say that he was relieved from his duties of Minister by Sir Robert Borden and that his criticism is inspired by personal grudge. But another arraignment still more formidable than the charges laid by the ex-Minister of Militia, has just been made against the military administration of this Government which is alleged to have been created for the purpose of "winning the war." I am referring to the statements made in the legislature of Quebec, last Friday, by General Smart, Conservative member for Westmount.

In a forceful speech, General Smart, who returned from overseas recently, where he secured an important command and remarkable promotions after four years of active service, denounced the medical service and the general administration of the Canadian army in Great Britain and in Canada.

What will be the answer of this Government to the charges laid by the general, who makes the following solemn declaration:

> Before I left England, I was requested by several officers to call the attention of the Canadian people upon certain conditions which obtained there for a long time and which the officers could not bring to light.
>
> Unfortunately they can do nothing for those who are dead, except perpetuate their memory and extend protection to their families; but there are many officers and men who are going

to be the wards of the Government during the next 20 or 30 years, and it is in their own interest that I should bring forth the following facts: I say, without any fear of being contradicted by any unbiased authority, that the medical administration overseas was bad. It showed itself dull and careless and should have been much improved. Personally, after a stay of four years overseas, I have no confidence in those who carry on the administration in Great Britain.

General Smart sharply criticized the heads of the Army Medical Corps and particularly Sir George Perley who, according to his statement, caused much harm and trouble which he set forth and condemned. In the course of his violent denunciation, General Smart cited facts and names; his facts were quite specific. For instance he charged the heads of the Army Medical Corps with having caused the death of General Steele and through their inefficiency and carelessness, and with rendering incurable a great number of soldiers.

The dealings of Sir George Perley, General Turner and Sir Edward Kemp are closely scrutinized by that gallant officer. He positively states that the troubles at Rhyl, as well as those which occurred at Shorncliffe, at Witney and at Bramshott, were the outcome of the resentment inspired by the treatment to which the men had been subjected for a long time past. He denounced some of the Orders in Council passed by this Government and wondered whether this Government were composed of men still possessed of common sense.

After having re-asserted that the overseas administration was bad and had been so for the last two years, General Smart moved the following resolution which was adopted unanimously:

That in the opinion of this House, the Federal Government should supply the people with all the information relative to the treatment meted out to officers and men of the Canadian Expeditionary Force recruited in this province, who have returned from overseas sick or wounded and are still under treatment in the hospitals.

Mr. Gault another Conservative of long standing, whose name I have already mentioned, seconded general Smart's motion.

In view of these facts, the "win the war" Government find themselves in a queer position. Such is the work accomplished by the Government, who juggled away the election in 1917, by proclaiming that they want first of all to organize the Canadian army in order to win the war. Such is the record of this Union Government, who persist in saying that their task is not yet completed and that their existence is absolutely necessary for the welfare of the country. The more we go, the more we realize the harm which they are doing, as evidenced by the returning officers and soldiers. General Smart exclaimed in the Quebec Legislature: "I do not want imperialism, if it must be at the cost of the soldiers suffering". These words which fall as a whip's lash on the face of the Government are expressing my own opinion, and I may add that the "win-the-war" cry, with which the Unionists were able to smother the free and true expression of public opinion in 1917, is no longer strong enough to drown the loud denunciations and the bitter complaints of those who fell the victims of the carelessness, incompetence and favoritism of this Government. Moreover, Mr. Speaker, since the tragedy on the battlefield is over, why should they keep up at home this joke of unionism which has not even a pretence to justify its existence?

Let us see what the Government has accomplished. In establishing conscription, they satisfied nobody, and, less of all, the western farmers; they broke the harmony, so essential to the efficiency of our common endeavour during the terrible war in which we were taking part. Under that useless legislation, they succeed in securing only a few hundred soldiers more than they would have done under the voluntary system, had the latter been properly organized. It is easy to prove it, and I will do so on another occasion during this session, should I be given an opportunity to do so.

The speech from the Throne contains no reference to the most serious problems which Canada is facing to-day. The country is indebted to the extent of $2,000,000,000. Each year we shall require several hundred millions to meet our most unavoidable obligations. One of the ministers told this House a few days ago that he expected a deficit of one hundred millions for the next fiscal year. However, the speech from the Throne does not mention any way by which the Government can secure the revenue which they require.

There is no mention of the cost of living in the speech from the Throne, though it is a difficult problem which requires a prompt solution. Who does not know of, or has not suffered from the effects of the increased cost of living: unjustified penury and hardship for the great majority of the people, distress for many, evident social unrest, agitation among certain sections of the proletariat, strikes or threat to strike, ever swelling budgets on account of the increases in salary, pensions and bonuses which we must provide for

Were not the people entitled to expect that the Government, re-organized under the high-sounding title of unionism, would deal carefully with the economic conditions of the country which were and are still most critical? What efficient steps were taken to prevent excessive profits, to prohibit hoarding, to prevent the formation of combines for the purpose of boosting prices and to reduce the cost of living? This government did not take enough care of these economic problems. The prices of commodities have steadily gone up, not only since the war, but even since 1913. I want to point out that the crisis resulting from the increased cost of living dates not only from the time when the war broke out, and cannot be attributable exclusively to the war. Even previous to the war, two years after the coming into power of the Borden government, a financial crisis was raging in Canada. The customs receipts decreased by $1,000,000 during each of the six months previous to the outbreak of the war. Those of the railways decreased by $13,000,000 in 1914; immigration was slackening and the applications for homesteads had fallen off considerably, though the war was not declared. Then the cost of living was increasing steadily. Therefore the war is not the only cause and source of that increase, but of course, it has made conditions worse. The burden imposed upon our people becomes heavier every day. The cost of feeding a family is now $14 a week, compared with $7 in 1914. This is a serious problem for all salaried people, for those who have a small income. Bread and bacon, to mention only these two articles of food, are dearer in Canada than in Great Britain.

Is it possible, as Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated in his manifesto in 1917, to doubt that prices here are increased through causes which are not related in any way to the war, except that the war served as a pretext for that increase?

Again I say that the evil was due to excessive profits and the hoarding of foodstuffs with a view to increasing the prices. Everybody knows it, and so does the Government better than anyone else. Then why did they not apply an efficient remedy?

First, this Government ought to have taken efficient means to bring under their control all the manufacturers producing foodstuffs, in order that these might be sold at fixed prices such as was done in Great Britain, Australia and elsewhere.

In Great Britain, the Government guaranteed certain prices to the farmers and procured them labour, horses and implements at fixed prices. The farmers were promised substantial returns for their wheat, potatoes and so forth, thus stimulating production. Then the Government fixed the retail prices of meat, milk, butter, margarine, cheese, sugar, potatoes, fats, poultry, pork, rabbits, ham, bacon, tea, coffee, oils, and so forth, to the consumers. By some legislation they caused the bread to be sold to the people at reasonable prices.

Adequate measures were also adopted by the Australian government. In a recent work entitled "State Regulation of Prices in Australia," an Australian economist, Mr. H. L. Wilkinson, states that the government's legislation and intervention in that country caused a reduction of prices which would not have obtained otherwise, thus affecting the cost of living to the advantage of the consumers. The intervention of the Australian government, in one simple case, that of bread, saved the consumers of the Commonwealth a sum of $2,000,000. Sometime about the summer of 1916, the Australian government made up a list of prices which could not be increased without their consent, covering from meats to Italian paste for children. It is worth while comparing the prices of the main products of Canada and Australia. I have with me a comparative statement which, though it was made in February, 1917, can give us a good idea of the cost of living in Australia and Canada, for the difference in prices in these two countries has necessarily increased.

Here is the statement as drawn out on February 15, 1917:

	Australia.	Canada.
Bran (per ton)	$21.84	$35.00
Bread (per 1½ lb. loaf)	.05	.09
Butter	.36	.40 to .46
Bacon	.27 to .33	.32 to .33
Cheese	.21	.30
Flour	5.28 to 6.00	9.20 to 9.90
Oatmeal (per 100 lb. bag)	2.40	3.80
Potatoes (per bushel)	.45½	2.00 to 2.34
Eggs	.18 to .24	.50 to .58
Yellow sugar (per lb.)	.06	.08
White sugar (per lb.)	.06½	.09

The official report shows the cost of living increased from February, 1914, to February, 1917:

In Australia	9·4%
In Canada	44·2%
In United States	25%

Once more I say that the Union Government should have interfered, as was done elsewhere. They should have made arrangements with the producers of foodstuffs so

as to let them have a fair return in proportion to the money invested, in order that the middle class consumer might secure food at the cheapest rates. Should it have been impossible to make such arrangements, the Government should have requisitioned all food manufactures. This is what President Wilson did in the United States, after the revolting conditions that prevailed had been disclosed in an investigation of the scandalous profits made by meat packers. In Canada as well in the United States an investigation showed the exorbitant profits made in certain foodstuffs. Then it was the duty of this Government to put an end to those scandals. They did nothing of the kind; the business of their millionaire friends must not be interfered with.

A few weeks ago, Mr. Childow, an expert chemist of Chicago, stated at a meeting of the Montreal Housewives League: "Your food control department took greater care in protecting the millers than the small consumer. If the big American millers were able to declare dividends of 37 per cent by making a profit of 25 cts. per barrel of flour, the Canadian miller must have made still more with a profit of 40 cents, to which the Government assented. Beside, all you have to do is to watch for their annual reports and you will notice the enormous profits which the millers of this country are piling up."

The Government should have stepped in whenever the high prices were not justified, instead of limiting their intervention to foodstuffs. They had the necessary power to do so which they exercised in connection with the price of newsprint. Why did they not act likewise in the case of a great many other products and staple commodities the high cost of which is the cause of the helpless condition of so many homes? Instead of that, the Government did nothing and when they appeared as though they were taking action, it was inefficient. They did not fix the prices, they let the food accumulate in storage, they cared for nothing but to assist the profiteers and did not check the importation of our most indispensable products.

In his manifesto of 1917, Sir Wilfrid Laurier stated that no efficient measures for the lowering of the cost of living could be secured before the tariff had been revised and the duty taken off the commodities which make for excessive profits, hoarding and combines with a view to boosting the prices. Furthermore he said: "If I should be entrusted with the administration of this country, I would see to it that the farmers be immediately relieved of the customs duties which are a burden to them." Laurier also promised to abolish immediately the war tax of 7½ per cent which this Government has imposed since the beginning of the war. He said clearly: "I would abolish immediately the duties on agricultural implements and other farming requisites, such as requested by the western farmers, and I would make a feature of my administration a general and well elaborated revision of the tariff with a view to promoting production in Canada and relieving the Canadian consumer."

That is still desirable. Exaggerated protection, specially that of foodstuffs, is one of the principal causes of the high cost of living. The duty on foodstuffs is now forty per cent, which means sixty per cent for the consumer, as the profit made on such goods by the middlemen, represent 20 per cent. However, none of these products should be taxed more than 20 per cent.

The merchant who is unable, notwithstanding that protection, to compete with foreign manufacturers ought to change his occupation. Protection is a good thing as long as it applies to all classes and provided it does not work for the sole benefit of the producers but for that of the consumers as well. We are importing only 25 per cent of what we are consuming in this country; the other 75 per cent is the product of our own manufactures. While we are consuming Canadian goods, we are paying, through an increase in prices, a large proportion of the duty that we would have to pay if we had to import those goods. Each family is paying $300 or $400 in customs duties which fall into the treasury, and increase the manufacturers' profits, thanks to the tariff. This is exorbitant and the Liberal party has always striven to protect the consumer as well as the producer.

In 1893, the Liberal party did not include free Trade in their platform, as it is asserted by Conservatives and others. The 1893 platform included first, a tariff for the purpose of revenue; secondly, commercial reciprocity of natural products with the United States.

What did the Liberals do when they came into power? Here is what the blue books show. The Macdonald tariff was enforced in 1879; and the result was that in 1881, the average duty was 20.19 per cent on dutiable and free goods.

The Liberals came into power in 1896, and the Fielding tariff was adopted in 1897. The result was that two years after, in

1899, they were charging 16.17 per cent on all dutiable and free goods, that is 3.49 per cent less on the value of the goods imported for home consumption. For every $100 collected in 1879, we were charging only $83 in 1899. And the Liberal party kept on lowering the tariff from year to year. However when they came into power, the expenses of the country exceeded the receipts by two millions, and this did not prevent them from lowering the tariff. Therefore the Liberals have first reduced the duties to the extent of $17 per $100, and then they did away with high protection duties on all staple commodities.

For instance, cotton and linen and linen goods had to pay a specific duty of from one to two cents per square yard and an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent; the Liberal Administration abolished the specific duty and made a big cut in the ad valorem duty. The consumer was benefited for, when you come down to it, it is the consumer who has to pay the customs duties on all the goods we import into this country.

Some other examples: There was a duty of 7½ cents per gallon on petrol; the Liberals reduced this to 5 cents. Under the Tories molasses paid an ad valorem duty of 15 per cent; the Liberals cut this down to 1¼ cents a gallon. Under the Conservative Administration ready-made clothing paid 10 cents a pound plus an ad valorem duty of 35 per cent; under the Liberals the 10 cents per pound duty was abolished and the ad valorem reduced by 10 per cent.

The Liberal Government followed the same policy with regard to woollens; under the Conservatives these goods paid a specific duty of 7½ cents and 20 per cent ad valorem; the Liberals abolished the specific duty.

So that it may be said in very truth that the Liberals instituted a tariff for revenue only; and they adopted a policy of reciprocity with the United States in natural products.

We are told that a downward revision of the tariff at the present time would deprive the country of revenue which is badly needed. That sort of argument does not put the question on the proper plane. The tariff may be lowered in such a way as to protect the consumer and nevertheless still maintain and even increase the country's revenue. What must be done is to change the incidence of taxation. Let us note that in Canada about 10 per cent of our revenue is derived from excess profits and from the income tax, while 90 per cent is derived from customs duties and excise, which latter affect the pockets of the consumer. In England 82 per cent of the revenue is derived from excess profits and from the income tax while customs and excise furnish only 18 per cent. In England the burden is on the rich; here it is chiefly the poor man who pays. In France, besides the income tax there is a tax on excess profits. Starting at 50 per cent this tax has risen to 60 per cent on all profits above 500,000 francs. I believe this tax has been still further increased. If I be correct, 60 per cent is levied on profits beyond 100,000 francs, 70 per cent above 200,000 and, as in England, 80 per cent on all profits over and above 500,000 francs. In Canada the Union Government which always protects the big fellow at the expense of those who are least able to bear it, instead of increasing the excess profits tax so as to bear more heavily on the higher profits, has done just the opposite. I'll prove this to you: the income tax passed at the session of 1917 falls on the salaried workers and, on the other hand, exempts in unbelievable proportions the profits of the big enterprises which have fattened on the war; the same is true of big business which, through its tremendous capital, puts an abnormal strain on the resources of the country.

Let us compare the amounts contributed, in proportion to their profits, by the companies with a capital of $100,000, first through the war profits tax which lapsed on December 31, 1918, and then through the income tax.

A company making 10 per cent profit paid into the Treasury, under the business profits tax, $750; under the income tax that company pays only $280. A profit of 15 per cent brought $2,000; with the new tax all we get is $480. A 20 per cent profit gave $4,500; now it gives only $680; a 25 per cent profit used to give $8,250; all it gives now is $880. A profit of 30 per cent which used to bring $12,000 now merely brings in $1,080. A profit of 50 per cent contributed, under the old tax $27,000; under the income tax, the Treasury receives only $1,880. A 100 per cent profit used to give $64,500 in taxes; now it gives but $3,000; while a profit of 200 per cent which was formerly taxed to the tune of $139,500 is now asked to pay a paltry $7,880.

Would we like to get a better understanding of how it is that the companies which are making very big profits are exempt from the tremendous burden of taxation while those with small salaries are being constantly called upon to pay a great deal more

than they can afford? Let us cite a few instances of this and, Mr. Speaker, you will allow me to be perhaps a bit tiresome so as to make clear what I have to say and prove my case with substantial facts and figures

Let us suppose that the companies I am about to speak of made the same profits in 1916, 1917 and 1918, and then let us compare what they formerly paid, and what they pay to-day, into the Public Treasury. Let us take the Ogilvie Company, for instance: in 1916 its revenue on a capital investment of $5,622,486, warranted the payment, under the business profits tax, of $280,886. In 1917, if we suppose the company's revenue to be the same as in 1916, the tax on its profits should have amounted to $547,478, but with the income tax all the company has to pay on its 1919 profits is $60,564.

Another company, one which is not unknown, is the Wm. Davies Co.; in 1916 they paid an excess profits tax of $223,063. For the fiscal year ended March 31, 1917, they should pay $1,380,000; but for 1919 all the income tax demands from them is $55,200.

The net profits of the Nova Scotia Steel Co. in 1916 were $2,104,478 and the excess profits tax brought $237,252; but their income tax for 1919 is only $84,056.

Take Canada Foundry: net profits in 1916, $653,852; war tax, $222,368. The income tax has reduced this amount to $26,-152.

The Ford Motor Co., with an invested capital of $5,909,000, cleared profits amounting to $3,303,678, or 54.2 per cent, in 1916. Under the old tax this company contributed to the Treasury $697,323. In 1917 its taxes amounted to $1,782,095, but with the income tax this will be cut down to $127,-987.

The Northern Aluminium Co., with a capital investment of $3,860,000 cleared $1,636,600 profits in 1916, or 42.4 per cent; tax in 1916, $341,679; tax in 1917, $822,332. With the new income tax this company has to pay a mere tax of $65,565.

The Canada Forging Co., with an investment of $1,455,526 cleared $991,359 profits in 1916, let us say 68.11 per cent, and this brought a tax of $222,368; in 1917 this company paid into the Treasury $590,689; while in 1919 all they will pay will be $39,524.

The Steel Co. of Canada, with an investment of $13,963,000, cleared in 1916 a profit of $2,210,343, or 15.83 per cent; hence its tax amounted to $308,240; in 1917 the company paid taxes to the tune of $337,055; the income tax will bring only $88,293.

The Imperial Oil Co., capital, $27,161,000, cleared in 1916, $4,837,364 or 17.81 per cent; war tax, $734,046; 1917, $924,849. The tax under the new order will be only $193,374.

The Fairbanks-Morse Co., capital, $3,686,-500, cleared $669,100, in 1916 a percentage of 18.15 per cent; war tax $102,748; 1917, $135,767. The income tax will be satisfied with $26,640.

These figures go to show how lightly the income tax bears on the companies that are making the heaviest profits. And we must not lose sight of the fact that a great many of them are manufacturing articles of universal use, the prices of which have increased enormously since the declaration of war.

It is evident that these millionaire companies are not paying a sufficient share of the taxes which burden our Canadian people. Even when their share of the taxes was higher than it is today they were still paying less than they would have paid in Australia for instance.

Thus, in 1916, Stanfield Limited, instead of paying $14,297, would have paid $54,844 in Australia; in 1917 they would have paid $82,266. The Consolidated Rubber Co., would have paid to the Australian Treasury, in 1916, $453,750 instead of $154,687; and in 1917 they would have paid $680,625 instead of $247,500. In Australia, in 1916, the Dominion Canners would have paid $278,425 taxes instead of the $79,125 they paid Canada; in 1917, their taxes would have been $417,637 instead of $177,120.

The Government, far from looking to these millionaire corporations for an increase in our revenue at a time when the war which brought them colossal fortunes is putting a huge debt on this country, asks them for less than ever and lightens their burden.

If the Government had adopted a more enlightened policy, as has been done in Australia, they could abolish the duty on every single one of the prime necessaries of life and still increase the country's revenue.

The Union Government has neglected, and continues to neglect the alarming difficulties which the nation are vitally interested in seeing solved. If this Union Government insists on staying on despite the march of events which to-day fail to justify its existence, at least it should not reveal itself as a union against one race, against a minority that, within the fold of Confederation possesses, by virtue of our Constitution and of the most elementary justice, the same rights as the majority.

Oligarchy has been precisely defined: "A small group of citizens who undertake to

govern to the exclusion of the other citizens" (such was Canada from 1791 to 1840) "or a numerous class who exercise a monopoly of political power to the exclusion of the other citizens" (such is Canada since 1917, that is since the spontaneous generation of Union Government.)

We must regard a government of that kind as one of the enemies of freedom.

The present Government systematically neglects the French Canadian element and refuses to grant these people the share they are entitled to in the administration and the reconstruction of the country.

The Government is not justified in giving as its reason the fact that the province of Quebec went solid against those in power at the time of the 1917 elections. To begin with, the French Canadian element has plenty of company: the Opposition group in this House represents 800,000 Canadian voters of whom 519,940 are outside the province of Quebec; and this figure of 519,940 is one half of the vote polled by the Government throughout the entire Dominion.

Besides, has the Government any right to indulge such a narrow-minded grudge when it has proclaimed itself so often and so loudly the champion of democracy, justice and freedom? Nevertheless the Union Government, instead of striving to bring about the union of all races, the harmonious concord of all minds and hearts in a common national undertaking, without distinction of nationality, creed or opinion, seems determined to organize a union against the French Canadian Catholics, and thus comes under the head of the definition I gave a moment ago: a class who exercise a monopoly of political power to the exclusion of other citizens.

I find one proof of this, one out of a hundred, in the fact that we barely find two French Canadians on the numerous commissions appointed by the Government during the war; so much so that the Montreal district Chambre de Commerce was moved to protest, and with good reason, against this ostracism of French Canadians on the commissions appointed by the Union Government, especially on the commission sent to represent Canada in France and Belgium. In this connection the Government's fanaticism brought about the result, which not only is ridiculous but will work harm to our country's interests, that commissioners who have not the slightest knowledge of the French language represent Canada in France and Belgium in an endeavour to promote our commercial interests after the war! After that we can hardly feel astonished that the said commission is not meeting with any great success.

I find another proof of this deplorable spirit that seems to animate the Government, which styles itself a Union Government, in the list of physicians recently appointed by the Repatriation committee. Out of fifty doctors appointed how many are French Canadian? Not a single one!

If we but watch a bit these governmental appointments and the distribution of federal funds we are soon convinced, and the conviction strengthens the further we go, that we French Canadians are being systematically robbed. We are being deprived of our share of the profits accruing to us as partners in Confederation. The element which supports Union Government comprises only 54 per cent of the population and still they wish to treat the French Canadians as a conquered and ransomed people. What we contribute to the Public Treasury and what comes back to us in the form of public expenditure shows clearly the supremely unjust manner in which the Government of National Discord treats a race that is inferior to no other and that holds imprescriptible rights to representation whether in the councils of the nation, in the public service or in honours and in the distribution of State moneys.

Can it be that the Union Government is the official representative of that Anglo-Canadian clique defined and upbraided by William Moore in his fine book "The Clash" in which he, a Protestant and an Anglo-Canadian acknowledges and proves that his compatriots are meting out to the French Canadians exactly the same treatment as that which characterized the deportment of the Germans towards the people of Alsace-Lorraine, the Poles and the Danes.

I am asking for no favour or privilege for the French Canadian all I wish for is the recognition of that right for which the Great Powers of the Entente have just won a glorious victory. Have not the French Canadians the same right to national liberty and to justice as the Czecho-Slovaks, the Poles and the other nationalities within the muscovite empire? After the war which has just come to a close and which was heralded as humanity's crusade for the triumph of right let us hope that never again will any people be forced to bear the yoke of a tyrannical majority. Let them well understand and harken to what I say, those Unionists who are plotting the de-

gradation of the French Canadians, those jingoes and Tories who persecute us in our language and in our faith wherever they meet us.

We must never lose sight of the fact, and particularly the Union Government should always bear in mind, that the British Empire is not founded on violence, on force, on oligarchy, but on moral principles, on the principles of liberty and equality.

I claim for all those whose country occupies the first place in their hearts, and who want to see this country rise to prosperity and greatness in the full enjoyment of peace and harmony, I claim for both races in Canada the same political reciprocity that King Albert promised the Walloons and the Flemish on his return to Belgium last November.

Let the Union Government which insists on surviving the war at least accomplish deeds of life and not of death. Let the Government beware of dishonouring the name of Canada by depriving citizens of foreign extraction, whom we ourselves brought here at great expense, of rights which were promised and given them. Let us clean, or rather let us disinfect our statutes of that iniquitous measure the War Time Elections Act, and not show more severity than France or the United States towards citizens of enemy origin. So long as these folks remain peaceful citizens, respectable, industrious and law-abiding we cannot, without forfeiting our honour, repudiate the rights we granted them when we admitted them to British citizenship.

Let the Union Government give millions to the provinces for the building of great national highways, for the development of technical education, which forms the backbone of our industrial progress and our commercial expansion, for organizing hygiene and sanitation throughout the country, for agriculture; I am in favour of all that; but these grants should be made on a just basis, on the basis of population, and the distribution of the grants should be left to the autonomous government of each province.

Let the Government think of the people and stop being the protector of our millionaires, and this latter to such an extent that one of the Government's own friends was able to say that it belonged to Mr. Flavelle.

Let the Government see to it that the consumer is protected and this can be done without working any harm to our industries, if the tariff is lowered on all the necessaries of life and prices are fixed in such a way as to prevent the profiteers from piling up fortunes out of all reason.

Let the Government proceed to make a more equitable distribution of the taxes, so that the rich man and not the poor man will pay most. Let it show the greatest solicitude for our glorious soldiers who have emblazoned the name of Canada on the battlefields of Europe, let it show as much interest in the humblest of them as in the officers; let it shelter from misery our wounded and their families and furnish steady employment to the others, by reinstating them in their old positions, by settling them on the land or by utilizing their labour on works of national importance.

Let the Government be generous and just to all military defaulters; most of them are farmers who had been promised exemption and were shamefully deceived by the Government. Let the Government forgive; it has itself so much to be forgiven.

I fear, Mr. Speaker, that all this cannot be accomplished under the present Government which instead of giving its attention to matters of what we term reconstruction, seems to be entirely preoccupied with holding together its own structure which threatens to fall apart. We perceive the outer sign which permits us to force the tumbling into a heap of this patched up edifice. That is what is causing such great anxiety to the Government and that is what makes us feel hopeful; for the sooner this mongrel union, which will go down in history under the mocking title of "unionism," has been sundered, the better it will be for the people of this country who will then choose administrators and legislators more respectful of our Constitution, more jealous of the rights of all our citizens, and more devoted to the real interest of this dear land of ours.

Mr. JOHN A. MAHARG (Maple Creek): Mr. Speaker, before proceeding with the discussion on the question that is now before the House, I would like, on behalf of the interests that I largely represent, as well as on my own behalf, to say a word or two in regard to the passing of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. We in the West owe very much to our departed friend, much more than I would attempt at this time to enumerate. About the time of his taking up the reins of office here in 1896, the West was in a very bad condition, the agriculturists of Western Canada being, in so far as the marketing of their products was concerned, almost entirely in the hands of possibly one of the largest and most gigantic combines. I refer to the grain combine. It is not necessary to go into the details; suffice it to say that we had to take just

what they saw fit to give us. As there was no machinery whatever of a Federal character to deal with such conditions, we appealed to the late Prime Minister for redress, and we received it in a very great measure. Whatever else there may be on which we may differ, there is at least one warm spot that will always remain for Sir Wilfrid Laurier in the hearts of the agriculturists of Western Canada. We feel that he was indeed a great and noble person; his aim in life was to relieve the oppressed, and I think I can say with all sincerity that the life of our departed friend was largely devoted to this sublime object. If the words of the Master be true,—as I believe,—then, I am sure that the dead Liberal chieftain's cup has been an overflowing one in this world and will continue as such in the great beyond.

Before touching on the speech from the Throne, I would like to refer to one or two of the remarks made by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) in this House.

I am sorry the hon. gentleman (Mr. Fielding) is not in his seat, not that I have any very serious criticism to make, for with a great deal that he said I am thoroughly in accord; but there are one or two points I should like to touch on, and the first point is with reference to the presence overseas of certain ministers of the Crown. I am not in a position to say whether it is necessary for them all to be there at the present time, but I have no hesitation whatever in saying that, so far as the presence overseas of the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) is concerned, there never was a time in the history of Canada when they were more required over there than now. I had the pleasure of being in England a couple of months ago, and conditions there and on the Continent are such that unless we have the very best possible representation overseas conditions in Canada within twelve months will be very far from favourable. I will refer to this matter later when dealing with the chief product of Western Canada —our grain.

I also wish to criticise the remarks of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's with reference to the "word of a Canadian" not standing for very much when certain legislation passed by this Parliament some time ago is taken into consideration. With all due respect for his opinion, I can cite a case where we would have suffered much greater humiliation by breaking our word than on the occasion my hon. friend had in mind. Ever since our boys have been going to the war, what promise have we made to them? From one end of Canada to the other the parting word has been: "We will see you through boys, we will back you up to the last man and the last dollar." As to that there was no division of opinion throughout this country. And I ask, what value would be placed on our word now if we in this House had said, as some have said: "Canada has done enough for the present; let other countries who have not done their share have their way for a while." If this Parliament had said that, the word of a Canadian, the word of the Canadian people might truly have been lightly thought of; if we had not taken the stand we did I shudder to think of the criticism that would have been levelled at us by the few Canadian soldiers who would have returned. I for one would have hung my head in shame when they came back, and I am sure many others would have done the same.

The hon. member (Mr. Fielding) also gave some advice to the farmers of Western Canada. He advised them to join up with one or the other of the two great political parties in this country, but he would not undertake to say which party they should join. Surely, the hon. member, with his long political experience, was a little unreasonable in leaving the selection to agriculturists without any political experience whatever, especially seeing that for the time being he had decided to stay in a position from which he could jump to one side of the fence or the other. For his information and for the information of the House I might say that the farmers of Western Canada have absolutely no intention,—and I doubt if they will have for some considerable time—of tying themselves up to either one of the two great political parties we knew in this country in the past. Neither do I think they are going to tie themselves up definitely to the Unionist party, at this particular time. They do not wish to fetter themselves in any way; they are determined to have absolute freedom so far as action in this House is concerned.

A representative of the press has described it as a case of choosing between the sheep and the goats. That should be an easy decision to make under ordinary circumstances, for certainly the western farmers do not want to link themselves up with the goats whichever they may be. and as the Good Book tells us to beware of

wolves in sheep's clothing, we do not like to tie ourselves up with the sheep, even supposing we were able to distinguish them from the goats at the present time.

With the greater portion of the speech of His Excellency the Governor General, and particularly with that part referring to the war having been brought to a successful conclusion, I am in hearty accord. But with other parts of the speech I do not entirely agree. I think the first legislation mentioned is the new Franchise Act that will be brought down. I do not know just what is in the minds of the Government, but I will say this much: unless the new Act makes radical changes in the Act on which the last election was fought, it will be severely criticised so far as Western Canada is concerned. I do not say that I disapprove entirely of the War-time Elections Act, but it has certain features which the West did not like, and I trust the Government will give due consideration to that.

With regard to highways, although I should undoubtedly like to see good highways, I am thoroughly convinced that there are other things which we need more at this moment than highways, or what might be termed automobile roads. A national highway has been spoken of. To attempt to build such a highway at this time would in my opinion be utter folly, and I am convinced that there are many other works which should first be undertaken, and which would prove much more valuable and provide an equal amount of employment, and perhaps more congenial employment. Take, for instance, our railways. The amount of money which the Government purposes setting aside for distribution, over a number of years, in the building of highways, would go a long way towards giving relief in the way of railway facilities to certain districts in Western Canada which have been waiting patiently for it for the last seven or eight, and, in some cases, ten or even twelve years.

The next matter referred to in the Address is the question of housing. Now, if it is the intention of the Government to confine the proposed assistance to returned men, I have nothing whatever to say in opposition to it. I entirely agree with any proposal that aims at assisting those who are now seeking homes, and who have been married overseas. I think we should give such men every possible assistance in securing homes. But if it is the intention that this assistance shall be general, for any and every one in the country, then I would certainly object very seriously. I do not think that such a thing would be proper. We, in Canada, should surely be in sufficiently good circumstances to be able to look after our domestic wants,—that is, those of us who have remained at home during the war. Employment has been abundant, wages have been, to say the least, fair, and in some cases more than fair; and it seems to me that those desiring accommodation should be in a position to obtain their own requirements, if they have not been overseas. The matter of assisting the returned soldier is one that, in my opinion, should be given special consideration. The plan under which the Government are now working is in some respects very good. In other respects I do not think it goes far enough. Some three or four years ago I outlined what I thought to be a better plan, and the Government has adopted my suggestion practically in its entirety, but with this exception, that they are leaving the returned soldier entirely at the mercy of the land speculator, at least so far as Western Canada is concerned. As far as I can ascertain, there is no provision made for dealing with those who purchased land in that part of the country years and years ago, who gave for it a mere pittance, and who are now holding it at what, to my mind, are exorbitant and unreasonable prices; at all events when it is offered to the returned soldiers. This Government might very well indeed devote its attention to some measure whereby the present Soldiers' Settlement Board, or some other board, could step in when they considered prices were exorbitant, and act as arbitrator between the returned soldiers and those holding the land.

Now, I come to the question of prohibition. I do not think we need worry very much about that. I feel that the Government must surely be convinced that the people of Canada have intimated very unequivocally to them their opinion on this matter. There is one argument,—indeed, I might term it a campaign,—that is being used to defeat the interests of prohibition in Canada. This argument came to my notice on different occasions. It is an argument which is being urged by those who are anxious to have the prohibition law, as they say, "eased up just a little bit." They contend that the soldiers want beer; that they have been accustomed to getting it overseas and will demand it on their return. Well, were I a returned soldier I would regard such a statement in the light of an insult. I cannot for one moment think that the boys who have been "over there" fighting all this time for our protection,

will come back and lend their assistance to any attempt that may be made to restore in this country a demon which no less a personage that the Prime Minister of Great Britain said was a greater enemy to England than the Germans themselves. I repeat, Sir, I cannot for one moment think that those boys have anything like that in their minds at all.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I shall mention some of the things that are not contained in the Address of His Excellency, and which are of considerable interest, at least so far as our part of the Dominion is concerned. I have learned much since coming here, and I have discovered that the gulf that existed between the East and the West is now in some respects very largely bridged; and that there is a feeling, which is apparently steadily growing, in favour of a greater degree of freedom in relation to matters of fiscal policy. We discern it on all sides. It appears in very unexpected quarters; and personally I think that this Government would be wise to heed it. At the present time, owing to some misconceptions as to what the Western agriculturists, as well as those of Eastern Canada, have been asking for, I would request the privilege of placing on Hansard the entire platform as propounded by the Canadian Council of Agriculture. It has never before been placed in Hansard. The first section of our platform is this:

1.—A League of Nations as an international organization to give permanence to the world's peace by removing old causes of conflict.

2.—We believe that the further development of the British Empire should be sought along the lines of partnership between nations free and equal, under the present governmental system of British constitutional authority. We are strongly opposed to any attempt to centralize imperial control. Any attempt to set up an independent authority with power to bind the Dominions, whether this authority be termed parliament, council or cabinet, would hamper the growth of responsible and informed democracy in the Dominions.

The Tariff.

3.—Whereas Canada is now confronted with a huge national war debt and other greatly increased financial obligations, which can be most readily and effectively reduced by the development of our natural resources, chief of which is agricultural lands;

And whereas it is desirable that an agricultural career should be made attractive to our returned soldiers and the large anticipated immigration, and owing to the fact that this can best be accomplished by the development of a national policy which will reduce to a minimum the cost of living and the cost of production;

And whereas the war has revealed the amazing financial strength of Great Britain, which has enabled her to finance, not only her own part in the struggle, but also to assist in financing her Allies to the extent of hundreds of millions of pounds, this enviable position being due to the free trade policy which has enabled her to draw her supplies freely from every quarter of the globe and consequently to undersell her competitors on the world's markets, and because this policy has not only been profitable to Great Britain, but has greatly strengthened the bonds of Empire by facilitating trade between the Motherland and her overseas dominions—we believe that the best interests of the Empire and of Canada would be served by reciprocal action on the part of Canada through gradual reductions of the tariff on British imports, having for its object closer union and a better understanding between Canada and the Motherland and at the same time bring about a great reduction in the cost of living to our Canadian people.

Fosters Combines.

And whereas the Protective Tariff has fostered combines, trusts, and "gentlemen's agreements" in almost every line of Canadian industrial enterprise, by means of which the people of Canada—both urban and rural—have been shamefully exploited through the elimination of competition, the ruination of many of our smaller industries and the advancement of prices on practically all manufactured goods to the full extent permitted by the tariff;

And whereas agriculture—the basic industry upon which the success of all other industries primarily depends—is unduly handicapped throughout Canada as shown by the declining rural population in both Eastern and Western Canada, due largely to the greatly increased cost of agricultural implements and machinery, clothing, boots and shoes, building material and practically everything the farmer has to buy, caused by the Protective Tariff, so that it is becoming impossible for farmers generally, under normal conditions, to carry on farming operations profitably;

And whereas the Protective Tariff is the most wasteful and costly method ever designed for raising national revenue, because for every dollar obtained thereby for the public treasury at least three dollars pass into the pockets of the protected interests, thereby building up a privileged class at the expense of the masses, thus making the rich richer and the poor poorer;

And whereas the Protective Tariff has been and is a chief corrupting influence in our national life because the protected interests in order to maintain their unjust privileges have contributed lavishly to political and campaign funds, thus encouraging both political parties to look to them for support, thereby lowering the standard of public morality.

Definite Tariff Demands.

Therefore be it resolved that the Canadian Council of Agriculture, representing the organized farmers of Canada, urges that, as a means of remedying these evils and bringing about much needed social and economic reforms, our tariff laws should be amended as follows:—

(a) By an immediate and substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff.

(b) By reducing the customs duty on goods imported from Great Britain to one-half the rates charged under the general tariff, and that further gradual, uniform reductions be made in the remaining tariff on British imports that will ensure complete Free Trade

between Great Britain and Canada in five years.

(c) That the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911, which still remains on the United State statute books, be accepted by the Parliament of Canada.

(d) That all foodstuff not included in the Reciprocity Agreement be placed on the free list.

(e) That agricultural implements, farm machinery, vehicles, fertilizers, coal, lumber, cement, illuminating fuel and lubricating oils be placed on the free list, and that all raw materials and machinery used in their manufacture also be placed on the free list.

(f) That all tariff concessions granted to other countries be immediately extended to Great Britain.

(g) That all corporations engaged in the manufacture of products protected by the customs tariff be obliged to publish annually comprehensive and accurate statements of their earnings.

(h) That every claim for tariff protection by any industry should be heard publicly before a special committee of Parliament.

Taxation Proposals.

4.—As these tariff reductions may very considerably reduce the national revenue from that source, the Canadian Council of Agriculture would recommend that, in order to provide the necessary additional revenue for carrying on the Government of the country and for the bearing of the cost of the war, direct taxation be imposed in the following manner:—

(a) By a direct tax on unimproved land values, including all natural resources.

(b) By a graduated personal income tax.

(c) By a graduated inheritance tax on large estates.

(d) By a graduated income tax on the profits of corporations.

(e) That in levying and collecting the business profits tax the Dominion Government should insist that it be absolutely upon the basis of the actual cash invested in the business and that no considerations be allowed for what is popularly known as watered stock.

(f) That no more natural resources be alienated from the Crown, but brought into use only under short-term leases, in which the interests of the public shall be properly safeguarded, such leases to be granted only by public auction.

The Returned Soldier.

5.—With regard to the returned soldier we urge:—

(a) That it is the recognized duty of Canada to exercise all due diligence for the future well-being of the returned soldier and his dependents.

(b) That demobilization should take place only after return to Canada.

(c) That first selection for return and demobilization should be made in the order of length of service of those who have definite occupations awaiting them or have other assured means of support, preference being given first to married men and then to the relative need of industries, with care to insure so far as possible the discharge of farmers in time for the opening of spring work upon the land.

(d) That general demobilization should be gradual, aiming at the discharge of men only as it is found possible to secure steady employment.

(e) It is highly desirable that if physically fit discharged men should endeavour to return to their former occupation, employers should be urged to reinstate such men in their former positions wherever possible.

(f) That vocational training should be confined to those who while in the service have become unfitted for their former occupation.

(g) That provision should be made for insurance at the public expense of unpensioned men who have become undesirable insurance risks while in the service.

(h) That facilities should be provided at the public expense that will enable returned soldiers to settle upon farming land when by training or experience they are qualified to do so.

6.—We recognize the very serious problem confronting labour in urban industry resulting from the cessation of war, and we urge that every means economically feasible and practicable should be used by federal, provincial and municipal authorities in relieving unemployment in the cities and towns; and, further, recommend the adoption of the principle of co-operation as the guiding spirit in the future relations between employer and employees—between capital and labour.

Land Settlement.

7.—A land settlement scheme based on a regulating influence in the selling price of land. Owners of idle areas should be obliged to file a selling price on their lands, that price also to be regarded as an assessable value for purposes of taxation.

8.—Extension of co-operative agencies in agriculture to cover the whole field of marketing, including arrangements with consumers' societies for the supplying of foodstuffs at the lowest rates and with the minimum of middleman handling.

9.—Public ownership and control of railway, water and aerial transportation, telephone, telegraph and express systems, all projects in the development of natural power, and of the coal mining industry.

Other Democratic Reforms.

10.—To bring about a greater measure of democracy in government, we recommend:—

(a) The immediate repeal of the War Time Elections' Act.

(b) The discontinuance of the practice of conferring titles upon citizens of Canada.

(c) The reform of the federal Senate.

(d) An immediate check upon the growth of government by order in council, and increased responsibility of individual members of parliament in all legislation.

(e) The complete abolition of the patronage system.

(f) The publication of contributions and expenditures both before and after election campaigns.

(g) The removal of press censorship upon the restoration of peace and the immediate restoration of the rights of free speech.

(h) The setting forth by daily newspapers and periodical publications, of the facts of their ownership and control.

(i) Proportional representation.

(j) The establishment of measures of direct legislation through the initiative referendum and recall.

(k) The opening of seats in Parliament to women on the same terms as men.

That, Mr. Speaker, in substance is the programme of the Western agriculturist. I might go so far as to say that it is the programme of the agriculturists of Eastern Canada also. I might go even further and say that those who have been the most advanced in the demand for tariff concessions have been the organized agriculturist body of the province of Ontario, and they have gone further in their demands than have the organized agriculturists of Western Canada. Things are moving, and it will be well, indeed, not only for the members of the Government, but for the members of this House to keep their ears very close to the ground. There is a feeling of discontent abroad which is not by any means confined to the agriculturist; the consumer is probably just a little more agitated over present conditions than even the agriculturist. That is being manifested very clearly in a great many quarters, and even from some unexpected directions, so that I think it behooves us all to give serious consideration to this matter during the present session in order that we may possibly avoid serious consequences before Parliament might have an opportunity of meeting again.

I am not at present going to enter into any argument about the tariff, because this is not the proper time to do so—when the Budget is brought down ample opportunity will be afforded for full discussion—but I would just say, for the benefit of those entrusted with the framing of that Budget, that we expect something of a rather generous nature in so far as the reduction of the tariff is concerned. As intimated last session by myself, we have been keeping close watch on the trend of events, and we have been keeping our ear to the ground. Hon. gentlemen will remember that I stated then that we were prepared to give the Union Government every opportunity to make good.

The reason advanced last session for not interfering with the tariff was the seriousness of the war situation. We agreed with that to a man. Not a Western member that I know of raised the slightest objection to passing that issue over until another session at least, and possibly until the actual conclusion of the war, that is, the actual fighting. Now the war is over in so far as the fighting is concerned. We expect that within a very short time the peace treaty will have been concluded and signed, so that we shall know where we are at. We have come back again this session, and the request now made is that we leave the tariff question in abeyance during the period of reconstruction. Mr. Speaker, that is going just a little too far; that is asking just a little too much; the request is entirely too indefinite. There are those who might endeavour—I will not say that they would—to have us believe that reconstruction will be going on when the next session meets. I do not doubt but that it will, for reconstruction will take some considerable time; it depends entirely upon the attitude of the people towards reconstruction work. A Reconstruction Association has been formed in Eastern Canada they were very anxious to get Western Canada linked up with them—and they had their representatives out through the West. We attended some of the gatherings, addressed by those gentlemen, and listened to their speeches, but it is the same old method that has been adopted. They, too, according to their spokesmen, have an Eastern and Western method of campaigning. One of their officials—and a very prominent one I may say—when speaking in a manufacturing town in Eastern Canada, the town of Galt, I believe it was, is reported as having said that the tariff was a dead issue, it was as musty as the tombs of Egypt, and should not, under any consideration, be resurrected; it should be left there. That same gentleman came West. He visited my home town and addressed the Canadian Club there. I had the pleasure of listening to his address, but in so far as the tariff was concerned the mustiness had all disappeared—the issue had been resurrected from the tombs of Egypt very hurriedly and had been transplanted to Western Canada, for his words there were that the tariff was quite a live issue and must be dealt with. "But," this gentleman said, "I do not say that there should be an upward revision of the tariff at all;" he took very good care, however, not to intimate that there would be a possibility of a downward revision in so far as they were concerned; he kept that very much under his hat. That kind of talk will not satisfy Western Canada.

Surely we can deal with this tariff issue on its merits, give it the same position in the East as it holds in the West, and talk in exactly the same way to those who may be anxious to have it maintained as to those who are anxious to have it revised downward. And there is another attitude that has been displayed in the House which I deprecate very much. I noticed the other day that when some references were made to the reduction of the tariff, and one Western gentleman was waxing quite eloquent in speaking of the subject, an hon. gentleman from Eastern Canada

jumped up very indignantly and strutted out of the Chamber, using expressions in regard to my friend's arguments that I would not care to use on the floor of the House, as I think they would be pronounced unparliamentary, and you, Mr. Speaker, would be quite within your jurisdiction in asking for a retraction of them. If that is the attitude some people in Eastern Canada are going to take against the arguments of the West, well and good, but we had all hoped there would be a different spirit displayed. Let me say that the West is not one of those communities of people that cannot at least attempt, and I think fairly well, to distinguish and appreciate the other man's point of view. We have never taken the attitude that we are absolutely right, that we invariably have got to have exactly what we ask for; but we would like the manufacturers, who have been asking us to postpone tariff reduction from one year to another, to at least give us an idea of what we might expect from them even if we did agree to postpone it for another year. But they vouchsafe no information; they simply ask us to come back a year later when doubtless we will be asked to postpone consideration again for some other reason.

Now, as I have already stated, in so far as Western Canada is concerned, we have got to the end of our tether, and for the benefit of the manufacturers I want to make a statement to the House, and it is this: I may preface it by stating the position four or five years ago, when this matter came up in the House. There was a strong agitation in the West at that time for tariff reduction, and there was just as strong opposition to it in the East. The press was inflamed with arguments and abuse of the western farmer by eastern interests. Then a movement was started in the West in the way of a campaign to persuade all our western agriculturists to buy only imported articles. Now, that was just at the bursting point, as it were; and a few representatives of agriculture in the West counselled these people at least to stay their hand in that respect, which they did.

At six o'clock, the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. A. MAHARG (resuming): Mr. Speaker, at six o'clock I was attempting, for the benefit of the Manufacturers' Association, to describe a situation that was almost sure to arise unless something was done along the lines I had suggested in regard to the tariff. I was endeavouring to describe the acute feeling in favour of tariff reduction versus protection that existed in Western Canada some few years ago. I had just started to outline a movement that was taking form there, the result of which would have been that practically no articles of Canadian manufacture would have been purchased throughout Western Canada. As I intimated, some of the leaders in the movement thought this would be unwise and, their counsel prevailing, no action was taken at that time. The matter had come before our organized bodies in a very concrete form, and everything pointed towards definite action being taken, but the feeling was allayed for the time being. Feeling is, however, running a little high again, and I have no doubt that a similar situation will arise in the future. Should that be the case, none of the leaders would be able to stem the tide. I am not saying this for purely selfish reasons. Under present conditions we have to have a revenue, and if the Government decides to maintain the present policy of raising the major proportion of its revenue by indirect taxation by means of a tariff, then there is only one thing for us as patriotic citizens to do, and that is to buy our requirements in such a way that the revenue derived from that source will go into the treasury of the country and not be divided between the treasury and those whom the tariff is protecting. We shall be very sorry to see such a condition of affairs arise. We are just as anxious as the manufacturers themselves that they shall continue to prosper and increase their output. In fact, from the attitude the manufacturers assume, I think we are a little more anxious for them to increase their output than they are themselves. We are supported in our views not only in the West but in the East, and what I have described is the feeling not merely of the agriculturists of the West but of almost the entire population of the West. I do not think there is in Western Canada a newspaper that does not support the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. The Legislature of Saskatchewan, at a recent session, unanimously passed a resolution endorsing these views and asking for tariff reduction. Although that assembly is composed of persons on both sides of politics, there is no division in that regard. Returned soldiers in Western Canada with whom I have been speaking are in favour of those principles. I hold in my hand a letter from a returned soldier who has undergone eight

or ten operations resulting from his wounds, but who has still enough pluck to go back on to the land and endeavour to work out his own destiny. This is a quotation from his letter:

> What your association is fighting for will benefit thousands of soldiers who go on the land.

It is the association of farmers to which he refers. This is not class legislation so far as the West is concerned.

The West made Union Government possible. Why did the West support Union Government almost unanimously? In the province from which I come Union Government could not have received stronger support than it did. Out of seven or eight acclamations of Unionist candidates throughout all of Canada, four came from Saskatchewan. There was not in that province a single Unionist member who did not receive a very large majority, and, taking into consideration the vote polled, Union Government got on the average, in that province, the largest majorities received anywhere in Canada. I may say further that Saskatchewan returned a complete list of Unionist members. Why did the people of Saskatchewan do that? I suppose we have in that province the largest association of agriculturists in the world, banded together in one body. We have some fourteen or fifteen hundred distinct entities in that one organization, and so far as their actions are concerned they are entirely autonomous. It is probably as educative a body as can be found anywhere. Any hon. member who has been fortunate enough to attend our conventions at which we have from fifteen hundred to two thousand delegates, will realize that those people are trying at least to inform themselves. They take this attitude: We have listened to promises long enough; we have, if I may use the phrase, seen the buck passed from one side to the other; we have seen in this Parliament, when one side was in power, the other side would immediately bring up something of special interest to Western Canada. The former Liberal Government, for instance, went into power on the distinct promise that they were going to have a tariff for revenue only, and the West expected great things from them. But when a resolution came from the other side of the House asking for radical reductions in the tariff on agricultural implements, our Liberal friends did not see fit to grant them. The same gentleman who moved the resolution has been on the treasury benches now for a considerable time, but he has not gone out of his way to bring about that reduction although he has a better opportunity to do so. The West has come to the conclusion that there is no use depending on pre-election promises; that there must be something more than that. The reason why the West supported Union Government is because Union Government had been bold enough to do something; they had taken a stand; they said: We are going to furnish sufficient recruits to keep our forces at the front right up to strength. That was doing something that appealed to the people of the West. They said: A Government that has grit enough to take such a stand regardless of consequences is the Government to which we want to give an opportunity to carry on a little further. The Union Government carried out their pledges to the letter, and when the big push came, as it did last August, the forces of Canada were second to none on the Western front. It is recognized that they were the best disciplined, best equipped troops on the field, with every battalion right up to strength, and with a strong reserve, and that they were ready to go into action at any moment.

The Union Government carried out its pledges. That appealed to the West, and the West is prepared to support this Union Government again if it will take the same bold stand in our domestic affairs as it took with regard to our soldiers on the western front. The Government's policy then was no mythical thing floating in the air; it was nailed down in legislation. It is no use for any Government, whether it be Unionist or something else, to appeal to Western Canada again until it has demonstrated its sincerity by taking action.

The West has been spoken of sometimes as unpatriotic, and our schools have been held up to ridicule by some Eastern journals in a very unfair way. I remember that during the last provincial election in Saskatchewan there seemed to be more anxiety in some parts of the East than there was in Saskatchewan itself. A friend of mine in Ontario, for instance, sent me copies of a certain paper which pointed out the condition in which our schools were supposed to be, and told us we were educating our children to be non-Canadians and such stuff as that. Just to show the patriotic feeling amongst the school children of Saskatchewan let me give one illustration— and I could give several. During the war an organization was formed to raise funds for a patriotic purpose from the school children throughout the entire Dominion. The appeal was made to

Saskatchewan as to the other provinces, and was enthusiastically taken up by our schools. The result was that $67,000 was collected from the school children of our province. That is not a very big sum, and perhaps we should have collected more, but there was sufficient patriotism in our schools to raise just $30,000 more than was raised in any other province of the Dominion. That should show whether we have been teaching patriotism in our schools or not, and I think that before eastern journals undertake to show us how to run our schools, and besmirch us as this particular journal did, they should inform themselves as to the true conditions.

There is one other point I wish to draw to the attention of hon. members, though I shall not deal with it in an argumentative way. The United States has often been held up to us as a country whose example we should follow in the matter of the tariff. It has been pointed out what a great country they have built up under the high protective tariff. Now, I should like hon. members to see how the comparison works out in two different lines. First, I would ask hon. members to ascertain the proportion of dutiable and non-dutiable goods entering the United States. Next, compare the percentage of tariff as between the United States and Canada. Next, ascertain the percentage of the revenue of the United States, and of Canada, that is raised by the tariff. Then compare the per capita tariff tax in both countries. If hon. members will take the trouble to find out these facts, they will see that the United States is miles ahead of us in every instance. To give just one illustration, the per capita tariff tax of the United States is about $2.11, and of Canada $18.45. And yet, we are told to follow the example of the United States! Well, if this Government would give us a few of the things they have in the United States we should not object very seriously. The agriculturists of the United States get all their farm implements and many other things free. The labouring man also gets his boots and shoes free, and several other things free. I repeat that if the Government would go as far along certain lines as the United States has done, it would go a long way toward satisfying the people of this country.

Now a word with reference to disposing of our agricultural products during the coming year. In my opening remarks I told the House that I thought the proper place for the Prime Minister, and at least the Minister of Trade and Commerce as well, was right where they are now; that it was absolutely necessary some one in authority should be over there for some time yet, and I would add that when the Prime Minister comes back I hope this Government will still leave on the other side of the water one or two or three responsible ministers, for there will be plenty of work for them to do.

In Western Canada we are probably more interested in disposing of our wheat than in anything else. I had the pleasure of being in London for a few weeks a short time ago, examining into the wheat situation. I found the situation very peculiar indeed and very difficult, if not impossible, to analyse. Neither could I find any one in England who would attempt to analyse the situation. England was then fully supplied with cereals, with enough on hand to last for a considerable time, but there were other places in Europe that were not, by any means, in that position. The Continent of Europe has never been a very large importer of wheat; it has been a large producer of wheat. The Russian Empire, for instance, was the largest wheat producing country in the world until the war started, producing from 700,000,000 to 900,000,000 bushels of wheat per annum and Russia exported only to the amount of 200,000,000 bushels per annum. Russia's situation, as near as it was possible to find out, was that her wheat producing areas had been practically wiped out. Her machinery, transportation facilities, and everything else were all completely ruined, when the eastern line had broken everything had been taken from there to the other side, leaving nothing that was of any practical use. Her wheat-producing areas had been utterly devastated. Now, it is obvious that if Russia is not a very large producer of wheat, she is bound to be an importer; otherwise she must face starvation; and from what we can gather, this is the state of affairs in Russia at the present time. Her wheat producing possibilities having been reduced to a minimum, Russia will require large quantities of wheat. But she is not in a position to pay for this wheat, and, even if she could, she has not the facilities for its distribution. The country is so disorganized that it can handle practically nothing. The interior of Russia is in a serious condition so far as food supplies are concerned. Then there are the other smaller nations, like Serbia and Roumania, not very largely populated countries, but still requiring a considerable quantity of foodstuffs. The new allocation of territory will give Serbia a population of

probably twenty millions. Now, Serbia has no food of any kind. Her people are merely living from hand to mouth, and must be supplied from extraneous sources. Their producing possibilities are almost nil, as the country has been completedy denuded of all equipment in practically every direction, being destitute of even seed to sow. Rumania is in the same position, while alien countries are in as bad a plight. Germany, with her very large population, was not a considerable importer of wheat. Although she consumes a great deal of cereals, of about 400,000,000 bushels consumed she did not import more than about 70,000,000 bushels of wheat, but she was a large producer of rye, which took the place of wheat. Now we are given to understand that Germany's producing powers are practically exhausted, so that she may be compelled to import large quantities of grain. With all those countries in that condition, with not only transportation and distribution facilities to be secured, but credits to be provided, I believe that Canada will have to provide credits for a very large amount of her exports to them. Therefore, the people of Canada must arrange matters to meet these circumstances, if they are going to dispose of their products. Possibly we could secure credit elsewhere. We might secure it from the United States, and probably that would be satisfactory; but in view of rumours which are current overseas and in Canada, I think the safest course for the Dominion to take is to provide those credits herself, so that there may be no possibility of restrictions in any shape or form interfering with the export of her products. I am not in a position to say definitely that there have been restrictions, but the rumours one hears from time to time might indicate that there has been some difficulty in that direction.

About the beginning of January there was quite a large surplus of wheat in the world. The United States had about 300,000,000 bushels, while India, Argentina, and Australia had probably an equal amount amongst them. But what do we find today? These stocks, so far as the United States is concerned, are going very quickly. At all events, the millers are now offering a premium over the fixed prices to secure this wheat for their mills. That must surely be an indication that the stocks of wheat, so far at least as the United States is concerned, are in demand; otherwise the millers would not be offering a premium for the wheat. Now, if the European conditions are as I have outlined them, there will be a heavy demand for cereals from this country. The United States at the beginning of the year was reported as having sown the largest acreage of wheat in its history. Conditions were almost perfect, and it was thought that there would be a tremendous surplus of wheat on hand when the United States crop should be harvested next year. Well, there may be, but one cannot estimate the crop six months before it is harvested. We might just as well try to figure out the crop of Western Canada, the seed of which is still in the granaries, as to figure out the crop of fall wheat that has been sown in the fall. So that we do not know, and nobody can tell, just what the situation will be, but personally I am convinced that if a satisfactory peace can be arrived at; if conditions can be restored to anything like normal in those countries that I have just mentioned; if transportation facilities can be provided, with an organized government of some form to carry on the distribution—and if credit is forthcoming, we will find a ready market for all of our wheat and our other agricultural products as well. But it will be necessary for this Government to exert every effort. I am certain that our representatives overseas are working on that. They were doing so—at least some of them—some months ago, and the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) has no holiday, I can assure you, Sir. He is as busy a man as can be found anywhere. I had not the pleasure of meeting the Prime Minister. He was in Paris at that time, but I met the Minister of Trade and Commerce on different occasions, and he assuredly will have all he can do for some time to come, and instead of criticisms being directed at those gentlemen, they should be given every encouragement in order that they may assist in an attempt to remedy conditions to permit of a free export of our products into those countries.

This brings me to the question of what is going to be done with the wheat crop of Western Canada. Different suggestions have been made. There is a request from one of the provinces that the price of wheat should be fixed. I will not say at this stage whether that is a proper thing to do or not, but one thing I will say, and that is, that if we are going to have a stabilized business industry in Canada during the next wheat season from August or September on something must be done.

I have outlined to you the difficulty of disposing of our grain quickly. It is going to take us the entire crop year to dispose of it. We will not be able to rush it out. Storage facilities will not be available for

it should we have a fair average crop. Something will have to be done to stabilize the price which will be paid for that grain. If it is thrown open to the world, and open to speculation, and an assurance of equal treatment is not guaranteed for the entire year, the market will simply be glutted early in the season, the price will be forced down to the lowest level, and after all the storage has been occupied and all the money of the country has been invested in wheat, the price will go up and neither the producer nor the consumer will get a square deal. The consumer will have to pay the high price and the producer will have to take the low price. This Government has got to do something; whether it be to fix the price or to absolutely prohibit speculation, something must be done. I think there is only one way to do it and that is by fixing the price. It is a very difficult matter to prevent speculation in the handling of grain. The only successful remedy we have found for it has been the fixing of the price.

With all due respect to the other two provinces, they are not as anxious for a fixed price as we are in Saskatchewan. Their interests differ from ours. They are not the wheat-growing provinces that Saskatchewan is. Our province produces more wheat than all the rest of Canada combined. Consequently, we are very much interested in what is going to be done with wheat. Manitoba has a more varied production in the matter of coarse grains and stock, while from 75 to 80 per cent of the agriculturists of Saskatchewan produce wheat. Almost the entire balance is divided between oats, wheat, and some stock.

Some arrangement will have to be entered into if you are going to stabilize the industry because its effect will be far reaching and will not be confined to agriculture. It will go all the way down through the line to the consumer in more ways than one. It will have an effect on production in urban centres in the same way that it will have throughout the country. If something is not done to stabilize this industry, to give some kind of a guarantee that all who produce wheat are going to receive fair and equal treatment, the area that will be sown to wheat will be decreased to an alarming extent. I have met men—yes, scores of them—who have said that unless something is done to guarantee them a fair return they will not under any circumstances seed anywhere the amount of ground they had prepared for seeding. Seed is very expensive; it costs something to seed in Western Canada and the old saying that a bird in the hand is worth two in the bush is going to appeal very forcibly to those people before they are going to spend from $4 to $5 an acre to provide seed for this land.

I want to go back again to the criticism of the farmers of the West that I have heard since I have come down here. I will give one illustration. I have been told: "You fellows come down here to Ottawa with your seal skin coats and your fur-lined coats (and all that kind of stuff); the West must be rolling in wealth." You have only to look at the blue books which are available to everybody to be able to reckon for yourself what the average income has been for western farmers from Winnipeg to the Rocky Mountains. True, we had a bumper crop in 1915 almost all over the entire West. What was the result with regard to prices? While we had a bumper crop, prices fell on the market and it is doubtful if there was any profit at all in the production of the crop. In 1914 there was practically a crop failure in Western Canada. Eastern industry felt it very keenly. Unemployment existed all over the country, soup kitchens were established everywhere and provincial governments were loaning money to different municipalities to provide employment. I remember that in our own little city thousands of dollars were expended in crushing stone in the hope that it might be used some day for pavements just simply to give employment as a consequence of the 1914 crop having been almost an entire failure in Western Canada.

If there was a little profit in the 1915 crop, which there was, and I am not arguing that there was not, it was largely taken up, and in some cases entirely taken up in meeting the deficit of 1914. What has been the result since 1915?—very moderate crops on the average and in large areas almost total failure. Take Saskatchewan as an illustration. Our entire exportable surplus of wheat from the last crop is about 65,000,000 bushels or, say, 70,000,000 bushels. The proportion of that from Saskatchewan, put it at one-half, would be in the neighbourhood of 35,000,000 bushels. We have in that province roughly speaking 120,000 or 125,000 farmers. We will say that 25,000 farmers were producers of other grain; that is a very liberal estimate. We will take 100,000 was exported. The proceeds of these 35,000,000 bushels of Saskatchewan grain that was exported. The proceeds of those 35,000,000 bushels, providing it was all high

grade grain, none of it less than No. 2, would be $70,000,000, roughly speaking. It might average $2 per bushel but no more provided it was high grade grain. Therefore, you have $70,000,000 distributed amongst 100,000 people. What does that mean? That is the gross amount and you can figure it out for yourself. That would only give each man a gross revenue of $700. Out of that he has to take his entire expenses. In the first place he would have in the neighbourhood of $500 or $600 to pay for labour, allowing only one man to each individual farmer, he would have to pay from $60 to $80 and if he employed a married couple he would have to pay from $100 to $125 per month. At the very start he has to pay from $600 to $700 for labour and that would leave him about $900 to take care of all his other expenses. I could go on and give you the actual expenses that this man had to pay, and show you that the average farmer of the province of Saskatchewan did not make one single dollar last year. Indeed, I doubt if he broke even. You have only got to take the actual figures for that statement. You do not need to take my word at all, go to the blue books and find it for yourselves. The conditions in the two years previous were very little better. So that in so far as the farmers of Western Canada are concerned, they have not been making money out of the war. As far as Eastern Canada is concerned, the representatives of the Eastern agriculturists are more familiar with the situation here, and can deal with it themselves. The condition with respect to the West is this: That up to the outbreak of the war, agriculture in Western Canada was at a very low ebb. The tide was flowing the other way; instead of increasing numbers engaging in agriculture, the population was decreasing. There is no question about that; any man who was in Western Canada and was familiar with the conditions, knows that the number of people living on the land was decreasing—they were moving out of the country right along. The war has helped to hold them. There was the prospect at least of securing a good crop and a good price for their grain. They lived in hopes of securing a good crop, and they are still there and prepared for another trial—at least, practically ninety or ninety-five per cent of them are still there. I do not think more than five or ten per cent had migrated from the land; they are prepared to try it again providing they will get at least some return for what they produce. I have placed these facts before the Government and the House in order to show that unless something is done in regard to the marketing of our crop next year, the sowing of an increased acreage in Canada next year need not be looked for, but on the contrary, the result will be much the other way.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (Perth, North): Is there any remedy to be found in shipping to the United States?

Mr. MAHARG: We are prohibited from shipping there now.

Mr. MORPHY: But ordinarily the market there is open?

Mr. MAHARG: It will be open on one condition, and that is if the production of the United States is below their requirements.

Mr. MORPHY: Who shut you out?

Mr. MAHARG: The United States Government, on account of the war conditions. Now they have got an abundance of wheat there for themselves, the price of which is guaranteed by the Government, and they are not going to purchase the surplus wheat of Canada, and take a chance of disposing of it again. They have got sufficient wheat of their own to look after, without taking ours.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I wish to say in conclusion that Western Canada is watching this Government very closely. It is also watching this House, and individual members of the House very closely, and unless something is done,—I want to be very clear and emphatic in this statement,—to attempt to remedy conditions in so far as the West is concerned, you will at least have a number of by-elections on your hands before this House meets again next session.

Mr. GEORGE PARENT (Quebec West): Mr. Speaker, a born citizen of Quebec city cannot let the occasion pass without paying a last tribute to the memory of our late leader, the member for the electoral division of Quebec East, Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

To speak on behalf of electors, whose confidence and admiration in Sir Wilfrid Laurier have never faltered, my first impression was to use the French language. It is the language that Sir Wilfrid loved the most; it is the language he spoke at home, it is the language spoken by every one of his former electors. In speaking French I would feel more at ease, but I realize that in making use of the English language, it may demonstrate that with very little effort and good will, one can be made to speak both languages.

I have come to the conclusion that in being courteous to the majority in this House, I am but following the example of my revered leader. If, Sir, at this time, the whole country is in mourning, no part of Canada regrets more the loss of this illustrious statesman than the electoral division of Quebec East. Sir Wilfrid began to serve his country as far back as 1871 in the Provincial Legislature of Quebec. A few years later he had already reached distinction as a statesman both in the Parliament of Canada and outside, to such an extent that he was offered, and accepted, a portfolio in Mackenzie's Cabinet. An election had to take place and the newly chosen minister had to go before his constituents of Arthabaska to have this choice ratified, but Arthabaska turned him down. In an instant, a nomination paper was prepared in St. Roch and St. Sauveur, and a delegation succeeded in bringing to Quebec East the then down-hearted and disappointed young minister. From that time this constituency has enjoyed the honour and privilege of having been faithful to one of the very best public servants this country has ever had. Of him it may well be said:

> In youth a student, and in old age a sage,
> Lover of freedom, of mankind a friend,
> Noble in aim from childhood to the end,
> Great is thy mark upon historic page.

Among those who then affixed their signature to the nomination paper for the election of Quebec East very few are alive today. Their names were given lately in the press, and I shall quote them in the order in which they were published: S. N. Parent, Chas. A. Parent, M. Coleman, J. B. Laliberté, Jos. Gauthier, J. E. Martineau. It is these men who jointly with the members of the district of Quebec have been claiming the right to bury their distinguished compatriot in Quebec city where a reverent population could come and pray by his grave. Their desire was a true expression of their love and devotedness, but when they realized how painful, not to say cruel, it would have been to impose a second separation upon Lady Laurier, the accomplished and beloved wife who for over fifty years had been the best companion of her husband, the claim was given up.

It is not my intention to make a full review of Sir Wilfrid Laurier's career. Laurier will sleep forever in a cemetery of the province of Ontario and, to use the expression of Archbishop Mathieu, of Regina, he lies as a connecting link between Ontario and Quebec, the two large provinces which during a lifetime he has tried to see united in perfect harmony. Unfortunately, Sir, his teachings have not been successful in the province of Ontario, and he died at a time when the racial and religious prejudices have in that very province reached possibly the limit. Let us hope that a reaction will soon occur for the general benefit of the community.

We find, from the speeches delivered by members in this House and from expressions that have lately appeared in the press, that a reaction is certainly taking place. No province would more gladly welcome a change than the province of Quebec. Educated by Laurier and following the broad principles for which he stood, it will gladly join with those who have at heart a sincere desire that the Dominion shall enter upon an era of progressive reconstruction and readjustment.

These two words, Sir, cover a great deal of ground; they involve a consideration of various problems connected with the situation created by the war. I shall glance rapidly over a very few of the most important of those which I find mentioned in the speech from the Throne.

The consensus of opinion is that nothing is too good for the soldier, especially the returned soldier, and that steps should be taken at once to enable him to enter into civil life under the best possible circumstances. I need not say that every policy having such an aim in view should meet with unrestricted support. I am not very conversant with things pertaining to militia or military matters, but I have heard remarks made to justify the assertion that unless a distinction be made between officers and men who remained in Canada and officers and men who have actually gone to the front, troubles will surely arise. It may be true that certain officers knew so much about certain things that their services were more valuable at home than they would be abroad. Unfortunately, the soldiers who have been overseas do not seem to think so. What this Government, therefore, ought to do, is give to returned men positions that have been filled by men who have done no actual fighting. In various departments, not only in Ottawa but in many cities all over Canada, the very best situations have been held during the last four years or more by men who did not—so far as we can judge, at any rate—make what could be called a real sacrifice in connection with the war. It was said that their services were so valuable that they could not be dispensed with—that was always the excuse given when it was desired to keep a man in a job of some sort.

But as soon as the soldiers return from the front, the very first thing they say when they see an officer who has not been overseas, is: "This man will soon disappear; we will see that he disappears and that we take his place." If you want to facilitate the re-establishment of the returned soldiers into civil life, one of the first things to be done is to replace by returned soldiers men who have remained in the country during the last four years. The soldiers want it, and I believe they are entitled to it. Of course, this may not meet with all views; it may not be in line with all purposes. Evidently the Government, however, has realized some of the necessities of the situation, because in the speech from the Throne certain things are mentioned, the carrying out of which will likely have the effect of helping the soldier to re-enter civil life. Among these are two which I have specially noticed: the construction of highways and the provision for better housing conditions.

I have heard some criticism of the proposal for the construction of highways. I have heard men say that to some extent this is an infringement upon provincial rights; that whatever moneys go from the Dominion Government for this purpose should be handed directly to and be spent by the provinces themselves. There may be a good deal in that suggestion, but from the resolution as it appears on the Order Paper—of course, the resolution has not yet been moved—it seems to me that there is not much danger to be apprehended in this connection. I am much inclined to congratulate the Government upon inaugurating this policy for the construction of highways. I know of no other province where the policy of improving roads and highways has been so well developed as it has been in the province of Quebec, from which I come. That being the case,

9 p.m.

I am interested in supporting a policy of that kind. Although in Quebec that policy has produced good results, there is yet something lacking. We find in certain places that our highways are disconnected because of the absence of bridges. It would be a good thing if some of that federal money could be spent on the building of bridges at certain places, for instance to complete a break in the road connecting Ontario and Quebec by building a bridge at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, so that the people of the two provinces may pass back and forth in automobiles instead of by train, and so that they may not be separated as they have been in the past. I suggest that if some of that money be spent in that way, much good will result. Besides, we find that throughout the country, industries which were formerly engaged in the manufacture of munitions have now stopped work. If bridge building is carried on these industries will have something to do, soldiers and ordinary labourers will find employment, and one more step will be taken towards re-establishing the soldier in civil life.

Then, the speech from the Throne mentioned some steps to be taken to provide better housing conditions. I have heard a good deal of criticism of that from gentlemen on the other side of the House, but in itself the policy is not so very bad if it is properly applied. Of course, we cannot discuss it very well at this stage because we do not know what the Bill will contain. But although we have not the Bill, in a certain little booklet that the Government has spread all over the country, called "Conservation," certain photographs are published. It appears from these that the houses recommended for the labouring classes are to be built in rows, one house touching the other, without any extra land at all. It seems to me that if any moneys are to be spent in that direction, a fair quantity of land ought to be provided for each house to be occupied by labouring men. That would be much better for him and for his family, and would go far towards preventing the bad feeling which may exist among labouring classes who live under such conditions that they have no chance of taking a little fresh air.

Other things are mentioned in the speech from the Throne; I shall not refer to them all. But I believe that the Government should not stop with the proposals mentioned in the speech from the Throne. I think that money devoted to the development of our natural resources would be well spent; and in this respect I share the views of a few hon. gentlemen who have referred to this matter during the course of this debate.

Part of the Northwest is altogether unknown, and in Quebec there is a territory which is unknown and which is said to be probably the wealthiest section of Canada so far as minerals of all kinds are concerned. I am speaking of new Quebec, or Ungava. The iron beds of Ungava are said to be the very best in the world. According to the report made by Professor Low some years ago, there is in that territory immense wealth in reserve for the people of

Canada. It is said that the water-powers of the Hamilton river of Ungava will produce as many million horse-power as imagination can conceive.

We have been told that the returned soldiers have been so much in the open air that many of them will not care to return to office work. Here is an opportunity for them. Let survey parties be formed and sent into the Ungava district. There are hundreds of returned soldiers who have experience in connection with aeroplanes, who will be glad to take up this work, and the time is not far distant when aeroplanes will be used for this purpose. His Excellency the Governor General recently made a speech in which he said:—

Obviously, it is not for me, in my position, to attempt to lay down either rules of policy or rules of conduct. But certainly I may say that my experience here—very short but if I may be allowed to say so, my very happy experience in Canada—teaches me that far greater attention ought to be paid than is paid at the present moment to research work and to the development of the natural resources of the country. And I cannot help thinking that, in facing the great problems which lie in front of us those who are responsible for the administration and the conduct of affairs should proceed on these lines. Whatever money is required to be spent that money should only be considered as an investment, and a very safe investment, I believe it will be. Canada provides a very fruitful field for both research work and development. It is almost commonplace to say that the Dominion's resources have only been scratched. Thus we have unlimited opportunities for the future, and it is for all, whether we belong to great institutions like yours, or whether we are engaged in other affairs, to do everything which lies in our power to develop on sound, scientific, and practical lines, the knowledge which we already possess of these great resources.

So much for the mineral and other resources of Ungava. I think the Government will do well also to inquire into the fishing industry in the province of Quebec. The Labrador coast, the Baie des Chaleurs and the Gulf of St. Lawrence can provide the whole of Canada with the best fish in the world, but up to now the industry has been altogether ignored. Strange to say, there was given, a short time ago before the Quebec Board of Trade, a splendid address by a prominent Englishman, Mr. H. C. Thomson, in which he showed the people of Quebec what could be done as regards the fishing industry in that province. To embody what he said, I will put on Hansard the resolution passed by the Board of Trade following the speech delivered by Mr. Thomson:—

Resolved:—That the thanks of this general meeting of the members of the Quebec Board of Trade be expressed to Mr. Harry Cranfuird Thomson, of London, for his most interesting address upon the extent and wealth of the deep sea fisheries of the Gulf of St. Lawrence, the Baie des Chaleurs and the coasts of New Foundland and Labrador, and that the Board desires to express its conviction of the inestimable value of these fisheries as a source of cheap food for the people of Canada and the United States, made so urgent by the present high prices of all other food. That the experience of Aberdeen, Grimsby, and other fishing ports of the United Kingdom whence thousands of tons of fresh fish have of late years been sent daily in chilled cars to all the cities of England and Scotland, and also that of Gloucester, Mass., whence similar shipments are made to United States centres, and where fish preserving and curing in all its shapes is now being carried on, would seem to point to the advisability of more attention being paid in Canada to the exploitation of this source of cheap food. There would seem to be no reason why Quebec should not become, like Aberdeen or Grimsby, a distributing point for fresh fish brought in by properly equipped iced fish carriers from Baie des Chaleurs and the Gulf of St. Lawrence, destined to all points in Canada and the United States, provided a suitable iced warehouse were erected on the Louise Dock alongside both railway tracks and deep water.

If the Government will take these remarks into consideration and also the requests made by many hon. members to develop the natural resources of Canada, I have no doubt that such a policy will meet with general approval.

With regard to the situation created by the war, I have been very much impressed by the speech that was delivered by the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell). I think he stated that the debt this country is facing to-day is over $2,000,000,000, and that our expenses cannot be less than $300,000,000 per annum. He stated that our revenue is not expected to be more than $195,000,000, so that we are short $105,000,000, and the Government at last puts this question: Where are we going to find the money? I must congratulate the Minister of Public Works for having boldly put the facts and the situation as it is before the country. I have also been impressed by the speech delivered by the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes), in which he made certain statements, and I said to myself: Perhaps the Minister of Public Works could find in that speech a hint as to where he could get a little of the money for which he is looking. I was amazed to hear falling from the lips of an ex-minister of the Crown (Sir Sam Hughes), who was responsible for some of the expenses of the war, the following words:—

We had bad financial conditions in Canada—but of these I do not speak now. At that time, I regret to say certain distinguished members of the Government were not moderate in their

views or in their actions. Why, I have had ministers of the Crown bombard me on behalf of different interests and in order to keep this business, that business and the other business from failing, from going to pieces, I was asked to buy a few hundred yards of cloth here, and a few hundred there. The Dominion of Canada was down to such a state in financial matters that we had to practically dole the contracts out, to give some business here, some there, and some elsewhere and this became a very serious drawback.

Let me read a little further. The ex-Minister of Militia and Defence tells us that in the very midst of the war, when the lives of our soldiers were at stake, there were grafters around trying to get money out of him. The hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) stated the other day that for every dollar spent on the soldier another dollar has gone in graft, and it begins to look as if that statement were true To continue the words of the ex-Minister of Militia (Sir Sam Hughes):

Sir Joseph Flavelle became head of the Munitions Board, this work having been transferred from the War Department in England to the Munitions Department. Then, following that, we find a certain distinguished citizen obtaining large contracts both in Canada and the United States for the supply of meats and meat products. We have had some evidence in Canada about meat profits, but we have only touched the fringe of it yet, and we have not got anything about what was going on in the United States. I am informed on very reliable authority that upwards of $5,000,000 monthly was handed over in the last three or four years in the United States under contracts with the British Government and other governments to this gentleman, by reason of the position which he held as head of the Munitions Board, which gave him the prestige that enabled him to get all these things into his own hands, little by little, until the whole affair was brought in as an appendage to the business interests run by this Toronto organization. Its estimated profits will be upwards of $100,000,000 in the last four years on these commodities alone.

Sir, if we are short of money, as we are told by the Minister of Public Works, one of the first steps we should take is to get back the money that has been pocketed by these people. There are other ways, perhaps more interesting to the city of Quebec in particular, in which money could be saved by this Government. It is no secret that for a good many years past the province of Quebec has been deliberately isolated by the Government of the day. Still, Quebec is alive just the same, and will probably continue to live. Although we are not receiving any favours from the Government, there are citizens among us who wanted to help on the war and do something for the soldiers. Mr. G. G. Stuart, K.C., a lawyer well known all over Canada, a considerable time ago bequeathed to the Government his beautiful estate of about three hundred acres, to be used for hospital purposes for the Canadian soldiers. The property is situated on the St. Foy road, overlooking the St. Lawrence river, occupying as fine a site as could be imagined. Although this property was bequeathed to the Government over a year ago, the Government has done nothing towards providing a hospital, and not a cent has been spent on the property for the benefit of the returned soldier. On the contrary, the Government has been renting hospital accommodation elsewhere. The Government, for instance, rented Kent House, which is situated on the Quebec Railway, Light & Power Company line, which company is very friendly to the Government, while all the time the property bequeathed by Mr. Stuart was lying idle. Another instance of how the Government is favouring this company is the fact that it has given the company a contract for lighting all the public buildings of Quebec—the post office, the Customs Department, the Revenue Department and the Militia Department buildings—without calling for tenders, and the contract is good for five years. There are other competing companies in the city of Quebec, but they were not given a chance to tender. This was simply another case of throwing away money.

I wish to refer to the Siberian expedition and to correct a statement made by the Minister of Militia and Defence (Major-General Mewburn) the other day. I understood him to say that all members of the Siberian Force had left this country voluntarily. That is not correct, because I know quite a few young men who, though willing to go and fight in France, deliberately refused to sign any papers for Siberia. And yet those men have been sent. I was very glad to hear the Minister say they would all soon be back. The province of Quebec badly needs these men, and they should certainly be back in Canada for the beginning of the summer. In Siberia, they are of no use to this country or to anybody else, unless, as was suggested by the hon. member for North Essex (Mr. Kennedy), they are there trying to collect loans made by capitalists of Europe.

I was very much interested in the speech of the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck), and particularly in his defence of Sir Arthur Currie; and one thing which he said in connection with that matter impressed me considerably. He said that when the troops were going through places infested with Germans the natural feeling at the moment

was to crush the enemy, paying them back in their own coin. But he said the policy of revenge was not worth a man's life. These words struck me as being very eloquent and compelled a thought which I shall now express, in regard to the last Order in Council passed by the Government that the fathers—for that is what it amounts to—of defaulters under the Military Service Act should be fined at least $250. I do not know what the intention of the Government is; but if it is intended that defaulters should go to jail, I would say, let that Order in Council stand as it is, because with such a fine as that at least eighty per cent of the defaulters would have to go to jail. Now, if the policy of revenge is not worth a man's life, it should not, I think, be worth a man's liberty; and I think that if the Government persists in enforcing such heavy fines it is nothing but revenge. It is ungenerous; and the result will be that a good many young men who were not as guilty as some people believe them to be will be sent to prison. Every one expresses a desire for harmony now. Well, if the Government have the same desire, I suggest that one of the first things they should do is to repeal that Order in Council and leave the whole matter to the discretion of the judges. Our judges have proven themselves capable and honourable throughout the whole history of Canada, and I do not see why they should now be incapable of dealing with this matter. They are familiar with local conditions and should be the best judges under the circumstances—at least better judges than the Government.

In conclusion I will say this: Quebec is not as bad as it has been represented to be. Quebec is well disposed toward the rest of Canada, and will gladly unite with those who have the best interests of the country at heart. It stands for order as against the forces that would make for revolutionary change. Its devotion to Canada's cherished institutions and to the highest interest will continue in the years to come.

Mr. JOHN A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that the House and the country must be getting tired of this prolonged debate on the Address. I am one of the old members of the House and I have not yet seen an Address discussed at such length. However, it is just as well, perhaps, that the Government should have the views of its followers and the hon. members of the Opposition upon questions of public policy, so that it may frame its legislation in accordance with such views.

It would be quite impossible for me to offer any tribute as touching or as graceful as those tributes which have so far been offered to the memory of the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier who has passed away from his place in this House, and whose face and figure I am sure all of us miss a great deal. I have known him for a great many years, and I always had considerable admiration for him—personally unbounded admiration; although I confess I could not see my way clear to follow him in some of his policies. He had that magnetic quality which endeared him to his followers, and he had filled the place in the public life of this country with dignity, with courage and address; and even his bitterest enemies cannot deny that though he may have erred in his policies, he erred believing that he was doing his best for the country.

Now, it is always painful for a speaker—especially so is it for me—to refer to personal matters; but possibly it might be just as well for me to dispose of these questions at the beginning of my address. Unfortunately, in his speech the other day, the hon. member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) made a reference to myself which was calculated to reflect upon Sir Arthur Currie, the leader of the Canadian army in Flanders. In that speech the hon. member left it to be inferred that an injustice had been done to me by Sir Arthur Currie. He said that I was blamed for something for which Sir Arthur Currie was to blame, and that no effort had been made to vindicate me. Now, I am very much obliged to the hon. member for his endeavour to help me fight my battles; although my friends and intimates will admit, I believe, that I am generally quite capable of attending to my own affairs. The circumstance to which he alluded was this. In the second battle of Ypres I had the great honour to be senior officer at Grafenstafel Ridge, and that point, which was farthest east in the enemy's line was held by my battalion, the 15th Battalion, 48th Highlanders, of Toronto. When the war broke out I was in command of that battalion in the city of Toronto. It was considered one of the crack battalions of Canada, and was then 985 men strong which was greater than the number of men in any other single battalion in the country. It was fully armed, had complete field equipment, and was ready to take the field, and when the call to this war came, as a member of this House, and for the dignity of the House, I considered it my duty to leave all personal affairs and go; so that it should not be said by the people of this country that when the call to the war

came no member of the House of Commons was willing to go, and that we were all a lot of "safety-firsters." I went to the war, and I do not regret it. I will say further, that from the very moment I landed in England, I felt that there was being made an effort—to use the vernacular—to "can" me. But I behaved myself with becoming dignity, avoided controversies of every kind, kept out of politics, and attended to my own business. I complained only once. When my men were up to their knees in mud and their tents were down, and there was no place for them to warm themselves, or dry themselves, I did write to Headquarters. I told them I thought that in Canada we did better for hogs, than they were doing by the men over there. Nothing was said about that; I was forgiven. The reason I did say it then, or make a kick, was simply because the Canadian battalions had given details of men to build huts for themselves, they had built them, the huts had been unoccupied for nearly three weeks and we should have been allowed to go into them. When I went to France I still felt that I was under observation and that there was some hidden hand behind, I do not know whose, seeking to destroy me in some way or other. I was not mistaken. When we were at Fleurbaix my battalion was very well-behaved and we did not have a crime oftener than once in four or five days. Then commissioners came down from army headquarters to investigate and I was virtually deprived of my command. They wanted to inspect my battalion and they inspected it. They told me that my battalion had been shielding crime amongst the men. They inspected every company and every man, and if the inspecting officer found an "i" that was not dotted, or a "t" that was not crossed, and if every man was not clean shaved and in his proper order and place, I knew what was going to happen to me. Fortunately, the battalion was well-behaved and the commissioners, after they had been around, came and complimented me and said that they were in error, that they did not consider it possible that a Canadian battalion could have such good behaviour, such fine discipline and such clean, well-behaved men as mine. I was permitted to carry on. They could not have found anything else because the men who were with me were amongst the finest boys to be found in the city of Toronto, all well-behaved lads, not such a class as you would expect to be guilty of any crimes.

[Mr. Currie.]

At the battle of Ypres I was placed in a peculiar position. I was the commandant or senior officer on Gravenstafel ridge. That ridge was held by my own battalion together with the Montreal Highlanders; and the 7th were dug in on our left, this being the battalion to which the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Cooper) was attached. The 7th was dug in on the road between St. Julien and Gravenstafel ridge. It was on the morning of the 24th that the Germans attacked my battalion. Early in the morning the gas attack came and my battalion was gassed and it seemed as if every gun in the German army was turned upon us. We were attacked about fifty to one and they flattened our front line trenches, killing and wounding a great many of my men.

I might here say as a matter of explanation that when I came back to Canada I was told by some high military officers that I should have withdrawn my battalion rather than remain in such a dangerous place. If I had had my own way I would have withdrawn to the crest of Gravenstafel ridge and dug in. But we had no option in the matter. On the night before the grand attack word was sent out to every individual company commander by telephone that he was not to move until help came next day. If I had withdrawn my battalion or any of my men before orders came to move, I would have been courtmartialled, and I would have deserved it, because it would have been disobedience of orders. In the morning, however, when the attack came, I was there. The attack occurred about four o'clock in the morning. My men had nothing to do but fight and die in their places or be taken. They could not get out. Three-quarters of my battalion fell, but they sold their lives dearly. Between six and seven o'clock the grand attack was virtually over. My second in command, Major Marshall, had been posted on my left in a reserve trench, with my adjutant, now Col. Dansereau of Montreal, with a machine gun and a platoon of men. At daylight a German Albatross flying machine came over and dropped green flares over them. In a little while several batteries of eight or nine-inch guns began firing into their trench, blowing it to pieces and killing every man in it except seven or eight. I saw Major Marshall emerge between my men and the line of the 7th with half a dozen men and walk in the direction of the dressing station, and I went down to see him in order to ascertain what had hap-

pened to the rest of the command. I had seen them bombarded about 350 yards away and I wanted to know what had happened to my adjutant. He told me that my adjutant was killed. Fortunately that did not turn out to be true; he was badly wounded on the top of the head but he managed to crawl out afterwards. At that time the commanding officer of the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Cooper) came over to me. He was a young man, Major Odlum, now Brigadier-General Odlum and one of the famous Canadian officers. His commanding officer had been killed the evening before near Kaiserleer when they went out to reconnoitre the German line. I refer to Col. Hart Maharg. Major Odlum came and asked me if I felt he would be justified in remaining in his position. I asked him what he thought he ought to do, and he said that he thought he ought to stick it. I told him to carry on. He did stick it and the 7th died in their trenches almost to a man. They were dug in between St. Julien and Kaiserleer. The hon. member for South Vancouver says he saw me that day and spoke to me. He said he had seen General Sir Arthur Currie also. If he saw, and spoke to me, it would be at the dressing station and if so he was out of his position or a casualty because he otherwise should have been with his men on the road. I do not recollect seeing him that morning, but if he did speak to me it was at the crossroads in the rear of Kaiserleer at the dressing station. I do remember that scattered units of men had carried wounded men to the dressing station. I ordered them back to the trenches on the reverse slope of Gravenstafel ridge as senior officer and it may be that I did sometimes use language rather more forcible than polite. I believe that one man did write home that I told him and his chum to get into the trenches and that if he moved out without orders he would have his blooming head shot off, or something of that kind. However, that is where I was that morning, and I did not leave that position that morning.

With regard to Sir Arthur Currie, the right hon. the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden) has placed this question quite clearly before the House already, and as far as he (Gen. Currie) was concerned, there was nothing discreditable either to me or to himself, as far as I can see, in the whole transaction. He was at Fortuin his headquarters immediately south of St. Julien. Our brigade was on his left, and on our left were the French. He had given us the 10th and the 7th to help us out the evening of the day when the battle opened. The 10th battalion was badly cut up that night. That battalion was formed of troops from Saskatoon and Moosejaw. The 16th battalion, the Highlanders from Vancouver, which the hon. member for Skeena (Mr. Peck) had the honour to command and the 10th were lined up immediately to the west of St. Julien. They were in reserve and they were lined up on Thursday night after the gas attack on the French. They formed line with fixed bayonets and went forward to meet the Germans at St. Julien wood. There never was a braver bayonet charge than that in the whole war.

They drove the Germans back half a mile and established themselves, and their losses were tremendous. On Saturday morning the 10th Battalion was withdrawn, or at least the remnant of it, consisting of about one hundred and fifty men under Major Ormond. It was sent down to our assistance in the terrible salient, that tract we were in, at Gravenstafel Ridge. Major Ormond reported to me that morning—and his report is in the archives of the Militia Department—to that effect. Sir Arthur Currie was at his quarters in Fortuin. We all expected that reinforcements would have arrived at daylight in the morning, but they did not. The reinforcements did not arrive until hours afterwards, until after noon, or rather late in the afternoon, when the Durham Light Infantry came into that sector. Sir Arthur Currie got tired of calling on the telephone for help, and walked down from Fortuin to Wiltchz, about a mile and a half away, and he had a "head-on" collision with the British commander, General Snow—at least I was so informed, I do not know personally. He wanted to know why they were not sending help to us. I wish to say that if I had not been in the position, the honourable position, that I was in on Gravenstafel Ridge, I would just as soon have been in his position, because there was nothing dishonourable about it, and I think when his report is brought before this House it will establish that fact. Now, as far as the point is concerned where I was located, and the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Cooper), if there was one little spot in the whole world at that moment that the German Emperor wanted, it was that very place, Gravenstafel Ridge. If he had captured it that morning many believe the history of the world would have been changed. We held that ridge, and what is more we did not give it up. The ridge

was turned over to English troops, the Durham Light Infantry, who fought and went into action that morning right fresh from England, never having seen a trench before, not knowing the difference between a hedge and a trench. They fought for nearly two weeks in those trenches at the cross-roads, where I had previously been, and held the place. Nobody can cast any reflections upon any of those officers and men in my hearing with my consent. This war has seen a great deal of sacrifice, and it is most unfortunate that some people at home have done nothing but scandalize and slander the living and the dead. Why should I say anything against Sir Arthur Currie? I maintain, Mr. Speaker, that he is a wonder, and the fact that he managed to come through with all the intrigue that I saw going on—not amongst the soldiers, mind you, but there was intrigue going on—the fact that he, a civilian soldier, like myself, a militiaman, came through with the highest honours and led the Canadians to victory, I think is a marvel. It should encourage every other citizen in this country to perfect himself in the study of arms, so that should the time ever come when their country is in danger they will be able, as the old Greeks said, to take their place in the ranks.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I have covered that phase of the matter. I do not know, Sir, but I trust that we have heard the last of all this talk. I agree with the hon. minister, who suggested that some substantial recognition should be granted to Sir Arthur Currie. I think, Mr. Speaker, that the very first thing this House should have done—and I regret there was nothing at all pertaining to this matter in the speech from the Throne—was, after offering thanks to Almighty God for saving us, was to tender the thanks of this young nation to the officers and the men who have fought so bravely for us in those foreign fields in this great war, and written the name of Canada with victory and with glory. There is no man living in the Canadian forces that I can feel in my heart for one minute would do anything wrong, or anything that might injure his country. If he did wrong—and after all we are only human—it would be with the motive of doing good; and if a man makes a mistake in war when he is trying to do good, I think our forgiveness should be extended to him. But I cannot recall a single case of the kind.

The Canadians have had great losses. The living are coming home, many of them to find their homes virtually desolate, their business gone, and hardly knowing which way to turn. To them we should offer every encouragement. It should not be our part to seek in any possible way to minimize their employment. They fought for this country, and they did so, not because they expected that Canada was going to get any territory added to its already broad acres, or that it was going to have any wrongs righted; they fought because they were fighting for humanity, and making the future of this country sure, making sure that Canada would never become an adjunct or an appendage to any other country in the world. That is the feeling they had, and that is why they went overseas and sacrificed their lives. To these officers and men the thanks of this House are due, and I hope that the leader of the Government will take the earliest opportunity to have the House pass a unanimous vote of thanks to our army, such as the British nation always does after its army is victorious in a great war.

Attempts are made right and left to set the men against the officers, and I have heard remarks in this House, and read statements in the Canadian press, trying to disparage the officers, and saying that the pensions of the men should be the same as the officers, or that the officers should not get more than the men. In my view there is nothing too good for the men, but you must bear in mind, Mr. Speaker, that the officers of the Canadian army that went overseas in the first place—it is true their pay has been increased a trifle—on the basis of the same pay as the English officers; in fact their pay was less than that of English officers, while our men received four times the pay of the English private. I do not begrudge our men four times the pay of the English Tommy—they were always willing, if necessary, to do four times the fighting of any other man in the field. But as far as the officers were concerned a lieutenant-colonel, occupying the same position as I occupied, in the British army received a dollar a day more pay than I did. And those young men who led the troops over the top, the bravest of the brave, our subalterns, our lieutenants, what did they get? They did not get enough to maintain their wives on, they did not get as much money, Mr. Speaker, as the armourer corporals in the Canadian Forces got in pay. And still there is talk about the big pay of the officers! I trust that this House will not hear any more talk about the difference in pay or pension between the officers and the men. They all

did their duty, and they all did it very well. In peace they will be united.

As far as I am personally concerned, it is not very comfortable or pleasant for me to speak of my own affairs, but I will say this: I am not sorry that I took part in the war, it will always be a pleasure to me, even though I got no honour or glory out of it. You would think to hear some people talk that I had made a million out of the war over there, that I had received a peerage, or title, a V.C., and all that sort of thing. I got nothing, I did not want anything, and I do not want anything. The fact that I have the honour and affection of my men, the fact that the "Original" men of the First Division, last year asked me to lead them in the parade on Yonge street, Toronto, on St. Julien day, does not show there is any great reflection on me. I did not seek glory of any kind; I trust, therefore, that the House has heard the last of that and that no further reference will be made to it.

I want to compliment the member for Skeena (Mr. Peck, V.C.) on being in this House and on having secured meritorious recognition; also the other young men on this side of the House who have fought in the war and have been in the actual zones of combat. I am sorry that more of my old colleagues in the House cannot say that they were in the actual zone of conflict. A great many of them volunteered, put on khaki, raised regiments and took them overseas, and just as they got as far as the front received the same kind of telegram to come home that I got. I do not think that I should have ever got to the field of battle unless by some accident.

Two other members of the House of Commons got to the actual zone of combat. One was Colonel Baker—blessed be his memory. He died in action; no finer man ever wore khaki. I trust that some spot in the new buildings will be found where a monument may be placed to remind future generations of parliamentarians that there were men of red blood in the House of Commons in the days of the Great War.

Then, the member for Ontario, Colonel Sharpe, went to the trenches and would not leave them until his health broke down and he was a complete wreck. He died in Montreal—no wonder, when he spent two years and a half constantly within the sound of the guns, constantly in the midst of that great carnage. It was with great difficulty that he got as far as the front, but he was determined that nothing short of illness or death would take him away, because he, like every other member of this House, knew that if he did come back, he would—having my case in mind—"have it thrown into him" for all time to come by those who had stayed at home. But he has gone to his reward, and I trust that a place will be found to erect some monument to his memory. No finer comrade in arms could any man have than the late Colonel Sharpe.

I would like to say a word about those young men who have given their lives for their country. They died in order that Canada might be a great country, and here a responsibility rests upon members on both sides of the House. The responsibility is upon us of making this country great; of avoiding selfishness; of seeking to further not our own personal interests, but the interests of our country. These men have died gloriously in the cause of the Empire and, as Rudyard Kipling has said, quoting Ecclesiasticus, "Their names and their memories shall live forevermore." They have died in a great cause. It is a matter of deep regret that matters should be brought up which will cause the heart-strings of their parents and relatives at home to be wrung again. I know what that means, because for two days my own family lived in apprehension, having been informed after the battle of St. Julien that I was missing, that I had been killed.

We should not offer these parents condolence, because the young men of Canada died doing their duty. We may offer our consolation. They will always have the feeling that their sons did their duty and that of all the people of Canada they stand nearer to the heart-strings of our country than any others. Many of these people will send sons to this House; many will come to this House who have served in the war. You may rest assured that these men will do good service for their King and country and that Canada will never suffer by them.

I have heard it said that the country is afraid of the returned soldier. Mr. Speaker, people do not understand the returned soldier. References of a disgraceful character have been made in the press to the riots at this town in Wales. I am not surprised at riots if conditions were such as described to me in a letter from a friend. I know what it is to be up to the knees in mud, I know what it is to be without coal and to have to buy coal and coal oil out of my own pocket in order to keep my men warm. I know what it is to have the sleet and rain beating down and to hear the men coughing, their physical resistance breaking down, so that one could not sleep at night. There are several hundred dead Canadians in the

Netherhaven cemetery who perished from cold and exposure on Salisbury Plains. These men at Rhyl Camp must have been undergoing the same kind of exposure or they would not have rioted. The riot is to be regretted. I trust that the country will forgive them; the only thing I cannot forgive is the loss of life in connection with those riots. Somebody is responsible for that, and sooner or later, when the proper time comes, unquestionably this House will fix that responsibility.

I have dealt with some personal matters to the satisfaction, I hope, of everybody in the House. I trust that this recrimination will cease. We should all be satisfied that every officer and man of all the forces has done his duty to the best of his ability. Many of our boys gave up their lives in the performance of their duty. There are fathers on both sides of this House who have given sons to the great cause. These boys may have died trying to do the impossible, but it was because we did the impossible that the name of Canada is on the map in connection with this war.

I wish to deal at some length with fiscal questions. It is now ten o'clock, and I would ask the indulgence of the House in permitting me to move the adjournment of the debate.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If the hon. gentleman desires that the debate should be adjourned, I do not think I should be justified in offering opposition, although the hour is not very late.

Motion agreed to, and debate adjourned.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 10.05 p.m.

Tuesday, March 18, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

PENSIONS.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Council) presented the first report of the Special Committee on pensions, pension regulations, and all matters pertaining thereto.

On the motion of Mr. Rowell, the report was concurred in.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copy of a letter from the Secretary of State for the Colonies to His Excellency the Governor General, of the 25th of February, 1919, transmitting copies of the Convention signed on the 16th of January, 1919, prolonging the armistice with Germany, together with copies of the financial Procotol of the 13th of December, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Rowell.

Census of industries, 1917. Part I, Agricultural Statistics, 1917; Part III, Fisheries Statistics, 1917.—Hon. Mr. Carvell.

Annual Report of the Inland Revenues of the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918, Part I, Excise. —Hon. Mr. Reid.

Trade report of the Department of Customs, containing the tables and statements of imports and exports of the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

Copies of a general rule and order amending a rule of the Exchequer Court of Canada, pursuant to section 88 of the Exchequer Court Act. R.S.C. 1906, Chap. 140.—Hon. Mr. Burrell.

PRINCESS PATRICIA CANADIAN LIGHT INFANTRY.

ARRIVAL AT OTTAWA—STATEMENT BY MINISTER OF MILITIA.

On the Orders of the Day:

Major General the Hon. S. C. MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): With your permission, Sir, I would like, as a matter of courtesy to the members of this House, to remind them that the Princess Patricia Canadian Light Infantry is expected to arrive in Ottawa to-morrow morning. The regiment will detrain at the Central Station at 10.30 a.m., and, on arrival, will receive an address of welcome from the Mayor, on behalf of the Corporation of the City of Ottawa. They will then proceed by Besserer, Nicholas and Rideau streets to Connaught Square in front of the Chateau Laurier, where a platform is being erected, and it is hoped as many members of the Parliament as possible will be present there. I am sure their presence will be appreciated by the regiment. Tickets are being sent down here this afternoon for Members of the House of Commons and the Senate. A short address will be delivered by His Excellency the Governor General, and the regiment will immediately thereafter move along Sparks street and thence by Bank street to their quarters at Howick Hall.

GOVERNOR GENERAL'S SPEECH.

ADDRESS IN REPLY.

Consideration of the motion of Mr. D. L. Redman (Calgary East), for an Address to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to his speech at the opening of the Session, resumed from Monday, March 17.

Mr. JOHN A. CURRIE (North Simcoe): Mr. Speaker, yesterday evening when the House so kindly granted my request for adjournment, I stated that it was my intention to-day to deal with the question of the tariff and the economic condition of this country. The great war in which our soldiers have been engaged is over, and this country like every other country, is now confronted with the weighty problem of reconstruction. Very few people, when they speak of reorganization and reconstruction, realize the vital importance of those matters to Canada. Such a war as this was an unheard of thing before. In the whole history of the world, nothing like it had ever before occurred. It has swept away old traditions. It has destroyed old institutions, and many preconceived notions. In fact, all the old ideas of public men and of the people generally have undergone a change. This was brought very strongly to my mind the other day as I listened to the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding), discussing, in the same old tone, in the same old words, old policies and old matters that do not count at all to-day amidst the vital issues that confront us. His speech reminded me very much of J. M. Barrie's play "the Mollusc," which I had the pleasure of seeing not long ago. As J. M. Barrie's plays always contain a moral, this play contained a moral for the politicians as well as for others. According to the play, a mollusc is a shell-fish that attaches itself to a rock or some other object and that never moves. When I heard the hon. gentleman quoting from the speech of President Wilson about the waves and the tides moving on and sweeping things before them, the idea of the mollusc naturally occurred to me. As a mollusc attaches itself to a rock and never moves from that spot, so, many public men holding certain views, are determined to stick to them; never to change their policies; to carry on consistently forever with the same old politics, living entirely in the past. When I heard him speaking of free trade, and also my good old friend from Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark), whom I love to listen to, speaking about free trade, at this present moment, knowing the actual condition of the economic affairs of the world, the idea of the mollusc instinctively occurred to me, and I realize that no wave, even of war, pestilence and famine, will move those people one inch from the same old ideas.

Listening to these speeches, one would think for the moment that the whole world had stood still during the war and was starting on from 1914 as if nothing had occurred in the meantime. What are the facts confronting the people of this country? The whole world is, at the present time, engaged, not in a war of arms, but in an economic war. We find that England has slammed the door shut with embargoes on every country; that the United States has closed its doors and embargoed everything; that France has embargoed the foodstuffs and manufactures of the whole world. In fact, there is, at the present moment, no country discussing or even mentioning the words "free trade" except this country of Canada. These are facts. England will never go back to the former state of affairs, so Lloyd George says. England, at the present time, is in exactly the same position as she was in the time of Cromwell. She has Navigation Laws as she had then and Protection as she had then, and that Protection is even more effective now. You cannot get a dollar's worth of your manufactured goods into England, and England has decided that the manufacturers of Germany, the United States, or any other country, can no longer dump their goods into England to the detriment and injury of the English workingman. Not only is that the condition, but the agricultural situation has entirely changed. We listened with a great deal of pleasure to the remarks of the hon. member (Mr. Maharg) who, last evening, gave the story of the West—and a very fine story it was. If I did not know the actual conditions I should be very much inclined to agree with his view.

Let us first consider the conditions confronting the agriculturists of this country, and then see whether free trade (or in other words economic destruction) is going to assist them. A significant statement was made in this House a day or so ago by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). He is fully aware of the principle of cabinet responsibility, and therefore his statement that he stood for the total abolition of the tariff on agricultural implements, as he did in 1908-1909, was very significant. The manufacturers and working men of the

East are forced to the conclusion that this Government stands on that very ground. What are the conditions affecting the agricultural interests of this country? Mr. Lloyd George in one of his great speeches during the last election—I think it was at Manchester—said that in the year preceding the war Great Britain had raised only twelve weeks' supply of her own food, but that last year she had raised forty-two weeks' supply. That was a significant statement. He further stated that Great Britain would never again be dependent upon the outside world for her foodstuffs as she was before the war, and that legislation already existed and further provision would be made guaranteeing the agriculturists of Great Britain protection and a fair price for their product. Can we, therefore, look for a market in England? Can we look for a market in Europe? Russia has been mentioned. Nobody in his senses would propose to sell anything to Russia at the present moment, because she has repudiated her national debt. In fact, all those countries of Central Europe to which it is intimated we are going to sell vast quantities of cereals are seething with Bolshevism, a doctrine, which is founded on the repudiation of national debts. If we sell anything to those countries, can we be sure that we will receive payment unless Great Britain or one of the other big powers guarantees payment? Conditions the whole world over have changed. Every elevator in this country, through the failure of the Government to put an embargo on foreign wheat, is jam full of American wheat and other grains. The result has been that we have not been able to move our own grain from the West, although the people of this country have provided the money to purchase it. Owing to the Government giving way, as a matter of policy, to the cry in the West for free wheat, we now have free trade in wheat with the United States, so far as our laws and treaties provide. But have we really got free wheat? The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) told us that we could not ship a pound of wheat or cereals now to the United States. How is that, when the treaty provided for reciprocal privileges? The reason is because the United States is protecting its own people. It has a protective policy, just as Great Britain has at the present time, and will have, according to present indications, for many years to come. The policy of France, of Italy, and of every other country except Canada is also a protective policy. We are supposed to have free wheat with the United States, but the door of the United States has been slammed shut on our farmers, and I am satisfied that she will have an embargo against our wheat just as long as free wheat between the two countries is on the programme. But free wheat has not prevented the United States from selling us their wheat. According to the returns for 1918 the United States sold us half a million dollars worth of wheat, while we sold none to them. Last year we sold no cereals to the United States, as was admitted last night, but the United States sold us between seven and eight million dollars worth of corn to be used for human food in this country, and we were forced to eat it as a substitute for our own wheat. The result is that to-day every grocer in this country has his shelves loaded down with corn flour and is unable to sell it. It will mean a great loss to those who have bought these wheat substitutes from the United States. What is the use of treaties and reciprocity which are not observed.

I have read all the authorities on free trade and know my Adam Smith possibly as well as the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). I also know something of Jean Baptiste Say, who, according to the French-speaking members of this House, was an apostle of Adam Smith. He certainly was the apostle Paul of Adam Smith, because he cleared up many things on which Adam Smith himself was not so clear; Now, according to old economic doctrines preached before the war, a great war such as we have had was impossible. It was said that no great power could live in a condition of war with another great power for more than two or three weeks. Nevertheless the great war came and lasted four years, exploding all the fallacies propounded by Norman Angell and others who talked of peace, and whose work we now know was simply a form of German propaganda intended to render us defenceless so that we could be struck down by not being prepared.

Will any hon. gentleman tell me what country wants free trade at the present moment? Germany to-day has all her factories intact; not a wheel has been hurt, and they are ready now to flood this country with cheap manufactures if free trade is extended to them. Therefore, I ask this House and the people of this country soberly to consider exactly what our situation is. Is it not a fact that those who have the interests of this country at heart and our legislators, who know how delicate the situation is at home in our cities and towns,

should unite and forget all this ancient babble about free trade? Is it not in the interests of Canada to ask the Government to initiate a policy of embargoes against every country, so that when the economic conference sits in Paris, as it will immediately after the Peace Conference has concluded its labours, Canada will have at least a jack-knife to trade? To my mind, that is the sensible policy. I am fully conscious how difficult it is for me, a manufacturer, to address a gathering of any kind on any question pertaining to the industries of this country. We all know how unfairly the manufacturers of this country are constantly being attacked. The press of this country is fanning the flame of class hatred, so that the manufacturer appears to be a man full of plans of spoliation of treason, strategem and spoils, whose whole aim and object in life is to destroy society and pocket as much money as possible himself.

To give you an idea of the unfair way in which the manufacturers are attacked, I need refer only to my own case. A few weeks ago I addressed a gathering of Liberal Conservatives in the city of Toronto, and at that time the Toronto Globe was preaching far and wide all over this country that Canada had a forty-two and one-half per cent tariff. Now everybody knows that that is not so. If you turn up the pages of the customs returns, you will find a page devoted there to the percentage of the tariff of this country on goods entered for consumption. You will find, on that page, that the percentage is only 16.7, if I remember rightly, for last year. In view of that fact, why should the Globe talk about 42½ per cent? The Globe for forty years has been menacing the industries of the country constantly, in season and out of season, at a cost to the people of millions of dollars. As the leader of this Government at one time said in the city of Toronto, we are living constantly on suspended sentence. That is the chief reason why Canada has not achieved a success equal to that of the United States. If we had not been going around with one arm tied behind our backs, this country of ours would have a population to-day of at least 25,000,000 or 30,000,000. But this constant agitation, I pointed out, had injured the country. I challenged the accuracy of the Globe statement that the tariff was 42½ per cent. As a matter of fact on the goods consumed in Canada that are subject to tariff the duty amounts to something like 27½ per cent, which includes 7½ per cent war tax. We must bear in mind also, Mr. Speaker—and I would like all hon. members of the House to remember this—that the foreign manufacturer exporting into Canada is allowed, whether rightly or wrongly, to reduce the price of his goods below the regular market price in his own country by 5 per cent; so that this country and the manufacturers of this country lose exactly 5 per cent thereby. Now, take 7½ per cent from 27½ per cent and you have 20 per cent; from that take 5 per cent again, and the total protection that this country really has on the goods that are entered for home consumption is only something like 15 per cent. Surely that is not a very high tariff. I replied to the Globe to that effect. The Globe reported me to the extent of a small paragraph, but came out later with a column and a half of a reply. It began by stating that I was president of, or was connected with, a concern engaged in the manufacture of wire; and said by inference that I was virtually a member of a wire or nail combine. Now, I am connected with the Imperial Steel Company of Collingwood, and for two years we have not manufactured and sold in Canada products to the extent of 20 tons. We went into the foreign market and tried to sell goods where the Germans had sold before—in South Africa, India, Ceylon, Java, and other foreign countries. That concern last year sold goods to foreign countries to the value of over $850,000 worth, and paid out over a quarter of a million in wages in the town of Collingwood. I do not think, therefore, that it owes any apologies to the Globe. Furthermore, the Globe stated that a case had been tried in the courts in which a suit had been brought by a dealer in eastern Ontario against a manufacturer of wire, and that the judge, in giving judgment, said that the goods were sold with the understanding that the jobber who purchased them would maintain the "association" price. Therefore, the judge and the Globe said: "You are a combine; you belong to a combine; an association; you are characterized by the courts as being an illegal combine." Now, if the Globe had gone into the facts, it would have discovered that the "association" price was not an association price of the manufacturers at all, because no combination exists, nor has existed for very many years, among the makers of wire nails or wire, nor has there been any gentleman's agreement. The association price referred to was the price of the jobbers' association, and not of the manufacturers. Nor do I belong to any association that is involved in any combine, for that is a very poor argument to put for-

ward, after all is said and done, as the United States is now discussing the necessity of permitting its manufacturers to form committees of trade to deal with the sale of United States goods in foreign countries. Why should such unfair argument be raised? I challenge the Globe to show that I belong or have belonged to the association which has been referred to, and I make that challenge openly and publicly. I do not belong to the Manufacturers' Association, because if I did I would be challenged on that ground also. Ever since I went into public life I have kept out of the Manufacturers' Association. So that, as far as all these things are concerned, I hope the hon. gentlemen who are listening to me will realize that I am not speaking on behalf of any interest of the kind. I am trying to put the industrial side of this question, for the workmen as well as the manufacturers.

Now, the problem before the people of this country at the present time is the demobilization of the soldiers, and the remobilization of our industries. The question of our taxes, which have been added to enormously through the war, also confronts us. On the question of demobilization I do not quite agree with the programme of the Government. Two years ago I expressed my views in one of the local papers here—I said that the soldiers should be returned by units and that the Headquarters of the units should be established in brigade areas here, and that the men should be allowed to have working furlough, and should be kept under pay for six months or a year after they return. I expressed the opinion that when a man returned he should be given a working furlough so that he might obtain a position, and if he did not like it he could go back and drill for a while, and when he became tired of drilling he could go and get a job again. In that way he would be able to find the position that suited him best and in which he could be most useful, because the men who are discharged are in an unsettled state of mind. They are not in their old frame of mind, and when they get a position they do not always realize how good it is, and after a few weeks it becomes irksome, and they give it up and walk around the streets, acquiring habits of idleness. Now, if it is unavoidable that they should be idle at any time, it would be better for them to spend the interval with their unit, where they would be under discipline for the time being. If such were the case the country would not see the sad spectacle of some of these men peddling shoe-laces. The soldier has had very little

out of the war. If he was kept a year in this way he would not be getting as much out of it as the man who stayed at home working on munitions. The question is, what are we to do with the soldiers? A programme of land settlement is proposed. The soldier must go into some industry, either in the manufacturing industry or in the industry of agriculture. A few years ago—not ten years, or even eight years ago—we had millions of acres of idle land in the West. We have Colonization Ministers, and Bureaus of Colonization and all that sort of thing, but strange to say, when the soldier returns and a little piece of land is wanted for him, there is no land left. A programme is proposed, a copy of which I have here, which provides that the soldier can purchase a farm costing up to $5,000, the Government assisting him, and that he can borrow $2,000 more for his house, and farm implements. Then he is expected to begin life as a farmer on a hundred, or hundred and fifty acres of land, with a mortgage of $7,000 tied round his neck. I do not approve of that, Mr. Speaker. I think that the returned soldier who has fought in the war is entitled to just exactly as fair and generous treatment as a soldier who fought in South Africa, or those who fought in the Fenian Raid, and I say that adequate justice must be done these men. They should not be allowed to be the dupes of a lot of real estate dealers. The returned soldier is at the mercy of real estate men, and, indeed, at the mercy of everybody. He never will be able to raise his head above water if you put a debt of that kind upon his shoulders.

We know there are millions of acres of land in the West standing idle. Great corporations control between 22,000,000 and 25,000,000 acres of the finest land in the West along the railways that never had a plough in it and never a man settled upon it. It would be much better to take that land over at a fair price and give the returned soldier his land free. Give him assistance, if need be, to help him along; supply him with seed wheat, give him a start and do not allow him to become the victim of the real estate sharks. This country surely is not run by real estate sharks. I never saw them do any good to any country anywhere, much less to Canada.

How about the returned soldier in urban districts? I want to tell this House and this Government that if you are going to start closing the industries, if you are going to adopt the policy of reducing the industrial life of the country, if you are going to

deprive the present factories of the small amount of protection that they now have, you are going to take away from the soldier the opportunity of employment. As the conditions are now, there is not a manufacturer in this country who will invest a dollar in any industry. Every dollar they have and the employment of their men is menaced by this movement to wipe out protection and to have free implements, and free this, and free that. That means that the United States will be the country that will be manufacturing those things for us, and the workmen that are at the present time employed in the industries of Canada will have to go to the United States.

In the name of God is that going to give employment to our returned soldiers? Not in this country. That, Sir, is directly the opposite of the view we should take in regard to these matters.

The hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) made use of an argument that is constantly employed against the manufacturers. He said that if he purchased a foreign article on which there was a duty of $2 he would pay that $2 into the treasury of this country. Quite right. But if he purchased an article of Canadian manufacture, the Canadian manufacturer would put the $2 into his pocket. Would the Canadian manufacturer put the $2 in his pocket? Go a little beyond that and see how much of that $2 the Canadian manufacturer would actually put in his pocket. The Canadian manufacturer does not earn five per cent on his turnover. The balance of the $2 would really go into the pockets of the men, women and children who were employed in his factory. And they are doing what? They are eating the products of those men in the West who are so much opposed to them.

Let me put the argument to you in another way. There is one thing that the farmer in the West needs, and that is greater markets. He is not only producing far more in the way of cereals than this country, or the United States, or Great Britain, or any other country, will for the moment need. He needs greater markets. He thought that he was going to get a greater market in the United States. Did he get it? Bang! The Americans shut the door in his face in spite of treaties and everything else. That is just in line with what I and other hon. members on the floor of the House said they would do, when we were discussing the reciprocity question. We said that it did not matter what we did in connection with reciprocity; the very moment the United States got it they would slam the door in our face, while at the same time shoving their goods into our country.

The elevators of this country are filled with United States wheat, and it is the duty of this Government to embargo their wheat and grain unless they want this country flooded with their products at any price in the next two or three months, resulting in the price of our wheat being reduced to forty or fifty cents a bushel. They will be willing to take several million dollars loss on last year's crop, and on this year's crop, if they can get rid of it and control this market. That would stop their farmers coming to Canada.

Suppose I were a farmer in the West, and I bought a tractor in Canada and paid a dollar or so more for it because it was a Canadian product—is there not such a thing as nationalism, as love of country? Has all that feeling been taken out of our breasts entirely? I know too much to believe that. But, supposing you do buy an American tractor—every pound of the food that the men who built that tractor in the United States consume is supplied by the growers of American products and you do not supply anything in exchange for the money that you have paid for that tractor. But if you built that tractor in Canada, every dollar that went into its manufacture would go to the men here who were providing a greater market for the men in the West, by consuming their wheat and beef in Canada and God knows we want greater markets.

We want to help the West. The East has never tried, and never will try to injure the West, even in spite of all those new trenches and wire entanglements that they are setting up, and all their threats about what is going to happen to us in the East. We are men of red blood, we are the fathers and brothers of the men who carried Vimy Ridge, took Cambrai, and destroyed the finest units in the German army. You cannot scare us. We never get scared.

My hon. friend the Minister of Colonization and Immigration (Mr. Calder) said that the greatest danger in this country was the politician who was appealing to the soldier. I say that the man who is the most dangerous to the people of this country is the man who is preaching class hatred. The press of the West, with very few exceptions, have been preaching class hatred against the East for a number of years. They have been constantly threatening us and calling upon their people to unite against the East.

What has the East done to the West? The time came when not a pound of western grain could be sent to Europe. Great Britain, with all her boasted resources, had no money to buy grain or flour two years ago. We have heard a great deal about what free trade has done for Great Britain, but free trade had not increased English industry during the twenty years before the war one-quarter as much as protection had increased the industry of Germany, France and other countries. Great Britain was without any money; she was at the end of her resources and the western crop could not be moved. Where was the West to get its wider markets then? There was no money in Europe to purchase grain. The United States slammed its doors tight. In that situation, did the people of this country stand idly by and do nothing to help? The Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) asked the people of Canada to buy Victory bonds in order that the crop should be moved from the West and in order that we might provide Great Britain with the credit that was necessary for the movement of that crop. Was there any demur from the people of the East? They went down in their pockets and bought Victory bonds. The men in the factories that the western people want to close up bought Victory bonds. The little girls working in the factories in the east went without winter clothing to buy bonds in order that the people of England might have food, and that the people of the West might get good prices for their wheat. Is it becoming of the West to come down here, threaten these people and say: We want to close up this factory and that factory because they want ten or fifteen per cent protection; we will send the people employed in those factories over to the United States? We want to buy foreign goods, not Canadian made goods.

And I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that as a matter of fact within the next year the people of this country will have to go down into their pockets to buy another crop in the West. Now would it be well for any manufacturer in the East to go round saying to our workingmen, "I would boycott the West, I would not buy any western flour or any western oatmeal, I would not buy Victory bonds to pay for their wheat or do anything of that kind because those people in the West want to close our factories?" That is exactly the kind of class hatred that some of these men in the West are preaching against the East, though there are hon. gentlemen in this House, representing the Grain Growers' in the West, who are big enough and broad-minded enough not to take that stand. But it is exceedingly difficult for them to do so: they are bombarded night and day by telegrams from a lot of men in the West, headed by a man named Wood, who is known to be an avowed annexationist.

An hon. MEMBER: I ask the hon. gentleman to prove his statement in regard to Mr. Wood?

Mr. CURRIE: It is well known that Mr. Wood and his crowd are the people who have been raising such a row because the Germans in the West lost their votes. We have had hon. gentlemen talk in that way here. The German schools in the West, and the Germanizing of the West rests at their door. They are responsible. We know exactly where all this clamour comes from, and we know there is a small clique of these men in the West, so-called leaders of the farmers, there, who are trying to induce them to form Soviets, and councils of agriculture, and this, that, and the other thing which will have the effect of destroying industry and dividing this country. Now I do not pretend, and I do not wish to be so understood to be preaching class hatred of any kind. We have had a little bit of that class, of race hatred between Quebec and Ontario, and nothing has come of it, only perhaps a broken head or two; but the kind of class hatred to which I am alluding touches the life of everybody—it touches the pocket and the employment of all. It is going to tear this country to pieces and destroy its industries—that is exactly what is going to happen. Let me ask hon. gentlemen a question—and I would like them, and the people of this country to ponder well over it—how are you going to get additional employment for the returned soldier in factories if you are going to close those factories? I cannot see how it is going to be done; and to my mind it is disgraceful that there can be found in this Dominion people going about the country preaching class hatred of that kind. I know exactly what I am talking about. Up in my riding a year ago there was a gathering of farmers, and they sent for me to come and direct them. We were taking council together to find out how they could best increase production for that particular township for the coming year to help in the war. I went there and we had the finest meeting possible. Talk about a class meeting, or a religious meeting—there was nothing at all of the kind that could equal it. When the meeting was over and the assembled farmers had decided that they were going to add five or ten acres of wheat each, so many cattle and hogs, and what they were going to do to make up for

the boys that were away (they were going to help one another and exchange their labour with each other and do all the good they could) about half past nine a man came in with a grip under his arm and asked if he could be allowed to talk. We said "yes" we were quite willing, and he got up and started in preaching this Bolshevism. First, he wanted to destroy the commercial travellers because he said they were eating up $500,000,000 a year of the money of this country. Then the lawyers came in for criticism. They were the worst of the lot, they were parasites, the names he called them were something awful. Then he started after the other professions and the manufacturers, and the legislators, and it was only a tirade and torrent of abuse. He had been going along in this way for about half an hour when a farmer rose and objected. He said to me, "Are we going to listen to all this nonsense? Where does this man come from? Is he a pro-German?" I said, "I do not know." Then the farmer asked the man himself, "Where do you come from?" The man replied that he came from some place in western Ontario. The farmer then said to him, "How do you come to be here preaching this kind of stuff to us, who pays you for coming here?" The man's reply was, "The United Farmers of Alberta sent down a thousand dollars to carry on this propaganda." There is the whole story. Then a farmer said, "You are not preaching Canadian propaganda—you are a disloyal subject and a pro-German," and four or five of the audience made a rush for him and he had to get out of the meeting. That is the kind of propaganda that is being carried on all over the country, and we might as well face the issue now squarely and fairly, we might as well look it fairly in the face and ask ourselves the question, "Are we going to be subjected constantly to these class hatred programmes, or are we going to listen to such trash for the moment in the presence of our dead, or going to try and build Canada into a great country and be a united people.

Now let us look at the question from another aspect. I saw this programme of the Council of Agriculture. It was very nicely and skilfully drawn up, and a man in my riding, a farmer, said to me, "Did you read that platform?" I said, "Yes, I did." "Well, you know," he said, "it reminds me of the dress my old lady wears in the summer." I inquired, "What is that?" He said, "It is a Mother Hubbard." I inquired, "Why is it like a Mother Hubbard dress?" "Because," he said, "it covers everything." This programme covers everything. There are only two things left out of it that I can discover, the Ouija Board and the Twentieth Plane, nothing else. Very well, let us examine it. What are the tariff proposals? I have dealt with those and I have told the House plainly that if you are going to remove the protection that we have we shall be destroyed industrially. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) put a very pertinent question, and placed his finger on the sore spot when he asked, "Why cannot Canada compete?" That is the whole thing. I say that in the markets of the world we have had to go out and seek business in competition with the Americans during the last few years. In one export business the manufacture of wire, Canadian manufacturers have increased the business from nothing to $9,000,000 last year in competition with the United States and foreign countries. Why can we not compete at home? That is the question. The reason that we cannot compete is because the United States will not allow us a free exchange with them. If we had a free exchange of commodities, of all kinds of manufactured products, with the United States, there is not a manufacturer in the Dominion but would be willing to compete and be very glad to do so. But what has occurred? They never allow us to compete on fair terms. As a matter of fact a great many of the leading manufacturers in Canada to-day have within the last three or four years built factories in the United States, so that when their line of business is wiped out by the western propaganda they can take their workmen over there and find them employment. The United States will welcome them, and protect them with a high tariff. I ask you, Mr. Speaker, is that fair to our working men? Is that building up this country? Can we compete under such circumstances? Is there any line of business that we can compete in? Can the grain growers in the West compete with United States at the present moment in the article of wheat?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Yes.

Mr. CURRIE: See where you are at the present moment.

An hon. MEMBER: There is no doubt we can compete.

Mr. CURRIE: You will know inside of six months whether you can compete or not. You know that to-day you cannot compete to the extent of a bushel of wheat in the foreign markets against American wheat.

An hon. MEMBER: We are willing to try.

Mr. CURRIE: Unless, as an hon. member said last night, the Government fixes a price for you in your local market you cannot compete and you have to submit to a loss on the wheat you export for the Americans are going to take a big loss which their government will pay. Who will pay your loss?

An hon. MEMBER: What about seed?

Mr. CURRIE: I do not say anything about that. We bought seed for the West and I was very pleased to support that proposal in Parliament. That is one of the greatest examples of the benefits of a national policy.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE: Wait a moment until I get through. I say that was one of the greatest examples of the benefits of the national policy that I have yet seen, when we bought that seed wheat for the West and especially for Saskatchewan. We bought that wheat and gave it to the farmers, and inside of a year or two it resulted in the addition of over a million bushels yearly to the crop of this country. That was national protection. Now, suppose we had adopted the policy of "do nothing" which these gentlemen teach; what would have happened then to the West? I am quite in agreement with the hon. member for Maple Creek when he says that we should fix a price for the wheat of the West. That is in line with the National Policy.

Mr. MAHARG: May I make a correction? The hon. gentleman has made the straight assertion that I asked this Government to fix the price of wheat.

Mr. CURRIE: No, I am wrong there. The grain growers of the hon. gentleman's province asked that, and I will support my hon. friend in this House on that proposal if he will be a good National Policy man and go in for protection. You cannot blow hot and cold in this matter. You cannot get all your manufactured goods free and then ask the rest of the country to fix a price for your products. That is impossible. We should stand together on all these questions. Having regard to the tremendous production of cereals in the United States, it is a question whether we should go in for cereals as strongly this year as we might.

The hon. gentleman painted a lurid picture last night of what was to happen to the farmers of his province. He said that the farmers of a community of 100,000 received only something like $70,000,000, or $700 each, from the sale of their exported grain. But only a few days ago the Minister of Agriculture for Saskatchewan was telling the assembled farmers there that that province had marketed over $370,000,000 worth of farm products and that the average income from this source of every farmer in the province was over $3,700. Now, who are we to believe? I believe that the people there are not so badly off. I am inclined to accept Mr. Dunning's statement in preference to that of the member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), although I have great regard for that hon. gentleman. I think, however, that in the statement which the hon. member for Maple Creek made, he had reference only to wheat, not to other cereals.

Now, I have given you a picture of what is going to happen. You may say: "What are you going to do about it?" I am going to point out the actual facts of the case. I am going to ask hon. members of this House to forget all this class talk, to remember there are two sides to every question. I sat at the feet of Macdonald and Tupper and other great statesmen. I listened to their arguments, and I became a firm protectionist. I made up my mind that protection does not mean high tariff. It means the assisting of every person in this country when he is in need; it means an effort to build up our country and make it greater to give it a place in the sun. It is not a question of high taxation or low taxation. I am going to deal with the matter of taxes in a few minutes. But let me ask this: Is there anything in the policy of this Council of Agriculture, when you examine it from end to end, which can convince you that the community which adopted that platform has shown any desire to assist in paying the taxes which have been brought about by the great war? The figures will be here in a few days, and I am satisfied that it will then be shown that the people of Toronto are paying more income tax—a form of taxation which all the western members are strongly in favour of—into the Dominion treasury than all the Prairie Provinces are paying. The member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) laughs. He is taking great consolation to himself because the Governments of the United States and of Canada have adopted the income tax. But income tax is only a form of taxation whereby a government raises revenue for its purposes. Various methods of taxation were em-

ployed before the income tax was adopted. In South Africa they have a hut tax; a man pays so much on his hut. In England the tax on window-glass was abolished years ago; people did not dare put window-glass in their houses without being taxed for doing so. Then, there were taxes on the wheels of the carts, so that it was found advisable to have carts with two wheels instead of four. Previous to the war Great Britain did not raise the bulk of its taxation by an income tax. Income tax did not amount to fifty per cent of the taxes raised by Great Britain. She now has a large income tax because there was no other way in which the money of the wealthy people could be got at. The leader of this Government was not careful in his provision for an income tax on the people of this country; he did not distinguish between the people who earn their income by personal exertion and those who derive their income from estates that have been left to them or investments. That distinction is made in Great Britain. For instance, a lawyer like the Minister of Public Works (Hon. F. B. Carvell) has, we will say, an income of $6,000 or $7,000; he is taxed on a certain amount of that, while a farmer alongside of him whose income is the same, if not larger, escapes the income tax entirely by saying: "My income is in the nature of wages; I have worked hard with my hands for my income. What I have spent on my family should be deducted and therefore I do not have to pay any taxes." This man is let off, while the hon. member is taxed. That is not fair.

The income tax is very unjust in many ways. Income tax is a field which is or should be reserved entirely for municipalities. In Toronto I pay an income tax of 3½ per cent on the little salary which I get —"indemnity," we call it—from the House of Commons; and other members from Toronto do the same. Then we have to turn around and pay an added tax to the Dominion Government on that same amount. In adopting the system of income tax, the Dominion Government, rightly or wrongly, entered a sphere of taxation which had been reserved for the municipalities. Having done that, it must now go further into it and get after the land sooner or later; then where will our friends the agriculturists come in? The platform of the Council of Agriculture states that tnere should be a tax on land that is not used. Well, go ahead and do that, and in a few years there will be no land that is not used; then where will you get your taxes? The next step will then be the placing of a tax on the farm. After the great Napoleonic War there was a land tax in England of eight shillings on every acre of farm land. Considering the direct tax you would have to put on the farmers of this country if you abolish custom duties, as compared with that imposed upon other classes, two dollars an acre would be a fair amount to impose on farm lands. Every farmer in this country would, therefore, if you are going to adopt the system of directly taxing their property, have to pay two dollars an acre as his share of that taxation. What Government would carry out that idea and live? If you are going to wipe out the industries that are now supplying $40,000,000 or $50,000,000 of this taxation by taxing their output, where will you then go to get your money? The declarations of the Council of Agriculture are revolutionary; they include many of the platforms of the Soviets. If you put the tax all on one thing and thus wipe out that thing altogether, then, of course you wipe out the taxation. How can you get an income out of the factory in the East if you take steps which cause the factory to be closed and it has moved to the United States?

I warn every man, woman and child in this country who earns his living by industry to beware of agitations of this kind. I ask every man, woman or child who owns a Victory Bond: What is going to be its value if this policy is carried out? If the leader of the Government intends to adopt this policy of cutting down protection, to whom is he going to appeal when he again wants to sell Victory Bonds? What will be the result of such a policy? Can he sell his bonds to the Council of Agriculture? This country has only a small population. It comprises a number of provinces and those provinces have many divergent interests. Let me briefly sketch the condition of affairs in each province, and then let me ask the people of those provinces whether they are prepared to adopt an agrarian policy as against an industrial policy?

Let me first consider that province down by the sea which is represented by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie). He could tell me that at the present time hundreds of workingmen are walking the streets of the towns of that province, waiting to see what the action of the Government is going to be in the matter of protection of industries. At the present moment in Canada, all industry is paralysed, standing still. Gentlemen will have to ex-

cuse me for using such strong language, because I am not accustomed to doing so; but I am a good patriot—at least I hope so; indeed, I hope we are all good patriots—and when some one introduces such an anti-national policy at such a critical time, it is like a bugler sounding the retreat to our army when the Germans are upon them. That is the position we are in. In my hon. friend's province down by the sea there is a vast quantity of coal; but owing to the policy that has been adopted of taking away the ships from this country and using them elsewhere, the coal industry of Nova Scotia has languished, and instead of Canada supplying South America, Central America and part of Europe with coal, as she could have done if we had been allowed to use our own ships, our ships are taken away from us, no effort is made to replace them, and the collieries are virtually idle. The coal industry and the steel industry of Nova Scotia are great industries and the steel industry will, if it is properly developed, be one of the greatest industries in the world. It is far greater than that of Germany because Germany has lost her iron fields, whereas Canada has her iron and her coal fields there. What can a policy of agriculture to offer to the province of Nova Scotia? It means that if you remove the taxes, the manufacture of agricultural and other implements will fall into the hands of United States manufacturers and there will be less iron and coal needed from Nova Scotia. The result will be that many of those brave Nova Scotians—and in Nova Scotia is to be found the finest class of industrial people on the continent—will start the same old exodus of twenty years ago into the New England States. It is these people who went into these States in the old days who have made their industries what they are. At the present time, if you go into one of the manufacturing concerns in the New England States and ask to see the skilled mechanic, who is running the plant, the master-mechanic, the man who does the designing, you will find what? That he is a Nova Scotian. Recently, I had occasion to go to Pittsburg to consult one of the greatest metallurgists in the world. After we had talked for a while, he said: "You will be surprised to know that I am a Scotch Canadian." I said: "Are you?" "Yes," he said, "my father moved to the New England States when I was a small boy, and I was born in Nova Scotia." Nova Scotia has never had a proper opportunity; it has never had a tin roof put on its industries. Some people, even amongst Nova Scotians, are continually preaching against the industries of that province. What has Nova Scotia to expect out of grain farming? Nothing at all. The country is, to a certain extent, rough, and is not adapted to agriculture; it would barely feed its own population. Nevertheless, Nova Scotia, with all its wealth of coal and iron, can easily sustain an industrial population of 20 000,000. Its coal and iron is on the sea-board, where it should compete with the world.

Let me come now to New Brunswick, and we find similar conditions in its forests and mines. Nothing is being done to develop its fisheries, although there are great fisheries there. If this country had taken the proper stand, so far as the fisheries of that province are concerned, it would have provided cold storage facilities, so that the fisheries of New Brunswick—and the same may be said of Nova Scotia—would have been supplying frozen fish to Europe in competition with the whole world. But they cannot compete. Why? Because they have not the money to provide themselves with the necessary transportation to put their products on the markets of the world. Assistance from the Government is necessary, and a national policy is a policy that would provide them with ships and cold storage and would see that their fish were put on the markets of the world.

In Quebec there are great water-powers, vast iron fields, great forests and large industries. The finest workers to be found in Canada are from Quebec. The people of Quebec are an industrial people, and there is no reason why, with her cheap power, Quebec should not be the Manchester of the whole of North America. In textiles, in manufactures that require power and skilled workmen, she has made tremendous strides. Does the man or woman who works in a factory in Quebec want to have that factory closed? The manufacturers can always, in some way or another, escape disaster; he will cash in, and move to the United States, but the workingman, when the factory is closed, cannot cash in. He has to give up his house, losing what he invested in it. He will have to leave his own parish, losing everything, and go to the United States in order to carry on business there. For many years, while we were fighting for industries in this country, many of the people of Quebec were unfortunately compelled to go to foreign factories in order to earn a livelihood. When the National Policy was endorsed by that great leader, Sir Wilfrid Laurier, whose seat is now vacant,

when he refused to destroy the industries of the country at the behest of some of his followers—and he was a greater protectionist than many so-called protectionists, because they did not practise what they preached—his province began to develop its industries on a greater scale, the workers came back and emigration ceased. These people did great service in this war in manufacturing munitions. If Quebec had not an industrial population it could not do that. If it had not cheap power it could not do that. It has all that is necessary to make a country great industrially. Is there anything for Quebec in a policy that destroys the factory and fosters nothing but agriculture; that wipes out all those great factories and turns them into turnip fields?

I was almost forgetting that little green island called Prince Edward, down by the sea. It is an agricultural island, but still it is a model of thrift, and its cities and towns are gradually acquiring factories. It has a good, sound, well educated population. It is like Denmark. Denmark has no coal and it is the greatest agricultural country in the world, but still one-third of the population of Denmark is an industrial population, employed in factories.

Let us see what resources Ontario possesses. Ontario and Quebec have the cheapest power in the world. This war has taught us at least one thing, and that is this: Coal is power, water is power. Power is everything. The country that has the cheapest power is the country that is going to dominate the industries of the world, if that country is given the opportunity. Coal will never be a dollar a ton again. I used to buy lots of coal for a dollar a ton, but you cannot buy it at any such figure in the United States now. Coal will never go back to a dollar a ton again, unless, perhaps, in Alberta. We have power in Ontario and power in Quebec. We can harness that power on to the belt of a machine at a price equal to a dollar a ton coal. When we do that we can compete with the world, but we cannot compete with the United States in the way its goods are sold in this country. Let me point out one way in which they have, to my personal knowledge, competed with Canadian manufacturers, and I will ask you if such a course is fair. The Globe, in its discussion of the wire industry, stated that a large quantity of wire products had been sold by the United States in western Canada last year. That is true. How does it happen that while we are sending thousands of tons of wire products out of this country in competition with the United States, the United States can compete with us in the home markets? On that class of goods the tariff is very small. This is the method the United States' manufacturers adopt: During the whole period of the war the base price of nails in Pittsburg was about $3.50 per hundred pounds. That was the price quoted on your order. If you were an American and went to Pittsburg for a car of nails they would say: "The ordered price is $3.50 per hundred weight in car lots." I might say that I wanted a carload of nails to sell in Indiana. They would ask me when I wanted the nails. I might say: "Next week, because there are a lot of farmers there wanting to build farm houses." They would reply, "Very sorry, we will book your order, but we cannot guarantee to deliver until after the war." Then you would be stumped and would have to buy "spot" nails. The price of "spot" nails ranged from $5.00 to $5.50; that was the export price to all foreign countries except Canada. The conditions were then, that if you were an American and wanted nails for immediate delivery, you had to pay $5.50, but if you were a Canadian you could have the nails delivered next week at $3.50, the ordered price, because they want to put Canadian industries out of business. The Canadian manufacturers sold nine million dollars worth of wire products in competition with American manufacturers in the markets of the world last year, and at the same time the Americans took our market here. They are doing exactly the same thing with wheat, by putting an embargo on it. That is their policy every time—to drive our industries out of business—and they have no more mercy on a Canadian farmer than for any other Canadian manufacturer; and the farmer is the biggest manufacturer Canada has.

We now come to consider the province of Ontario from an industrial standpoint. We have the largest amount of developed water-power, and we have a thrifty population. Toronto is a great city. Some people call it "Hogtown," but its heart beats true to the people and industries of this country, no matter where they are located. It has just as soft a spot in its heart for the men of the West as for any other people in the world. Why, most of the people now living in the West originally came from Ontario. Manitoba is peopled almost entirely by people from this province, and I know the heart of the West responds to the heartbeats of Ontario. Ontario's policy is to build up everything in this country, so that one day Canada will have her place in the sun with other na-

tions. The province is rich in iron. It has no coal, except white coal, but where in the world can you find more silver than in Ontario, where can you find gold mines greater or better developed than in our province? The Hollinger mine is the greatest gold mine in the world.

I want to tell the House something about the iron mines of Ontario. We have great fields of iron which have never been touched, but there is not a workable area of iron ore in the province an acre in extent that has not been staked out and owned by the alien. In the United States millions of dollars are invested in the iron business; there is more money involved in that business than the value of the whole resources of Canada. These corporations are not interested in opening up iron mines in Ontario. To show how they operate, there are great deposits of iron in Minnesota. A new range had recently been discovered known as the Cayuna range. Some poor men owned that range at first, but later an option was taken on the property by a great iron corporation in the United States, which put in two years diamond drilling on the range. When they got through they said to the owners: "We are very sorry, but we cannot exercise our option as there is no ore there." That is the kind of stunner the people of Canada get who are interested in iron areas, after they are examined by American corporations, unless the property should be of proved value, when it might be taken over and shut down. As it happened, there were men of money on that Cayuna Range and they, the owners, proceeded to develop it with their own money, and last year the range turned out to be one of the great iron areas of the United States. That shows that the iron corporation which had an option on the property was only interested in keeping the iron out of the market. That is what these people would do with the iron deposits of Ontario, just to keep the iron out of our markets. I hope that fresh discoveries of iron will be made in the province of Ontario and, as a good National Policy man, I trust the Government will do something to assist the iron mining industry of this country, and then the province of Ontario will take its rightful place as a great producer if iron.

The province of Manitoba is a great grain-growing country. The farmers of that province have become wealthy and have decided to make their homes there. They have beautiful farms, and houses like the chateaux of France. The city of Winnipeg has cheaper power than almost any city in the world and is destined to be one of our greatest manufacturing cities—greater even than St. Paul or St. Louis. I do not know whether I shall live to see that day, but it will undoubtedly come if the Government adopts the policy I should like to see adopted, because Winnipeg has cheaper power, an active population, and other advantages. The northern part of Manitoba contains untold mineral wealth. In that district is the Mandy mine, one of the greatest copper mines in the world. Rich gold and nickel mines have also been discovered in this province. What is this country doing to assist in the development of those mines? Nothing. I am not one of those who want to see public money thrown away at the present juncture, but I would say that it is the duty of the Government, in the case of mines that have been proved to contain forty to fifty million dollars worth of ore, to build railways to bring out the products of the mines. The late J. J. Hill used to say that one good copper mine in the West was better than a whole wheat county. I do not know whether that is true or not, but if what the best experts in the world say of the mines of northern Manitoba is true we have a wonderful source of wealth there, which will mean a great future for the province of Manitoba and the country as a whole. I hope to see the day when the province of Manitoba will march along with Ontario. Hon. members may be surprised to know that in the particular business in which I am engaged we can buy manufactured goods from the city of Winnipeg and bring them down to Ontario cheaper than we can get those goods from our local mills. We ship our product in jute bags, and we bought those bags in the city of Winnipeg cheaper than we could have got them in Ontario or the East. Our staves we buy from New Brunswick. This goes to show that the industries of this country are closely interlinked together and that there is no inter-provincial divisions. We must all realize that, and not be small and narrow and provincial.

I now come to the province of Saskatchewan. One of the things the people of that province want is the abolition of the duty on cement. Now if there is one business that the West is succeeding in, it is the manufacture of cement. Ontario no longer makes any cement for the West. All the cement the West uses, and it uses a great deal, is manufactured in the West. Saskatchewan has rich fields of clay for cement, and great areas of cheap coal to burn that cement, and is destined to be one of the

great cement producing districts in the world.

There is another point. Can any hon. member tell me of any industry involving manual labour and the use of power that has been established in this country without the help of a protective tariff? We all know, if we read the history of the United States aright, that the greatest industry in that country is cotton, and that the cotton industry was not firmly established in the United States for many years until after a stout protective tariff was put on cotton so as to give their own cotton growers a chance against East Indian cotton. Can anybody point to one single industry established in Canada that has not been protected? In Saskatchewan there are great areas of natural gas and coal, and areas of oil that undoubtedly have not yet been discovered in that great province, which I believe will be one of the greatest manufacturing provinces in the Confederation. There are also great mineral resources, such as asphaltum, in the northern parts of that territory. We have been establishing councils of research to see what industries we can establish. Permit me, Sir, to point out one industry which we could establish by a national policy. There is no duty on pottery coming into Canada. We have no potteries. Consider the millions of dollars worth of china that is brought into Canada, yet, strange to say, the china clay, feldspar and all the materials that go to make pottery in the United States are imported into the United States from Canada, and all the cups and saucers and chinaware used there are manufactured from Canadian materials. Why should we let ourselves be robbed of our natural resources in that way? Why should the pottery industry not be established in Canada? I understand there are great deposits of china clay in Saskatchewan. Now, why should not thousands of soldiers who are engaged in potteries in England not be brought to these provinces so that a great industry might be established in this country? There are also vast areas of glass sand in Canada. We had a small glass industry in Canada, but whisky bottles were all that we made, because that was the only line protected. Window glass to the value of $8,000,000 or $9,000,000 a year,—and up to even $15,000,000 is used in Canada. But we have no window glass industry in this country because there has been no duty on window glass, and you cannot establish an industry under such circumstances. One half of the wire industry of this country is without protection, and if this Government would place a proper protective tariff on it I am confident in saying that a whole division of returned soldiers could be absorbed in that industry alone. We have not these industries simply because there is no duty. There is no better glass sand than is to be found in the West, and we should be making all the glass windows that are needed for our stores, and for the stores of the Empire, and I believe we could secure the trade of Australia and foreign countries if we had such an industry here. But all the people of Saskatchewan do not approve of this agitation and class hatred, and they are looking forward to the day when Saskatoon and Regina and all those fine cities there will see the wheels of industry running, and every village will have its factories. There is no reason why this should not be so, and why the western farmer should not take his automobile in the evening and go into town and meet his boy and girl at the factory and go to the movies. That would be the proper condition in this country, but you cannot live miles from civilization and make yourself believe that that is right. Why, Mr. Speaker, if I were to believe the doctrine that is being preached by alleged representatives of agriculture, I would not think of advising returned soldiers or any body else to go into farming, for they would be nothing more nor less than slaves. You cannot preach that doctrine to the farmer, because he knows better. The farmers of Ontario are thrifty, having in their houses all the modern conveniences of the city home. They are becoming wealthy land-owners, and have all their money in the Ontario factories; and that is why they voted against reciprocity.

If we took the tariff off and reverted to free trade and that policy came before the people of this country again they would reject it. Now, as regards Alberta, the German Empire has 4.5 per cent of the coal of the world. Alberta has 12½ per cent. Canada has 17½ per cent of the coal of the world, and yet Germany built an Empire on 4½ per cent. Now, if we are really Canadians we will not do one single act in this House or elsewhere that would tend to delay the day when Canada will take her proper place as the greatest manufacturing country in the world, with all the resources we have. I have never seen iron in Michigan or Minnesota to equal that of Alberta. There is in that province everything that goes to make a country great. It possesses the elements to make it the greatest steel and iron producing section of the whole of North America. "That is all right, Colonel," you say, "but why not let all the coal fields there be used to grow wheat? Never mind

about the coal." Well, when I was a young man, twenty-five years ago, I was in Colorado. In that state it was all gold mining, Cripple creek was booming and any one who mentioned the iron industry would be run out. The idea of Colorado competing with Pittsburg in the iron or steel business was considered absurd. But what has happened? To-day Colorado has forgotten about Cripple creek and although it is far away in the Western States it has an iron and steel industry that produces great wealth, and is of considerable importance, and will compare with any steel and iron centre in the world. At that time no mention could ever be made of iron. I hope to see the day —if this country adopts a proper system of protection, when the province of Alberta will put Pittsburg and all those iron regions in the United States in the shade. Its coal resources are far greater than Pennsylvania ever dreamed of, it has iron and gas, and all it needs is a policy of protection to encourage investment there, and the building of railroads to connect the iron with the coal fields, and the coal fields and iron fields with the natural gas resources, and Alberta will have a greater iron industry than the world has ever seen. Yet the farmers of Alberta, headed by a man named Wood, want all the industries of the East destroyed, and would discourage the eastern man who would like to go to develop these resources from going West and investing his dollar there. Has Alberta after all staked its all in agriculture? Has Saskatchewan staked its all in agriculture? Agriculture is only one of the dozen eggs they have in the basket. And Manitoba? Well, it does not follow the programme of the agriculturalists when it comes to voting. And let me turn to ask the province by the sea in the west, British Columbia, with its great areas of coal and iron, and its water-powers beyond the comprehensions of the world. No country in the world has such great hidden wealth as British Columbia. It has a great wealth of minerals, a great wealth of coal, and enormous forest wealth, it is capable of producing tremendous quantities of paper.

As to fisheries, no country can equal it. Well, British Columbia is British Columbia and after all British Columbia is not the "West" British Columbia is the place where the east and west meet. If we are going to have foreign trade one of the great channels of the country through which that trade will pass will be British Columbia. Our greatest field for foreign trade is the Orient, and Australasia.

Now, you may ask me: What do you suggest doing? That is the question. If I had the doing, I would immediately place an embargo upon the grain and manufactured products of every other country. Talk about the handling of grain! Those men who talk about grain-growing in the West, those men who control the grain of the West, allow a small coterie of Americans to get in ahead of them and to fill our terminal elevators with grain while they have their grain still in the granaries. It is absurd. The time has come when no alien should be allowed to own any of the granaries or transportation resources of this country. I do not care who he may be, or how friendly he may be. They have now blocked all our elevators with their grain. If the agriculturists of the West had devoted as much of their time to looking after their own interests as far as the elevators are concerned as after the affairs of the eastern manufacturers they would not have allowed their elevators to be stuffed with American grain while their own wheat is still in the fields and granaries.

The hon. member for Maple Creek made reference to the late lamented leader of the Liberal party, and he said that he was the man who first brought the elevators in the West to time. The western elevators are not brought to time. I have in my pocket a report on these western elevators which I might read, but I have no desire to extend my remarks. There are men in this House who are interested in these terminal elevators. Mr. Speaker, will you be surprised when I tell you that last year the overage—that is the amount of grain that was illegally taken from the farmers in the West by the elevators amounted to over $2,000,000. Has there been any kick? Or any row raised about that with the elevators?—No. Why? The Grain Growers own elevators and I understand the earnings of that company last year were 44½ per cent. There is no manufacturing industry in the East that can compare with that, not even Sir Joseph Flavelle's. Let us take the mote out of our own eye before we remove the beam from any body else's.

What would I do? The situation is very grave. Let us drop all this trade controversy for the moment. Let us assist the Government and back it up. Let us insist upon the adoption of a policy of embargo similar to that which every other country has adopted so that when we go into treaty making we will have a jack knife in a trade we will have a jimmy that will force some of our products into the markets of those countries. This is the way to provide foreign markets for our products.

There is only one way to get those foreign markets and that is by providing pro-

per transportation at sea. There has been a great deal of talk about this Government giving contracts for building ships but that is the wisest thing the Government ever did and there is not a ship building on our stocks to-day that could not be sold tomorrow for a great deal more money than it is costing us to Japan or some other nation. That is a fact that everybody in the business knows. Those ships should be put on those lines of transportation, not between Canada and broken down European countries which have been devastated by the war but between Canada, South and Central America, South Africa, India, China, Japan, Australia and New Zealand. What did the export of our manufactured goods last year amount to outside of munitions? It amounted to over half a billion dollars, principally to these countries. If this Government provided lines of transportation so that goods can be transported from Canadian factories to the markets of the world at less than they can be carried from the factories of Germany, France or the United States, we can get the market. We will get them. It will not matter then so much if the Americans come in and sell their stuff here; we can carry on and Canada will become a great manufacturing country and its products will find a market all over the world. The American manufacturers want a market at their door. They are afraid to go abroad in search of markets. It is only the big companies there that seek the foreign markets. The manufacturer in Canada has sought a market for his goods abroad; he has more courage than any other man in the world. When they were asked to make shells the Canadian manufacturers supplied their own money and financed themselves whereas in every other country the manufacturers were financed by the government. If you provide the Canadian manufacturer with transportation they will get the business. You would imagine from listening to those who are trying to stir up class hatred that the Canadian manufacturer is a terrible man. The manufacturer has a heart like any other man. He has a wife and family, he tries to do good in the community. He sometimes goes to church on Sunday. He is not such an awful man as he is pictured. When it comes to the question of patriotism the manufacturer takes no back seat to any grain-grower or any other person in the community. He has given a great deal to the war. What did the manufacturer do when he was asked to make munitions? In England they gave the manufacturer the money with which to put in his machinery and to finance the payment of his workmen. In this country the manufacturer had to go down on his knees and dig and shovel for himself. He did that and he made munitions cheaper than in any other country in the world. Did he not play his part in this war? You would think that it was not the man fighting in the trenches who won the war but that it was somebody away back on a farm or little village who talked politics. It makes me tired to hear such nonsense as that. Let us take a big view of this question. The manufacturer has done his share. He only asks what is fair and square. He does not want the country to adopt a policy that is going to drive his workmen out of his factory and into a foreign country. Nor, does he want to be driven out of the country himself. He wants to be considered a Canadian. His profits have not been as great as those of any other class of the community. I mentioned that the grain growers' profits were 44½ per cent. I do not believe that any of these manufacturers have ever made such a profit as that. Let us forget all that and let us be big. Let us adopt the policy of Canada for the Canadians. Let us adopt a policy that will give employment to our soldiers and to every class of the community. We cannot grow up to be a great nation if one foot—the industrial foot—is bound up like the foot of a Chinese lady who goes limping about. We cannot make this a great country unless it is well balanced. The United States is an example to us in that respect. The United States is a great country and under normal conditions it does not care whether it exports its cereals or not. In case of war the United States could live alone. It is a self-contained country. Germany was almost in the same position before the war. It adopted a form of national policy and aspired to national greatness. One hundred years ago Germany was composed of a hundred very small states but they united and Germany became a great industrial country. She was foolish enough to commence this war in the effort to dominate the world industrially. She made a mistake as a result of which her dream of world power has been shattered but not her industries. Her industries will come back again and her products will seek the markets of the world later on. Are we prepared to give them free trade?

I have put before the House the views of those who look upon this question in the same way as I do. I sat at the feet of the fathers of the National Policy; I have

listened to their arguments. I have nothing to go back upon in that respect. I am a Liberal-Conservative. I believe in the National Policy and I do not believe in giving way one inch to sectionalism, to one part of this country in opposition to the interests of another part. My party is not in any sense represented in this Governernment. We realize that. We were quite willing—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CURRIE: Hon. gentlemen need not laugh. I am stating facts. The Conservative party could have carried on. It never needed to ask anybody to come in, but when this war was on, in the greatness of their hearts, there was not a single man of the party that was not willing to ask other members of this House or gentlemen outside who were of the same views as we were in regard to carrying on the war, to come in and take a share of the responsibility. But the Conservative party did not have before it, when that question was discussed, the trade issue. We did not have that before us, and we did not invite people into the Government of the day who were going to adopt the policy that would be destructive in its effects on agriculture or the industries of the country. We did not follow the policy that was adopted in Great Britain, the policy of governing by groups whereby the Unionists have their own caucus and their own whips, the Conservatives have their own caucus and their own whips, and the Liberals who went over to the Liberal-Unionist ranks have their own caucus and their own whips. According to that rule, which is an historic one, we, the Conservatives in this House, should have had our own whips and our own caucus, and be represented directly in the Government by our own ministers. We did not do that, we were big and broad enough not to press for that. The Conservatives in this House have not held any caucus, and have not decided, or taken, any ground as far as any of the policies of the country are concerned —we were quite willing to leave that to the Union Government as an Administration. Other groups have caucused. But if there is going to be a change, if there is going to be deviation by the adoption of any policy that violates the principles of the historic Conservative party, there will be, without question, a caucus and a meeting of the Conservative party of this country in convention. It will foregather and we shall see who is going to have the funeral—we shall have a state funeral of some kind. There is no doubt about . can set that down as being as certain as that the sun rises in the East every day. After all the sacrifices that the members of that party have undergone for the sake of peace and unity and the building up of this country, if the principles which they have fought for to build up this country, and with which we have beaten our opponents again and again—and we can beat them again with the same policies—are going to be violated, and if it is intended to come down to a policy of compromise, all I can say is, "Nothing doing." I come from a race of Covenanters, and we do not compromise. There will be a decision very soon on this matter, and whatever that decision will be, upon it will depend to a large extent the future prosperity of this country. What have our men fought for? What have they died for, for what reason have they written the name of Canada large in the four corners of the whole world, if we are going to adopt a policy of retrogression, if we are going to stand still. It cannot be done. We must march on, and I would ask my friends on both sides in this House, and in all parts of Canada, who are lovers of their country and like to see things moving along, to drop all this piffle about Free Trade that we had before the war when there were no real issues at stake. There is only one great issue before the people of this country at the present moment, there is only one great issue for every man in this House, and that is the future success of Canada. Now that the war is over that is the great subject that confronts us. Let us think of that constantly, let us forget our own personal interest and put the interests of Canada above everything else.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Does not my hon. friend, who has just taken his seat, think it would be wise to give the evidence of a direct quotation before he makes a statement in this House that a gentleman occupying so important a public position as Mr. Wood—the United Farmers' President in Alberta—is an annexationist?

Mr. CURRIE: Unfortunately I have not got the statement here to prove it, but it is well known that during the Reciprocity fight Mr. Wood was trying to preach the doctrine of annexing this country to the United States, or making this country an adjunct of the Republic. He is an American born, and he thought he had all the Americans in western Canada behind him in that propaganda. Unfortunately for him, when the war broke out, and the Americans were

drawn into the struggle, those settlers of that nationality in the West gave every evidence that they are just as good and loyal Canadians as the rest of the people of Canada. I have not got the quotation, but it is well known in the East and spoken of everywhere, that Mr. Wood was an avowed annexationist—that his object is to annex this country to the United States. If that is not the case, I am very sorry "to put him in wrong." Until such time, however, as he changes his belief I shall have to adhere to my description of him.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): The House will not expect that in the few observations I have to offer I shall discuss the rival policies of Free Trade and Protection. Opportunity will be afforded during the debate on the Budget to deal with that very important issue; but it strikes me, after having listened to the remarks of my good friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie) that there is something wrong in his arguments about high protection, and about the future of this country, both of which he has linked together. If I gathered rightly from his remarks, he preached the doctrine of wider markets for Canada, and at the same time advocated a policy of embargo against foreign goods. I am only a layman, I do not pose as an authority on economics, or to have slept with Adam Smith by my bedside—although I admit some familiarity with the works of that great economist—but it seems to me that the Canadian manufacturer and the Canadian Government would have very poor results indeed if they were to place an embargo on the goods of foreign countries.

Mr. CURRIE: I think the hon. gentleman mistakes the purpose of an embargo. There is such a thing as an embargo, and there is also a system of licensing. The embargo would be placed against the goods of foreign countries coming into Canada; the licensing system is applied to goods exported by some countries.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I understood my hon. friend to advocate placing an embargo on goods coming from the United States.

Mr. CURRIE: My hon. friend is correct as to that.

Mr. LEMIEUX: At all events it is clear in my mind from what my friend said that the high protectionists of Canada all want things their own way, and those who do not share their opinions are to be termed Bolshevists.

I have listened to the lecture which my hon. friend (Mr. Currie) has read his colleagues on that side of the House. I am not impertinent enough to desire to intervene in the quarrel or quarrels that may exist. All these rows, which have taken place in the House since the beginning of this debate, will, I am sure, be transferred to-morrow, if I am well informed, to the caucus. We do not see any latch-string at the door for entrance to that caucus, but I can offer some advice at least to my good friends—if the worst comes to the worst, let them follow the Queensbury rules.

Mr. Speaker, this debate has lasted long enough, and should soon come to an end. I do not intend, therefore, to offer any lengthy remarks this afternoon; I shall make them as concise as possible in order to expedite the business of the House.

First of all, I join with members on both sides of the House in tendering my most sincere congratulations to the two young members who moved (Mr. Redman) and seconded (Mr. Manion) the Address. I think it will be agreed that they are an addition to the debating power of the House of Commons.

I wish also to congratulate my friend the member for North Cape Breton and Victoria (Mr. McKenzie) upon the great honour which has been conferred upon him in his selection as leader of the Liberal party during the present session. His fidelity to his late leader and his loyalty to his friends and to the principles which they represent have been tested by his clansmen sitting at your left, Mr. Speaker. He was not deterred by clamour or by passion from doing what he conceived to be right. He knew in days gone by how to steer his course; he was not deceived by false lights on the shore; and that explains why he sits where he does to-day.

The member for North Cape Breton and Victoria succeeds, as has been said by several others, a great leader, one of the great Canadians of the age. It seems to me that in the disappearance from public life of the lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier a giant oak has fallen in the forest. I believe that I express the sentiments of the House when I say of him:

> The Knight's bones are dust,
> And his good sword rust;
> His soul is with the saints, I trust.

Mr. Speaker, Sir Wilfrid Laurier is gone from our midst; but his spirit is still with us. I believe that on both sides of the House we can find inspiration in the noble life and lofty ideals of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

Allusion has been made in this House and outside of this House—notably in a

manifesto issued by the member for Shelburne and Queen's (Hon. Mr. Fielding) during the last election, when a division occurred in the ranks of the Liberal party—to the "Quebec situation." I admit that there has been a Quebec situation, unfortunately; but time is a great healer and the clash will not last forever. Already I see signs in and out of this House which indicate that the time is not far distant when the estrangement between the old province of Quebec and the rest of the Dominion will be a thing of the past. I say that the clash cannot last, because there are men of good-will on both sides of politics and amongst all races. The extremists, unfortunately, have had sway of late; now has struck the hour of moderation and for moderate men. There was a Quebec situation, as was stated by the member for Shelburne and Queen's in his manifesto; but it was not of our making. It was very easy in 1870 for Bismarck to create a French situation by the sending of a false despatch from Ems. So it was easy in 1917 to create a Quebec situation, which, I repeat, was not of her own making.

I read during my leisure hours the speeches of that great Irishman who is acknowledged as foremost amongst English orators. You will notice that when the Irishmen produce a man of genius, John Bull, who looks always after number one, takes him unto himself. I have always been struck with the following phrase from one of Edmund Burke's speeches, which I would like some of my friends to read and to ponder:

> It looks to me narrow and pedantic to apply the ordinary ideas of criminal justice to this great public contest. I do not know the method of drawing up an indictment against a whole people.

Mr. Speaker, as I stated a moment ago, there was a Quebec situation during 1917, but it was concocted, it was planned, it was matured, and it was launched, by expert hands. It was engineered by a patriot, Sir Clifford Sifton, aided and abetted by two other knights of equal fame, Sir Joseph Flavelle and Sir William Mackenzie; and it was worked up to a frenzy by a subsidized press. A clear and far-seeing man like my esteemed friend and ex-colleague, the member for Shelburne and Queen's, might have discovered the eye-wash, the camouflage, because they were of the same creation as those of 1911 which destroyed the policy of my hon. friend, advocated by us during that year. Mr. Speaker, it was given to a plain Scotch "hielander" to discern it. The member for Shelburne and

Queen's stated the other evening
5 p.m. that gratitude was a scarce commodity. Unfortunately it is, but the Liberals of this Dominion and their representatives in this Parliament have not exhausted their supply of gratitude; and that is why at the opening of this session, on the morrow of the death of Sir Wilfrid Laurier, unanimously and enthusiastically they entrusted their political soul to a Scotch Presbyterian whose head is as cool as the snow-capped mountains of the highlands, and whose heart is as warm as the glens of dear old Scotia.

I do not need to import into this House the domestic affairs of the Liberal party. At the beginning of the session the leader of the Opposition held out the olive branch to those hon. gentlemen who differed from us on a single issue relating to the war; to accept or reject it, as they might choose. This friendly offer was undoubtedly the extending of a privilege, if they chose to avail themselves of it, to hon. gentlemen to whom it was made. But it has been a surprise to the members to your left, Mr. Speaker, to hear some hon. gentlemen impute motives and intentions on the part of the leader of the Opposition that we know were not entertained by him when he made this offer out of the goodness of his heart.

May I, therefore, be pardoned if I refer briefly to what was said on this score by my old colleague and esteemed friend, the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)? The hon. gentleman gave us a good deal of gratuitous advice in the course of which he coupled up the friendly invitation of the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) with the claim said to have been made by some person or persons connected with the Liberal party to the effect that when the upheaval took place in 1917, those who remained true to their leader became the possessors of the Ark of the Covenant of Liberalism. Personally,—and I am pretty well informed on the affairs of the Liberal party—I do not know of any such claim having been made. Thank Heaven! in the Liberal party we respect individual opinions; we can differ and yet remain Liberals. I do, however, know that in repelling the persistent attacks of certain newspapers, when they continuously sneered at us and claimed that we were not real Liberals, but mere Laurier Liberals, we were obliged in self defence to direct public attention to certain historic facts; and perhaps it would be well that I should do so again in order to remove any misconception that may exist in the mind of the hon. member for

Shelburne and Queen's or in that of any other hon. gentleman on this subject.

Estrangements and divisions have taken place before to-day in the Liberal party in Canada and in other countries. It is a common occurrence in the traditions of the Liberal party that at times the members of that party may differ. Take the history of English Liberalism. In 1886, some Liberals of the Rowellian type differed with Mr. Gladstone. If I mistake not, the Liberals who left Mr. Gladstone on the Home Rule question and who joined the Unionist party of the time, became leaders of the Conservative party of to-day. Has not the same thing occurred at a later date? When Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman was the leader of the Liberal party in 1900 there was again a difference of opinion; and I am told, in fact I know, that the Liberals who left him on that occasion, left him for good, joining the Conservative party, and they are at the present time still within the ranks of that party. On those two occasions, therefore, it is historically true that the custodians of the Ark of the Covenant of Liberalism were those who remained true and faithful to Gladstone and to Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I am sure, knowing my hon. friend's mind, and appreciating as I do that he does not wish to be historically inaccurate, he will permit me to say that in the case of the Liberal-Unionist split, Sir George Trevelyan was one of two Liberal-Unionists who participated in the famous round-table conference for the reunion of the Liberal party. Afterwards, Sir George Trevelyan, on his own initiative, returned to the Liberal party.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I can quote chapter and verse in support of my own opinion. I can tell my hon. friend that Lord Lansdowne was a Liberal until he left Gladstone on the Home Rule question and became one of the leaders of the Tory party in England. Earl Grey, a former Governor General, left Gladstone and became one of the leaders of the Tory party. I may say that Lord Rosebery left Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman, and Lord Rosebery is to-day considered one of the leaders of the Imperialist party in England. I could give name after name; but it is true, as a matter of history—and my hon. friend cannot deny it—that those who remained with Gladstone and with Campbell-Bannerman represented the Liberal thought of England.

So it was in Canada at the time of Confederation. Take the example of George Brown. In 1885, in 1890, in 1891 and in 1911—on each of these occasions of political disturbance, the Liberal leader and those who remained true to him were regarded as the custodians of the Ark of the Covenant of Canadian Liberalism. Does the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) contend that the upheaval of 1917 must be considered as an exception to the rule, and that because of the personality of this or that gentleman who then broke with the Liberal party, the records of the past and the teachings of history must be ignored? If so, he will find few to agree with him—more particularly when it is borne in mind that by a statute of this Parliament, the leader of the Opposition is officially recognized. I will say this to my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's that there is another side to the Indian story which he told the House the other day. The wigwam was not lost; the Indian was lost. The Indian left the primeval forest in the morning; he met some white trash, drank some fire water, and in the evening when he came back into the bush, he could not find the wigwam. I would advise my hon. friend to hold another parley with John, the Indian, and say to him: "John, the wigwam is not lost; the wigwam is just where it always was, but the old chief, against whom we took the war path is dead; and so you might as well put away your tomahawk and scalping knife and come in from the war path and lend a hand to those who are trying to restore a free Parliament in order that they may re-establish the ways of peace."

To be serious, let me say this: The Liberal party is greater than any individual. Further, it is our belief that in the general recognition of this truth by Liberals of all shades of opinion will there be found a rallying place for the forces that make for national harmony and national progress, and that only upon such common ground will it be possible to formulate a policy that will make Liberalism the cure for the ills against which the masses of the people are now crying out in words of ominous import.

I remember, when I was a boy here at the University, trying to emulate my good friend the hon. member for Russell (Mr. Murphy), the professor would ask me to translate from Pope's Essay on Criticism. I remember the first two lines of that Essay:

'Tis with our judgments as our watches, none
Go just alike, yet each believes his own.

Exactly so. My hon. friend and esteemed colleague the member for Shelburne and

Queen's (Mr. Fielding) believes he is right in his conception of Liberalism. I believe he is wrong. Our watches do not go just alike. We each believe our own. I will make a bargain with him. Your watch, my friend, is not accurate. Perhaps mine is not accurate. Let us therefore turn to the old grandfather clock and set the time by it.

Mr. Speaker, this awful war is over, and I need not say how proud we all are of the record our soldiers made at the front—proud of the living, and prouder still of the dead. If this victory means anything it means the crushing of militarism, not only in Germany, but the whole world over, Canada included. Canadians have played their part in this war. For territorial aggrandisement? No. For the securing of indemnity? No. For a voice in the foreign affairs of the British Empire? No, Mr. Speaker. The five hundred thousand Canadian soldiers who with unfaltering steps faced the grey lines of Germany fought the battles of this war in order to put an end to all wars in the future, so that there might not perish from the earth what was so well defined by old Lincoln as "Government of the people, by the people, for the people." What will be the outcome of this welter of blood? We are told that we are to have a Society of Nations, possibly a League of Peace, but call it by whatever name you choose, I proudly hope that this Parliament of Canada, after all the sacrifices that have been made by our boys, will be called upon to ratify the treaty and the covenant of peace.

I know we are not a sovereign power, but, Sir, I remember two occasions during my parliamentary career when this Parliament—and we were not then a sovereign power—was called upon to ratify foreign treaties—the French treaty and the Japanese treaty. Both these treaties concerned our commercial relations with two foreign countries. Surely, if this Parliament can ratify commercial treaties as a matter of course, it should be called upon, in view of all the sacrifices that have been made by Canada in this war, to ratify the Peace Treaty. We have given unsparingly in men and in money. We mourn the loss of sixty thousand of our bravest, and thousands have come back maimed or wounded. Our country is saddled with a colossal debt, our industries are crippled, and we are facing a future fraught with the gravest perils as a result of our participation in the world war. I claim for Canada, my country, the honour of ratifying the Peace Treaty along with the other Allied nations. Canada has won that distinction. We owe that to the living; we owe it to the dead. True, Mr. Speaker, this may not increase our stature by one cubit. But it may enlarge our orbit. I have no patience with those who claim to be Liberals and are satisfied with the clerks of the British Foreign Office to represent Canada and do our work eternally.

I said a moment ago that this great war was over. The historic parties are aligned anew. I have listened to several addresses by hon. gentlemen on the other side of the House—all my friends—and I heard them repeat one after another their belief that all parties in this country had gone to pieces, that there were no more Liberals and no more Conservatives. True, my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) declared that the old, historic Conservative party was still in existence.

I turn to my authority, Burke, for his definition of a political party:—

> A body of men united for promoting by their joint endeavours the national interest upon some political principle in which they are all agreed.

Mr. Speaker, the party system has existed in Great Britain for many centuries. We borrow our traditions and our ideals, politically speaking, from the mother of parliaments, and as long as there are two Britishers in the world there will be a party system, and that party system will resolve itself into two groups—a Liberal group and a Conservative group.

What is Liberalism? Liberalism is not so much a policy as a habit of mind. It is the disposition of the man who looks upon each of his fellows as of equal worth with himself. Upon class distinctions in society, rank, wealth, race and creed he wages unceasing war. What is Conservatism? The Tory habitually thinks of his fellow creatures, not according to their individuality, but according to their class, the face value of which, regardless of their intrinsic worth, either entitles or disentitles them to his favour. They either belong to his own class or they do not. The real worth of each is not the standard by which he forms his judgment of them. Every act and utterance, every refusal or protest of another person is referred to the artificial connection or distinction, instead of being judged for itself. In a word, the Tory looks down from the institution to the man; the Liberal up from the man to the institution. That, Sir, is the basic distinction between Liberalism and Conservatism; it is the distinction which exists in all liberty-loving countries, such as those under the rule of King George the Fifth.

Party government needs no justification. Men differ widely in their views, but they can co-operate by subordinating some of their ideas to a general policy. What is the function of parties? It is to crystallize public sentiment, to formulate issues. In 1911 my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) crystallized the policy of the Conservative party in one phrase which he coined in Toronto, "No truck or trade with the Yankees," and my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) crystallized and formulated the policy of the Liberal party—wider markets for Canada.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: May I be permitted to interrupt the hon. member?

Mr. LEMIEUX: Certainly.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I never used such an expression at any time in my life.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am very glad indeed, I am very happy to hear the responsible Acting Prime Minister of Canada deny the imputation that he ever used those words. Sir, it has been repeated time and again; but, of course, ashes only remain of the old buildings, and all our words are buried with the ashes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: And should be.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, these words have been repeated. I do not know how many sessions we have had since their alleged use, but it gives me great pleasure, indeed, to hear the Acting Prime Minister of this Government state boldly and emphatically that he never used such debasing language in reference to our great ally to the south of us. The people have a direct voice in deciding public questions and in choosing and controlling the Government. Party government, I will go further and say, intensifies popular interest in public affairs, and promotes stability and order in national affairs. I repeat, Mr. Speaker, that as long as we follow the British system of government, and British ideals, we shall have the party system. It is true, parties may be temporarily decimated, but they are bound to revive. In England a few weeks ago Mr. Asquith was defeated—and it was a great misfortune for the United Kingdom that he was defeated; and the Liberal party was absolutely annihilated. Parties may be annihilated for a time, but, I say, they will revive; and only the day before yesterday in a by-election which took place in England, Mr. Lloyd George suffered the severest blow in his political career. In the province of Ontario the Liberal party was annihilated. We had a so-called leader who made an alliance with the Premier of that province in order to prevent public opinion from pronouncing itself on the public issues of the day. But what has happened? The people have taken into their own hands their salvation; and in by-elections which have taken place of late, Liberal opinion has asserted itself in the province of Ontario. I dare say if the Government of the day in Canada were to open some of the constituencies—the good Scotch constituency of Glengarry, the constituency of North Ontario, the constituency of Assiniboia, and Quebec East—I dare say my hon. friend would hear from the people; and the Government, strong as it is, might perhaps learn something from them. Mr. Speaker, you cannot change human nature. You may tell the people not to mention this, and not to speak of that. You may scientifically muzzle the press and prevent it from conveying to the public the real facts of the case. But you cannot change human nature; and already, Mr. Speaker, there is a clamour in this country against the methods adopted by the present Government. Why, Sir, we have that clamour arising from the ministerial benches. We all heard the speech delivered the other day by my hon. friend the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes), and we heard the speech delivered by the prominent Unionist member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding). And what do we gather from these two speeches?—to take only two examples. Since the beginning of this debate my sympathies have rather been with my good friend the genial Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White). He has been attacked and badly handled on right and left by his own friends. What did we hear? The hon. member for Victoria—who, I am told, was in his younger days a staunch Grit—he and the editor of the Toronto World one day bore the banners in a procession headed by the late Sir Oliver Mowat. He evidently recalls his younger days, because the other day he was the first to sound that note to the Government: "Restore the rights of a free Parliament;" and that note was re-echoed by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's. We have been told from both sides of the House—and we have heard it especially from both groups on the other side of the House—that Orders in Council should be abolished if responsible government is not to be a by-word. Sir, I say that the latest example that this House has had of lack of responsible government

is the Order in Council which came as a bomb the other day in reference to the receivership of the Grand Trunk Pacific. That we should in the year of our Lord, 1919 clamour for responsible government in Canada is indeed a sad commentary on Unionism in Canada. But this is not all. We have been told repeatedly by gentlemen belonging to both groups of the Government, that the iniquitous War-time Elections Act should be repealed. We have heard that it is a blemish on the statute book of Canada. Oh, it is true, my good friend from Westminster (Mr. Stacey), whom I do not see in his seat at present, said—in order probably to forestall the criticism that might come from this side of the House— that in that election of 1917 the people did not care for the means but were only looking at the end. Mr. Speaker, it is the first time that this doctrine of the end being justified by the means has been proclaimed in the House of Commons of Canada. I have been told—indeed I have read it not once but in practically every issue of the Orange Sentinel—that this doctrine is a sinister Jesuitical one. Mr. Speaker, if that is the policy of the Unionist party as proclaimed by my hon. friend from Westminster (Mr. Stacey), I would ask my good friend, the Secretary of State (Mr. Burrell) immediately to appoint a delegate—who should be Mr. Hocken himself—and send him to Rome and have him tender to the General of the Jesuit Order an abject apology on behalf of the Orange party. The end justifies the means, said my hon. friend from Westminster. But what about the charges which were made during the last session? What about the charges that were made, and made so eloquently, by our young friend the hon. member for Chambly and Vercheres (Mr. Archambault) in which it was established beyond a doubt that hundreds of men were induced to swear falsely as to their domicile in Canada? What about the charges made on the other side of the Atlantic? The Prime Minister, the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid), a King's Counsel from the province of Nova Scotia, and a certain colonel from London, Ontario, were said to have had their hands in a plot during the last campaign so as to apportion votes to constituencies where ministerial candidates were not safe. What about these charges? Can we ignore them? If the Government has any honour, and its honour is in its own hands, it is in duty bound to probe the charges which have been made and to investigate every one of them. If the Government does not do it, let it open one or two constituencies even in the province of Ontario and it will learn what the good people of Ontario think of such methods.

The hon. member for Westminster (Mr. Stacey) said that the bond of unity in Canada should be based on honour, truth and toleration. Let me tell him that if the War-time Elections Act is not repealed we cannot speak of honour, truth or toleration in this Parliament. Let me now make a very brief survey of the conditions prevailing in Canada.

The hon. the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) depicted in this House the other day a very roseate outlook. As a result of this great war Canada had participated in the deliberations of the War Cabinet and out of the war there would be evolved a cabinet of governments. He was not very clear as to the constitutional aspect of that change. Then he depicted conditions prevailing in Russia under Bolshevist rule. Sir, I do not think it is necessary for Sir Robert Borden, our Premier, to go to Prinkipo in order to investigate the conditions in Russia under Bolshevism. This Government appointed a friend of their own, Mr. C. H. Cahan, K.C., who was my opponent during the last Dominion election, to investigate the socialistic propaganda in Canada. Of late he has published a pamphlet as to what he found in Canada. He declares that there is in Canada a socialistic and Bolshevist propaganda that in my judgment should be enough to prevent the Prime Minister from running after it in Russia. In the last page of his pamphlet Mr. Cahan says:

> I have endeavoured to give you an idea of the milder forms of the propaganda, which has covertly been carried on throughout Canada, with the evident object of weakening the will of the Canadian people to carry on the war to a successful conclusion, and, more recently, to create difficulties and dissensions within Canada so as to hinder the attainment of a satisfactory peace. I say milder forms of propaganda advisedly; for, if I were to quote at length the quantities of obscene, profane and seditious pamphlets which have been circulated throughout Canada by the social revolutionists, it would only serve to excite your bitter animosity, and perhaps lay myself open to the charge of disseminating sedition, though merely repeating it for your information.

Here we have a gentleman appointed by the Government to inquire into the operations of the Bolshevists and socialists in Canada. His report is full of information on this subject of the most serious nature. Yet we are told by the President of the

Privy Council that Bolshevism is operating only in Russia. He did not say it but I suppose the logical conclusion to be arrived at from his speech was that the Prime Minister of Canada was therefore justified in going to Prinkipo. Let us look after our own affairs and let the Bolshevists of Russia look after theirs.

The observations and the ramblings of my hon. friend the President of the Privy Council may be very interesting but we must face, and solve, our own Canadian problems. As the hon. member for Shelburn and Queen's said, let us attend to our own affairs. What is the true situation to-day? I will not give my own opinion. I will give the opinion expressed by a bosom friend of the President of the Privy Council, a very eminent divine belonging, if I mistake not, to the Methodist church. Dr. Bland addressed a meeting a few evenings ago in Toronto and he used this language as he described the conditions in Canada:

> There is no English-speaking country at least so ill prepared for the storm now breaking on the world. Canada is a steamer drifting into the rapids, the crew quarrelling and no captain in sight. We have section pitted against section, race against race, class against class and the soldiers a powerful and unknown factor.

Is that picture too sombre? Is it true that Canada is the image of a steamer drifting into the rapids, is it true that the crew is quarrelling, is there no captain of the ship? Let us look at the situation. That the crew is quarrelling we have no better evidence than what we have had this afternoon, yesterday and indeed ever since the debate started in this House of Commons. That we have no captain is undisputed. The hon. member for Shelburne and Queens told us the other day that the captain was in Paris with three of his colleagues and that he was more needed in Ottawa than in Paris.

This session of Parliament has been delayed for nine months. In England, last year, they held two sessions and had a general election. In Canada we have delayed for nine months the meeting of Parliament. The usages of Parliament have been abridged. I have read the Parliamentary and constitutional history of England as interpreted by the best authors. It struck me that two years ago when we allowed Sir George Perley and two of the parliamentary secretaries to sit in this Parliament and to receive the emoluments of office without going before the people we were seriously abridging the British and the Canadian constitution. We saw a minister of the Crown (Mr. Blondin) defeated in two constituencies, and yet for months afterwards he continued in office and received emoluments as Portmaster General. He had no seat in this House, but finally he was provided with one in the Senate.

The writs for by-elections, Mr. Speaker, are not issued, as you well know. The national debt of Canada is simply staggering in its figures. We are facing a huge deficit. The Minister of Public Works the other day asked the House to look carefully into the condition of affairs, before the coming financial year was over, with a view of seeing what we are going to do in the future, and to look carefully, from a business standpoint, to the question where we are going to get the extra one hundred millions of revenue which we shall require after the present fiscal year. The adverse balance of trade is growing, and growing abnormally. Here is what I read in The Morning Sun, of New York, of March 11th, speaking of the staunch ally, the opulent customer and near-kin that Canada is to the United States:

> In the seven months Canada bought from us a quarter of a billion dollars more than Canada sold us.

This is how the balance of trade stands as between Canada and the United States. And yet for years and years, when my good friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) was the financial pilot of this country the wails of my hon. friends opposite, wails of sorrow and regret, filled the other Chamber. They would speak then only of the adverse balance of trade. Well, Mr. Speaker, this year, after a period of only seven months there is an adverse balance of a quarter of a billion of dollars as between the United States and Canada.

The Civil Service, right here in Ottawa—and if the expression were not a little vulgar, I would say right under the noses of the Prime Minister and the minister responsible for the Civil Service—are up in arms. Labour is arrayed against capital. Unemployment is rife in the large cities. Why, only in the city of Montreal—if I am well informed by my friend the member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) who is one of the city commissioners—there are actually twenty-five thousand men clamouring for work and bread. The railway problem is more entangled than ever. The freight rates have been unduly increased, and perhaps the express rates may be also unduly advanced before long. The cost of living is soaring higher and higher every day, and riots are occurring all over the land. Not

in Quebec you have noticed, Mr. Speaker —we have riots in Quebec only on the eve of a general election when there is a Unionist Government appealing for support, and those riots are concocted and paid for by the Department of Justice. There have been riots in Toronto—actually in the loyal city of Toronto—and the police of that city, a splendid body of men, had to defend themselves against the returned soldiers. Restaurants were broken into and men were bleeding from wounds. Where was the mayor of Toronto in all that trouble? Alas, investigation does not say. There were riots in Toronto, in Winnipeg, in Halifax, and in Lindsay——

Sir SAM HUGHES: That was over a girl.

Mr. LEMIEUX:—There is mutiny in the camps. We have all heard of what has taken place at Rhyl. I was informed the other day that the Third Division had mutinied because they had refused to be used as a police force against their fellow-workers in Great Britain. I cannot say whether it is true, but it has been asserted to me—of course, the press would not give out that information. Is the steamer drifting into the rapids? Sir, the Government has no policy, no pilot, no captain and no head. Its policy is indecision, confusion, humiliation and anarchy. I may be told that all this is the result of the war. Sir, a Frenchman who came to this country during the war as a trade commissioner coined a very good phrase in my presence as he was delivering a speech in Montreal. He said: France was taken unawares by war, France must not be taken unawares by peace. I agree, Sir, that all the Allied Governments were taken unawares by war, but this Government was warned repeatedly, during two, three and four sessions, that it should not be taken at a disadvantage and should cut its cloth accordingly. In England, Sir, they provided for peace conditions. Two years ago, according to a report to the British Government, a Ministry of Reconstruction was created. I shall not waste the time of the House, but we have in that report the evidence that John Bull, as ever, was prudent, was far-seeing, and knew how to conduct his affairs. In Canada we did not know how to be prudent for the future, and the Government has been very derelict in its duty. All we hear is, words, words, and only words—reconstruction, co-operation, Imperialism, and nothing is done. The truth of the matter is this so-called Union is nothing but a bombast, a fake, a sham. First of all, there is no union; since the commencement of the session we have had that experience. There is no union, there is no Government—we are ruled by factions. Sir Clifford Sifton is the ruler of this country, and he belongs to a Trinity. My friend from Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) said the other day that the Government was owned by Sir Joseph Flavelle. He stated only part of the truth. The Government is owned mainly and really by Sir William Mackenzie, Sir Joseph Flavelle and Sir Clifford Sifton. They are the masters of this Government, and when I say that there is no government, that we are ruled by faction, I am within the bounds of truth, my statement is borne out by the facts. The speeches delivered by hon. gentlemen supporting the Government are not only warnings, but they constitute, in my judgment, the most serious arraignment that was ever made against a government.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Hon. Mr. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (resuming): Mr. Speaker, when the House rose at six o'clock I was directing attention to the fact that the Government was being assailed not so much by its opponents, which is quite natural, as by its own friends. During the course of this debate we have heard not only very grave warnings, but also charges of a most serious character. The charges laid at the door of the Government by the member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) are among the gravest ever made against a Government. Sir, let me read to you a few sentences from the speech delivered in this House on March 4, by the member for Victoria. I find the following in a letter which he had addressed to the Prime Minister, and which he read during the course of his remarks:

> I have on other occasions drawn your attention to the massacres at Lens, Passchendaele, etc., where the only apparent object was to glorify the General in command, and make it impossible, through butchery, to have a Fifth and Sixth Division and two Army Corps. . . I think the time has arrived when you should assert yourself along positive lines, demand the removal of incompetents and have this needless slaughter—for I can call it nothing else—of our Canadian lads stopped. You should secure returns of the losses by brigade and battalions during each year or tenure of command, and what each brigade accomplished, and it will be found that, in many instances, the brigades and

battalions that have accomplished the most have suffered the least.

Bull-head and incompetency are traceable by the horrible casualties rolling up into eight and ten times the total force of a battalion or a brigade.

The hon. member spoke about the attack on Cambrai and the taking of Mons. He said:

I have just this to say about Mons. Were I in authority, the officer who, four hours before the Armistice was signed, although he had been notified beforehand that the Armistice was to begin at eleven o'clock, ordered the attack on Mons, thus needlessly sacrificing the lives of Canadian soldiers, would be tried summarily by court martial and punished so far as the law would allow.

It has been my misfortune to lose my only boy in this war. I would not, as the father of that boy, think for one moment of attacking the General Officer Commanding the Canadian forces. I do not for one moment believe that the charges made by the member for Victoria against Sir Arthur Currie are well founded; it is unbelievable that they should be so. I cannot believe that our boys were caused to be slaughtered and butchered for the sake of a little vainglory on the part of the Commanding Officer. But these charges have been made; they are now public property; they have re-echoed from province to province; indeed they are known throughout the world. The charges are made not by an insignificant person, but by a gentleman who was a member of the Government as Minister of Militia, by a gentleman who more than any one else can claim the credit of having equipped and sent overseas our First Contingent. The charges are made by one who, with all his failings, is known to be a generous-hearted gentleman. Sir, the Prime Minister and his colleagues may deny the charges; brother officers in this House may refute them, and the press may speak of the cruel egotism of the member for Victoria. But there is a sound public opinion in Canada, and whether the charge is well-founded or not, you cannot annul it by a mere denial or a sneer. The fathers and mothers of those who went through the valley of shadow during the great war will not be satisfied by a denial or by a sneer; they will insist, with bleeding hearts, upon an investigation which will probe these charges to the bottom. Indeed, the whole military situation so far as Canada is concerned is but a sad and melancholy tale of the Government's incompetency.

I have spoken of the charges made by the member for Victoria. What about the specific charges made but a few days ago by Brigadier-General Smart, a gallant officer if there is one, who has seen four years' service at the front, who does not belong to the Liberal party, who supports the Government in my native province as member for the loyal city of Westmount? Sir, the day of his first appearance in the Quebec Legislature on his return from the front, he deems it his duty to inform the country of what has taken place and of what is taking place yonder. Let me read in a few crisp sentences the charges made by General Smart. I quote from the Toronto Globe's report of his speech:

I feel it is up to me to tell the people of Canada how the Canadian Medical Service blundered overseas; how patronage, influence, pull, went to paralyse the good work of the medical services.

That is not surprising. During the session of 1916-17 the same charges were made from this side of the House, but we were debarred from the right of having Dr. Bruce's report laid on the Table. You will remember, Sir, how that genial gentleman who occupied my seat at that time, the Hon. Mr. Pugsley, insisted that that report should be laid on the table of the House. We could, however, never obtain that report. General Smart goes on to say:

I perfectly know who is responsible for this state of things; official Ottawa knows it too; Sir Robert Borden does not ignore it, but no one dares tell. And that is why I feel it is up to me to show all the evil that has been done, to show the abuse, the ill-treatment our wounded and sick received overseas at the hands of the improperly managed medical service. The whole trouble is to be traced to Argyll House.

We have heard, during the last few months, a great deal about slackers and time-servers. The farmer or the farmer's son, who was working on the farm, in order that our soldiers might get food, was not a slacker; but I am told that there were thousands of slackers at Argyll House in London receiving high pay. General Smart continues:

And I may add that personally, after seeing all that I have seen, I have not the slightest confidence in those who administer the affairs in England. Sir George Perley had much to do with the management of our medical service. Who gave him the authority to treat our wounded in such a way, be it even for the cause of Imperialism? Well, gentlemen, I tell you, if Imperialism is to be maintained through such a system, I say it is time that it be destroyed. I am as good an Imperialist as any one, but I do not care for this Imperialism at such a price; I care not for Imperialism if it is to be built on the sufferings of our wounded heroes.

Let me tell the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) that such severe language was never used by any hon. mem-

bers on this side of the House. General Smart says that Brigadier-General Turner is weak-armed. He blames him for the recent riotings at Rhyl and other camps, and he traces the matter back to the abuse and ill-treatment of the men.

General Smart said that many Canadian officers in England had asked him to bring these facts to light. Recalling the death of Major-General Steele, in London—

One of the best Canadian soldiers that Canada ever produced,

—he said that the Major General died of a broken heart over these things. He says he will produce correspondence to this effect.

Further he says:

Gentlemen, I tell you, without fear of impartial contradiction, that the medical service overseas was directed in an insensible and neglected way. Our Canadian wounded were afforded a medical service that was absolutely inadequate, and I have seen instances where medical officers, ridiculously inapt to care for the sick and wounded, were put in charge of important hospital units. I have pitied the poor soldiers that were made to travel through the British Isles to far-off hospitals when they passed close to the unit that should have received them for their particular treatment. . . . He stated instances where men medically found unfit in Canada, were, however, sent to England. These men caused hard work and worry to the officers overseas, went through hardships, and are now coming back a charge to the country, for they will be getting pay pension all at the expense of the country. Then General Smart told of what he saw in his own Military District of Shorncliffe. He said he could not criticise the medical officers and nurses. They were up to what he had expected from them, but, he says, I feel I must and do criticise the headquarters of management of this service.

General Smart said that each Canadian hospital had its full staff of competent doctors and nurses, but outside of these hospitals, there had been organized Voluntary Aid Detachments, made up of people of good-will, but who knew little or nothing of medical care, and he stated instances where soldiers were left for definite treatment in these Voluntary Aid Detachments while cots were empty in the regular hospitals.

He stated that, in cases he knew of, men had lost the use of their eyes because of this practice. When such cases reached the proper hospitals, said General Smart, it was too late for treatment to have any effect.

General Smart then mentioned cases where patronage placed in responsible posts men who had not even diplomas of medical studies, while competent men without the "pull" were kept in England or in posts where their science and experience could not be used to succor our wounded and sick.

Talking of the riot, General Smart said that the Rhyl outbreak was not the first of this kind; there had been outbreaks previously at Shorncliffe, Witley, Bramshott, and even at Rhyl before.

General Smart concludes by vindicating the French Canadian soldiers. I must offer General Smart my sincere thanks for that timely vindication. I have noticed that the subsidized press, when the cable despatch telling of those riots reached Canada, assigned the cause of them to the Montreal regiments; but, of course, a denial was immediately forthcoming, and then the subsidized press published another lie in order to cover up the old one. It said that the French Canadians at the Rhyl camp had been seen with Bolshevik flags.

An hon. MEMBER: Shame.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: Propaganda.

Mr. LEMIEUX: General Smart said that the Montreal Star's cable that French Canadian soldiers had floated the red flag was a vile insinuation. He said that he commanded French Canadian units and that they were the most orderly and disciplined fighting units. I must again thank General Smart for his vindication of my French Canadian fellowmen. I am rather surprised that this message first appeared in the Montreal Star, because the editor of that paper does not sing the same song as Windermere, the London correspondent. The Star correspondent in London cabled that the French Canadians have Bolshevik ideas and that they displayed the red flag; but I find, in order to rally the support of the French Canadians and of that much despised Quebec to the cause of high protection, an editorial headed "Canada and Quebec," discussing the reconstruction period and pleading that Quebec should be represented in the Government of the country.

The editor goes on to say:

Quebec is slow-going. It is a place of quiet people living placid, peaceful lives—a contented, home-loving, good-living, industrious folk.

Lots of taffy there!

Most of them own land and have a little money tucked away. Of the turmoil of the world outside they know little.

But enough to read Windermere.

The great currents which are uprooting established society elsewhere pass them by. They are "Canadien" three hundred years rooted in the soil, with a sense of mild superiority over citizens of younger growth and a contemptuous distrust of the new social philosophies that would tear old orders down in the vague wild hope that something better will sprout from the ruins.

As low tariff, for instance.

If a red wave of Bolshevism should sweep from overseas—

It means, from the West.

—as some people fear, it would shatter itself upon Quebec's stability as Atlantic surges are shattered on the Gaspé cliffs. But Quebec is a brake on the wheels of progress, some will say.

Maybe so, at times; but a brake is a necessary part of a moving machine and the world never needed brakes so much as now.

Again referring to the West.

Quebec stands for order, for cautious looks before leaping, for steadiness—for the utter opposite of the hysteria that shrieks under the red flag. Canada needs this solidity in her counsels to-day more than she ever needed it before.

We want progress, but progress upward. Better be still a while than rush down steep places into the sea.

So the Star has two voices—one voice screeching from London, and another voice singing in mellow tones from Montreal. In London, the French Canadian is a Bolshevik waving the red flag. In Canada the tender, emotional editor of the Star whispers in the ear of my hon. friend the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) that there is no better citizen than the French Canadian, and that in the reconstruction period he should have his say in the counsels of the Government.

My hon. friend, the Acting Prime Minister, when, in the House yesterday, his attention was called by my hon. friend from Russell (Mr. Murphy) to the grave charges made by General Smart, denied them in toto. General Smart says that he has the correspondence and can prove every one of his assertions. I do not say that I will not accept the word of the Acting Prime Minister; I am at least as generous as some of the members of the Unionist party who this morning in committee refused to accept the pledged word of the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid). I accept my hon. friend's denial, but he must not be satisfied with that. He is the Prime Minister; he is not a civilian; he did not serve his country on the battlefield as did General Smart, and the least he can do for this returned soldier is to give him an early opportunity of proving his charges to the hilt. I concede that General Smart suffers perhaps because of his environment. His charges were made in the Quebec Legislature in an atmosphere, which may not much be trusted by this Government. It is true General Smart belongs to good old English stock; it is true that he represents Westmount, the most loyal spot on the island of Montreal; it is true he has always been classed among the stoutest Imperialists; it is true he has served four years at the front. But he is from Quebec. So now let us hear what the real article, a soldier from the loyal province of Ontario, has to say. Lt.-Col. Pratt, M.P.P., if you please, not speaking within the precincts of the Quebec Legislature, not writing to Le Devoir or Le Canada, but to the editor of the Toronto Telegram, says:

Up to Wednesday last the British had repatriated one and a half million soldiers and 35,000 officers. The United States figures were practically the same. Canada had returned between 50,000 and 55,000 in all. Our men are coming to England at the rate of one thousand per day, and our whole army is on the march from the Rhine. Everything was stopped on Thursday last, and all our men held up because Ottawa imperatively cabled the authorities here not to send big batches of men.

You see, Mr. Speaker, our men wanted to get back to Blighty, but an imperative order came from Ottawa "Keep the men there. Don't send them in big batches. The boats are needed for the Americans." To continue:

In other words the military authorities here are not to use ships carrying over 2,000 soldiers, because our Ottawa civilians are unwilling or unable to handle the men when they reach Canada.

Apparently they will not build a landing camp at Halifax or St. John. Because of these orders from Ottawa it is impossible for us to use the Olympic and Aquitania, which the British had allotted to us, and these vessels have been turned over to the United States.

The whole thing is the gravest possible wrong to our fighting men, and not only may we expect further trouble of the Northland class, but we will be exceedingly fortunate if some of these small steamers are not lost with all on board.

Ottawa is open to grave criticism for the insignificant number so far demobilized. They deserve unmitigated censure for lack of demobilization plans and adequate preparations to handle every man that all ships could land. Nothing can excuse the orders from Ottawa that turned the Olympic and Aquitania to the help of the United States—

Our big brother.

—at the cost of additional banishment of thousands of our homesick boys for many months.

And now, as we used to say in our classical days, in cauda venenum!

If Sir Robert Borden, Sir Edward Kemp, Sir George Perley—

They are all "Sirs"—

—and probably our quartermaster-general in London, could be immediately repatriated, I fancy the army over here would suffer no material loss. Borden is never heard of over here in connection with the Peace Conference, and is useless there.

Which confirms what was said by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens.

He has taken no decided stand for Canada, and is looked upon here as weak and lacking aggressive decision.

I have carefully investigated all the above and what I am writing are hard, cold facts. It seems to me that you may be able to help our soldiers over there by your usual vigorous

policy. I am not anxious to be quoted unless you think it necessary.

Sincerely yours,
Arthur C. Pratt.

I was rather surprised, Mr. Speaker, to see that letter published in the Toronto Telegram, as I remembered another article published by the Telegram immediately after the famous election of 1917, referring to the frauds during that election in Toronto. The Telegram said, "We should have denounced those frauds before, but our denunciation might have helped Laurier; but now we are free to speak." So the Toronto Telegram can speak of the military frauds that have been perpetrated at the expense of our soldiers on the other side. I say to my hon. friend the Prime Minister that charges of the gravest character are made, not by civilians, not by political opponents, but by generals and colonels returning from the front where they have served their King, their country, their Empire, well and faithfully. They belong by tradition to the Conservative party, and the least that the Government should do—as it is in honour bound to do—is to probe those charges and punish the guilty. But, Sir, the Government is not only assailed by the military authorities; not only by its opponents, but we have undergone such a revolution during the past few years that the Government is being assailed by one of its own members and can survive the assault!

I am glad to see my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. A. Crerar) in his seat. There was held in the city of Winnipeg some time ago a convention of the farmers of the West, but more especially a meeting of the Canadian Council of Agriculture. The platform which was adopted at that meeting was read yesterday by our friend the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg) who is, I believe, president of the Grain Growers' Association of Saskatchewan. That platform, Mr. Speaker, contains the tariff policy of the western farmers, and in most of its planks I take great comfort. If it may please my hon. friend, I may tell him that I endorse several of the planks of that platform. As it was read last night, I need not refer to it again; I may, however, add this. I find that besides the tariff question the farmers passed several resolutions on different matters. For instance, they passed resolutions to bring about a greater measure of democracy in government. As democratic reforms, they demand the immediate repeal of the War-time Elections Act, and the discontinuance of the practice of conferring titles upon citizens of Canada. I have always contended, and I still contend, that titles in this country have been a source of corruption. Let me say this further to my Conservative as well as to my Liberal friends, that if they want to keep in their fold their followers, they should pass at this session the timely resolution which I see on the Order Paper, and which was moved last year. Let us abolish those titles, which are only a lure to the weak-kneed. The leader of the House knows whereof I speak. The Government has been assailed right and left, since the beginning of this war, and before the war, by some wealthy friends who were anxious to be knighted; and many of the rumblings which we hear to-day against the Government are no doubt attributable to disappointed knighthood seekers; and I have this confession to make to my Highland leader, that the Liberal party in the old days lost many of its friends because they could not obtain knighthoods from Sir Wilfrid Laurier. I repeat that it is a source of corruption, and I agree entirely with that plank of the farmers platform. But let us proceed. The farmers advocated an immediate reform of the Federal Senate; an immediate check upon the growth of government by order in council; increased responsibility of individual members of Parliament in all legislation; the complete abolishing of the patronage system; the publication of contributions and expenditures both before and after election campaigns; the removal of press censorship upon the restoration of peace, and the immediate restoration of the rights of free speech, the setting forth by daily newspapers and periodical publications of the facts of their ownership and control; proportional representation, etc., etc. Now, Mr. Speaker, that platform is very compact and very substantial. It will play its part whenever the people of this country are called to the polls. But the point I wish to make is this: This is the platform of the farmers of the West; it is a radical platform. Amongst the delegates who drafted the platform and who contributed the material that produced that platform, I find, to my surprise and my astonishment, the name of the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. A. Crerar). Yes. I find the name of Hon. T. A. Crerar from Winnipeg, representing the Manitoba farmers; and I am told—my hon. friend will correct me if I am wrong— I am told he presided at the meeting, put the motion to the meeting, and declared it carried.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: I must correct the hon. gentleman. I did not go quite that far.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Well, Mr. Speaker, I accept at once the amendment to the statement I made. But, in all earnestness, I will put this one little question: Does he, or does he not, approve of this platform of the western farmers? I will pause for a moment and ask him to answer "yes" or "no."

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. gentleman is rather curious this evening. The platform to which he is referring was not drafted at this meeting in Winnipeg of which he speaks. It was drafted two years ago and reaffirmed at that meeting. I have no hesitation in confessing that, with reference to the platform which was drafted two years ago, I was one of those who assisted in drafting it. I thought it was a good platform then, and I think it is a good platform now.

Mr. GAUVREAU: You will not stay there very long.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I would have no hesitation in enfolding within the Liberal party my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture. I accept his word: Yes, he assisted in drafting this platform. He was for it then; he is for it now. He has only one thing to do; that is to resign from the Government. This is a very serious matter. Here is a Government where gentlemen are united to carry on the affairs of the country. We have on the Government benches two groups of ministers who differ absolutely one from the other, not on secondary issues, but on the issue of the day. I would be very much interested in knowing what the views of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization are on this question. I know where the able young Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) stands. He stands with my hon. friend from Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I know where my good friend the hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) stands; he stands where he stood in 1911. I know where my hon. friend the Minister of the Civil Service (Mr. Maclean) stands, and I know where my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture stands. He stated it with a plainness and a frankness that I would like to have the other members of the Government practise. Let us, then, test the frankness, the truthfulness, of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration. He said the other evening that he was a Liberal and that nobody could eject him from the Liberal party. He said that he stood with the farmers whom he represented in this House. Here is the platform of the farmers of the three large Prairie Provinces. We have the statement of the Minister of Agriculture that he stands by that platform. I want to know if the Minister of Immigration is the same gentleman who goes out west and whispers to the farmers that he is their friend and that their policy will prevail. Let him speak boldly and proudly this evening. Let us see if he will imitate the good sense and judgment of his colleagues. If the hon. gentleman will allow me to pause for a moment I would like him to answer as the Minister of Agriculture has done.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order.

Mr. CALDER: If I may be allowed—

Mr. SPEAKER: The minister has already spoken and it is a reversal of the rule and practice of the House that a member who is speaking should interrogate hon. members who have already spoken and who are in their seast.

An hon. MEMBER: By unanimous consent.

Mr. SPEAKER: We are proceeding away beyond the bounds of order in permitting the hon. gentleman to speak.

Mr. CALDER: If I may be allowed just one word, I think that before the hon. gentleman (Mr. Lemieux) asks me to answer that question he should answer a question himself. He intimated that he agreed with some of the planks of that platform. He has not taken the House into his confidence to the extent of telling it which of the planks in the platform he agrees with. When he asks me the very general question if I agree with every plank in the platform I think he should at least state his own position.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Then I am to understand that that is the plain, unvarnished answer of the Minister of Immigration?

Mr. CALDER: No; the hon. gentleman has no right to interpret my words at all. There will be lots of opportunities during this session to state exactly where I stand on these various questions, and when the proper time comes I will state where I stand. But I do not propose to be moved in that way by him during the course of a debate to state my position in a general way in reference to a great many matters of very general interest.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House will readily see the very difficulty I anticipated when I endeavoured to prevent the minister from replying. The proceeding is unusual and very irregular, and I would recommend that it be discontinued.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is a good thing that the Rules of the House should force me to—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I was not blaming the Speaker at all.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What order?

An hon. MEMBER: Order in Council.

Mr. SPEAKER: I do not think that the hon. member (Mr. Lemieux) is questioning the ruling of the Chair.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I did not question the ruling of the Chair. It is an excellent ruling and we had an eloquent but typical answer from the Minister of Immigration. He stands by that answer and the people of the West will judge. In my opinion, he remains true to himself. I was told when he came here that he was a little bit of a trickster and something of a ward politician.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Order, order.

Mr. SPEAKER: There is one word that the hon. gentleman should withdraw and which I call upon him to withdraw, namely, that the Minister of Immigration and Colonization is a trickster. That word is certainly far beyond the bounds of Parliamentary language.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I bow to your decision with pleasure.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Withdraw, withdraw.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It is most amusing that we should have such an aggregation before us this evening—two groups of ministers on the vital issues of the day differing absolutely one from the other. Of course, we shall hear more during the session, and some means will be found to test the principles of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration and Colonization on the tariff. At all events, the House knows this evening where the Minister of Agriculture stands.

He was not afraid, he did not beat about the bush, he said yes. Mr. Speaker, this is a very vital issue, and it has engrossed the attention of the press of western Canada of late. The farmers of the West sent a representative here some days ago, a gentleman by the name of Rice Jones, and I wonder whether he is an annexationist or not. That gentleman canvassed the opinions of the hon. members who represent western constituences, and according to The Manitoba Free Press of March 15th, here is what he reports:

> The wire sent to Ottawa and the replies received from some of the Alberta members follow:
>
> Full Board Meeting of United Farmers now sitting at Calgary request that you, while in Ottawa, present farmers' platform to Government, as representing the organized farmers of Alberta in lieu of sending delegates from here with joint deputation from three Prairie Provinces.
>
> Also make personal demands on each of Alberta members on behalf of their former constituents, that they work and vote for enactment into legislation of reforms embodied in platform at present session. Am mailing copy of platform to each Alberta member.

The following are opinions of western members. I quote from the newspapers:

> From Michael Clark—I have been working along the lines indicated for many years, and you can rely on my continuing to do so.

No beating about the bush in the case of the hon. member from Red Deer.

> J. M. Douglas—I may say that all the Western men are a unit in support of a measure of this kind, and we have strong hopes that something will be done this session.

Of course, "Hope springs eternal in the human breast."

> H. H. Halliday—I can assure you that I fully appreciate the necessity of this action, and am glad to be able to advise you that the members for the three Prairie Provinces are almost—

He had the Minister of Immigration in mind.

> —unanimous on this subject.
>
> W. A. Buchanan—I can state my position very briefly. I am in entire sympathy with the platform, and have advocated it in my newspaper. I will use my influence as a member of the House of Commons to forward its adoption in the legislature.
>
> D. L. Redman—I will give this matter my earnest and sympathetic attention.
>
> Mr. Rice Jones, who has just returned from Ottawa was very pessimistic over anything being done this session on the tariff. The situation appeared to be that while the western Union members were solid on the tariff issue for reform yet they were hesitating to embarrass the Government by coming out and voting for them and thereby possibly defeating the Government.

Mr. Speaker, I leave it at that. I hope that we shall hear from some of the western members, so that we may find out if they really are trying to press forward the adoption of the tariff platform, but hesitate before defeating the Government. My hon.

friend the Minister of Immigration has inquired where I stood on the fiscal question.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: On the whole platform.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: I must say that for my part, with very few exceptions I would readily subscribe to that platform.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Will the hon. gentleman allow me?

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend is not in order.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is perfectly in order for a question to be put to an hon. gentleman who has the floor, with his consent. I do not think it is proper for an hon. gentleman who has the floor to interrogate various hon. members who have already spoken and who are in their seats.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: Will the hon. gentleman allow me to put a question?

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Pardon me.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: My hon. friend is very canny, but he is not canny enough for me. He wanted to know where I stood on the fiscal question.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No, no.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX: Yes, that was the question. I will tell my hon. friend where I stand, order having been restored. I will quote chapter and verse. The last great message of the former leader of my hon. friend the Minister of Immigration, was delivered in this city on the 14th of January last, and his platform has been published, just as the platform of the western farmers, as drafted by my friend the Minister of Agriculture, has been published. I may say for the information of the House that this platform, which was unanimously adopted by the Liberals assembled at Ottawa on the 14th of January last, was prepared under the supervision of the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier. After having recited the many resolutions concerning the tariff, moved whilst he was in office and leader of the Opposition, the platform thus concludes:

> Now therefore be it resolved that in the opinion of this Association, not only should the said Tariff increases of 7½ per cent and 5 per cent be immediately repealed, but that there should also be an immediate downward revision of the Tariff in accordance with the above mentioned omnibus resolution moved by the Liberal Opposition in the House of Commons on May 23rd, 1917, in these terms:—
>
> 1. That wheat, wheat flour, and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list.
>
> 2. That farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery and repairs for same, rough and partly dressed lumber, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers be added to the free list.
>
> 3. That staple foods and food products (other than wheat flour), domestic animals and foods therefor be admitted into Canada free of duty when coming from and being the product of any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty.
>
> 4. That substantial reductions be made in the general Tariff on all articles imported into Canada, excepting luxuries.
>
> 5. That the British Preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general Tariff.

That, Mr. Speaker, is my platform. I shall have an opportunity during the present session to vote for it, and I invite those westerners who represent the three Prairie Provinces to support that policy, because I can assure my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, who drafted the farmers' platform, and I can assure my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. Clark) and those others who are acting in good faith on the tariff issue, that after the caucus of to-morrow they will know they cannot get anything from the present Government so far as tariff reducions are concerned. Here is where I stand, and I am in good company. I also stand for the fair treatment of soldiers and sailors; for generous care for dependents of the fallen; for the gradual democratization of labour; for the abolition of Government by Order in Council; for the abolition of press censorship; for the repeal of the War-Time Elections Act; and for a League of Nations. There may be some slight differences between the farmers' platform and the Liberal platform. I stand by my leader—I follow his fiery cross—and I stand by my party on this tariff issue. I do not beat about the bush as the Minister of Immigration does.

Mr. CALDER: The hon. gentleman has not stated whether or not he agrees with the farmers' platform on the tariff. I would very much like to be informed as to that.

An hon. MEMBER: What about you, now?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I stated a moment ago where I stood when I read the platform laid down by Sir Wilfrid Laurier. My hon. friend is hard of understanding this evening. He cannot comprehend a plain statement; he abhors truth. I said that there were differences, but very slight differences, between the farmers' platform and the Liberal platform. I stand by the Liberal platform, and I think that the farmers of

this country will stand by it, too, when the time comes.

One word about our national ideals. The President of the Privy Council (Hon. N. W. Rowell) in his speech the other day sung the glories of new Imperialism—that Imperialism of the round-table clubs; that Imperialism of the Rotary clubs; that Imperialism of many of the so-called Canadian clubs. The hon. gentleman described what that chesty Imperialism meant to Canada. "We are going to have," he said, "a voice in the foreign affairs of the British Empire." Mr. Speaker, if there is anything for which I should thank the member for Shelburne and Queen's, it is the description he gave the other evening of that form of Imperialism. In this case his staunch loyalty cannot be questioned. He rendered a really valuable service to the country as he unveiled, with a humour worthy of Sam Slick, our nakedness as a nation. The picture which he presented is really a snap-shot of our colonial status, well worthy to be classed with the most famous paintings of the world. That imaginary interview between Lloyd George and Woodrow Wilson with regard to our real position at the Peace Conference is, in my humble judgment, a masterpiece, and that masterpiece—think of it, Mr. Speaker—is signed "William Stevens Fielding," not "Henri Bourassa." The irony of it all is that the President of the Privy Council has endeavoured to establish before this House the great benefits which Canada would derive from that War Cabinet. First of all, he says, we will evolve from that War Cabinet a Cabinet of governments—and then we have succeeded in obtaining new channels of communication. Let us see. Canada was conquered in 1759; the Treaty of Paris was signed in 1763; and through a slow process of evolution we have succeeded at last, according to the President of the Privy Council, in obtaining new channels of communication; hereafter the Prime Minister of Canada will be able to write personally and directly to the Prime Minister of England. What a noble conquest! Have we nothing else to expect, Mr. Speaker? Why, we have sent overseas to fight in the great war an army of 500,000 men; I think it was stated in the House that we had more men in the field than Wellington, Napoleon, and Blucher had altogether at Waterloo. We are saddled with a debt of about $2,000,000,000 and we mourn the loss of 60,000 of the bravest. Let us see for a moment whether we as Canadians have really won something out of this welter of blood.

Take, for instance, the trade mission that went to England on the morrow of the great victory, composed of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), but chiefly of Mr. Lloyd Harris and Mr. Jones, two able men, two bright Canadians. No better men could be found to advocate the cause of Canada.

The member for Shelburne and Queens read the other evening some words from the pen of Norman Lambert. I have read for years Norman Lambert's correspondence in the Globe; he is one of the best informed men in the country. But if you have followed the correspondence of Norman Lambert during the last few weeks, you must have noticed that the member for Shelburne and Queens read only part of it the other day. I hold in my hand one of his latest contributions to the Winnipeg Free Press—and when I read it I confess that I hung my head in shame. He describes there how the trade envoys of Canada have been treated by the clerks of Downing Street and elsewhere. It is true that the trade restrictions against Canada have been removed, but they have been removed only until the first of next September. Our Trade Commissioners have, according to Mr. Lambert, had to read the Riot Act to the British authorities in order to put an end to the policy of discrimination against Canada. In this letter of March 13 he tells us of his interview with Mr. Harris. Mr. Harris said:

> We have waited patiently for some change in policy, which up to the present time has not come. We hope that the effect of our representations may be that a change in policy here will soon be brought about. If we cannot get any satisfaction, I am afraid this whole question will be a serious one for the Canadian Government to consider, as our view is that, being a part of the British Empire, we should at least have equal rights—

Fancy, Mr. Speaker, we were denied equal rights. (Reading):

> —within the Empire, and certainly that there should be no discrimination against any part of the Empire.

And he says further:

> Canada entered the war with Great Britain and immediately her industries were converted into plants for the production of war materials and necessities.
>
> Any basis of imports from Canada during the years 1914 to 1918, therefore, it is contended by the Trade Mission, must show a discrimination against the Dominion whose people, during those four years, of necessity, enjoyed no other export trade in manufactured goods than those required for war. During the same period, Canada's boats were requisitioned, and it became impossible for Canadian exporters to find the necessary shipping space for cargoes consigned to Britain. Those same

boats, in many instances, as Mr. Lloyd Harris stated in his memorandum to Lloyd George, were being operated from the United States to Great Britain, the space reserved for commercial products being used by exporters in the United States.

Mark this. Our ships were requisitioned by the Admiralty; they were commandeered, and then they were sent to United States ports and the Canadian exporters were refused space and preference was given to the American exporters. That is how Canadians have been treated. He says further:

At the earnest solicitation of the Canadian Government, it is said, these industries prepared to equip themselves to engage in post-war export business, and particularly to compete for trade which formerly was held largely by Germany. Now, these companies find themselves in a position where they are entirely prevented from sharing in such business, so far as Great Britain is concerned while neutral countries which were fortunate enough to have established a trade with Great Britain prior to the war, now have the privilege of renewing their old connections. Obviously, this policy of granting import licenses to applicants who must prove pre-war importations, has the effect even of re-establishing those lines of trade dominated by enemy countries before the war.

Mr. Harris says further:

It is deplorable—

In spite of the new channels of communication.

—that so much ignorance exists in the British Government about Canada. The only idea they seem to have is that we should produce agricultural products, while they produce manufactured goods. They do not realize that we have had a very important industrial development, and that we are very rapidly getting into a position where they will have to consider us as competitors.

Here is the situation in a nutshell. Canada, as I stated a moment ago, took a very prominent part in this war. We sent 500,000 men overseas. We have lost 60,000 men and thousands are coming home crippled, maimed for life. Our national debt, as a result of the war, is simply appalling and we shall have an enormous pension Bill to vote for many years to come. On the very morrow of the victory, we send our trade envoys to Great Britain, and you have the result of their mission in what I have just read to the House. The manufacturers of this country should not be surprised at the attitude of England concerning their manufactured goods. Why, this was the policy of Mr. Chamberlain. Mr. Chamberlain, the father of that new Imperialism, which my hon. friend, in his speech the other night, extolled to the seventh heaven, did not, at the Imperial Conference —and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) is my witness—conceal his opinion about Canadian manufacturers. He told them: there are many things which you do not now manufacture, many things for which we have a great capacity of production; leave them to us as you have left them hitherto. That is to say, Canada should be satisfied to export to Britain wheat and raw materials, but as regards manufactured goods, that trade belongs to John Bull.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will my hon. friend be good enough to explain—I do not understand it yet—how our manufactured goods were prevented, by this arrangement, from being sent overseas?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I know they were prevented by this licensing system—

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not understand it.

Mr. LEMIEUX:—and by the embargo. We have here the sorry, sad, and melancholy comment of such stout Canadians and Britishers as Mr. Lloyd Harris and Mr. Frank Jones. This is not a new policy. It was the policy of Mr. Chamberlain, the father of that Imperialism; he did not want our manufacturers to compete with the British manufacturers. There is a lesson to be drawn from this last incident. Let us think of Canada, first, last and always. Let us be Canadians inspired by British ideals, but loyal, first, last and always to our native country, Canada.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I was fairly intimate with the policy of the late Rt. Hon. Joseph Chamberlain and I never heard him make such a statement. Will the hon. member be good enough to give an example of where Mr. Chamberlain objected to goods manufactured in Canada coming into Great Britain?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I will give the example of the "hidden list"—the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens will remember it—a list of manufactured goods which in any preferential agreement with the Mother Country should not compete with British goods. I have chapter and verse and I shall be happy, on another occasion, to convey that information to my hon. friend.

Let us be Canadians, inspired always by British ideals, but loyal to our country. I am not advocating the independence of Canada. I am not hinting at any annexation movement. Far be that from my thoughts. I am a Canadian. My ancestors were in this country three hundred years

ago, and I am not going to sell my birthright for a mess of pottage. I am a Canadian and I am a Britisher, but I say that the time has come, after this great war in which we have made so many sacrifices—that, in the words of Sir John A. Macdonald, "we should think of our country always." I remember a speech delivered by Sir John Thompson, on the occasion of the death of Sir John A. Macdonald, and I find these words in appreciation of the career of that great chieftain:

> Sir John's love of Canada and his desire to serve her must be put far in front of all his characteristics. His daily thought might be expressed in Webster's words: "Let our one object be our country, our whole country, and nothing but our country." "Nothing but our country" in the sense that Canada was to be first of all, in every consideration of public policy or personal action. His true and deep Canadianism was the "pillar or cloud by day, and the pillar of fire by night," to the hundreds of thousands whom he led as no man could have led by a mere party banner."

That was the Canadian policy of Sir John A. Macdonald. It was also the policy of Sir Wilfrid Laurier.

We have responsible Government in Canada and we cannot turn back to colonialism. I do not share the views of my esteemed friend and colleague the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) that we should be satisfied to let the Colonial Office in London manage the affairs of Canada.

I have a little more pride than that. We are not a nation of one million or two million, but a nation of eight million people, and some day when good times come back, when a Liberal administration comes into office perhaps we shall have a population of ten or fifteen million. We have won responsible government. Formerly, England drafted our tariffs, managed our post office affairs, looked after our public works, involved us in her commercial treaties, and defended Canada with her regulars. But we have outlived that policy, and to revive it now would simply be to ignore our national dignity. For eighty years Canada has been working towards greater efficiency, greater self-reliance, and more complete self-government. In matters of defence, we control not only our land forces, but our naval forces also. As a Canadian—I am speaking only for myself—I stand by the policy of ruling our own country and looking after our own affairs. A nation, like the individual, must go forward—not go backwards, crab-like. We must go forward, and I am looking hopefully forward to the day when there will be, not a colony or even a dominion of Canada, but a Kingdom of Canada. That was the view held by the fathers of Confederation. Sir, the fathers of Confederation delighted to proclaim that their offspring was to be a nation, and they did not hesitate to assign to Canada prophetically and proudly, its place and order among the nations of the earth. The Hon. Adams G. Archibald, of Nova Scotia, said that the united provinces "would form a nation which in all the elements that constitute real greatness might be ranked as the third or fourth on the face of the globe." Lt.-Col. Gray, of New Brunswick, said that they "wanted a national union, one which would enable them to take an honourable place among the nations of the earth." The Hon. Chas. Fisher, of New Brunswick, said that the federation "would be the fourth maritime power in the world. England, France and the United States would alone be superior to it." Sir George E. Cartier said that the delegates had "met to inquire whether it were possible for the provinces from their present fragmentary and isolated materials, to form a nation or kingdom." Sir John A. Macdonald said that the delegates had in view "the noble object of founding a great British monarchy in connection with the British Empire and under the British Queen." He said:—

> I am a subject of a great British-American nation, under the government of Her Majesty, and in connection with the Empire of Great Britain and Ireland.

"Confederation," he added, "would give them the national prowess and strength which would make them at least the fourth nation on the face of the globe." He preferred for the title of the new confederation "The Kingdom of Canada," and he desired an Imperial alliance with the Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland, with the Crown as the sufficient bond of union. At another time Sir John A. Macdwonald said that the new constitution "was intended to be, as far as circumstances would permit, similar to that of the Imperial Government, and recognizing the Sovereign of Great Britain as its sole and only head."

Sir, I accept the views of the Fathers of Confederation, and notably the noble views of the late Sir John A. Macdonald. The British Empire must assume this grander character and rise to its higher ideal. I claim that there should be not inferiority, but equality; not subservience, but equipollence; not subjection either of Canada to the United Kingdom now, or of the United Kingdom to Canada, but absolute and unreserved brotherhood, making with Australia, South Africa and other great

nations " a galaxy of nations." That phrase was coined by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier when he spoke in England at the time of the Diamond Jubilee. But in order to attain to the proud position of being a kingdom in the sense that there will be a feeling of brotherhood between all the British Dominions and the Mother Country, we must first of all be a united people. And I think the House will agree with me that the time has come to unite the Canadian people of all creeds, of all races and of all provinces. I remember a great speech delivered by the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier in Nova Scotia at an Acadian convention a few years ago. He told his audience that during his visit to the old country he had admired the noble proportions of some of the Gothic cathedrals of England and of France, and he prophesied that Canada too some day would take the form of a Gothic cathedral. "In that wonderful architecture," he said, " there is marble, and it remains marble; there is granite, and it remains granite; there is oak, and it remains oak; but those materials are blended into a harmonious whole." Mr. Speaker, we have in this country the best elements of which to create the great Kingdom of Canada. The very best races of the world are here—the sturdy Scot, the impulsive Frenchman, the warm-hearted Irishman, and the cool and brainy Englishman. Sir, if these races, representing as they do the loftiest ideals and the noblest traditions of Europe, are blended together after this war in which our men have played such a noble and lasting part, we shall then be in a position to build a great Canadian nationality.

Mr. JOHN FLAWS REID (Mackenzie): I congratulate the hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) on the very able manner in which he has held the attention of this House for nearly two hours and three-quarters. I shall not inflict myself upon the House for that length of time. I am sorry the hon. member cannot swallow the organized farmers' platform, but I suppose he is not used to taking pills of that kind unless they are sugar-coated with politics. I understand that my hon. friends came into power in 1896 on a platform as radical in many lines as the present farmers' platform, and it was practically forgotten for fifteen years by my hon. friend and his associates. Now I want to say as a farmer from the prairies that the farmers of the West—I can speak for them—are not as easily caught to-day as they were in 1896; and if my good friend and his associates want to get the farmers' support they will have to undertake, not as a pre-election promise, but at once, a thorough house-cleaning on their side of the House, so that they may say with some degree of truth that they are Liberals indeed.

I wish in passing, Mr. Speaker, to refer to some of the statements made by the gallant colonel who represents the constituency of North Simcoe (Mr. Currie). I shall borrow a phrase for the time being from the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson). I am of the opinion that we have two prophets in this House. At all events I am sure we have at least one, representing the constituency of North Simcoe. Unfortunately he is a prophet who predicts destruction. He tells us of the great calamities that will befall Canada if the tariff is interfered with; and that reminds me of a statement that was made in the city of Winnipeg some years ago by a secretary of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, when he said that the Manufacturers' Association of Canada was so strongly organized that, if they saw fit, they could cause the grass to grow on the streets of any town or city in the Dominion of Canada. Perhaps my friend from Simcoe is one of that number. He made the statement in regard to the embargo on wheat, endeavouring to make us believe that it was the American Government that put on that embargo. If I am correct—and I believe I am—the embargo was put on by the Government of Canada at the request of the British Government in order that the foodstuffs of Canada might be preserved for Great Britain and her Allies; and even if the embargo had been imposed by the American Government conditions would not compare at all with those of normal times. Then he states that there was a duty on foodstuffs in Canada of 27½ per cent, but he failed to tell us how this would enable the labourers or mechanics working in factories in the cities to obtain their foodstuffs cheaper. I think he made a mistake when he quoted that figure of 27½ per cent as the average duty on foodstuffs. Next, in dealing with the land policy of the Government he gave some advice as to what the Government should do in regard to the returned soldiers. He said in effect that the Government should give to the soldiers land on the same terms as given to the South African veterans, implying I presume, that they should be issued scrip. Now any one who has been in the West for any length of time knows that very few soldiers who received scrip settled on the land. It was merely a bonanza for the speculators, who bought the scrip at a

trifling figure; and as a result many of the scrip lands to-day lie unoccupied. But while the gallant Colonel (Mr. Currie) who has had the honour to represent North Simcoe would like the Government to do well by the returned soldier, I would suggest to him one way in which he might very materially help those returned men who desire to go on the land. I presume he is a member of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association. Might he not persuade the association at least to give our soldiers who go on the land their implements duty free? That would be a considerable help to those men. The hon. member launched an attack on Mr. H. W. Wood of Alberta, President of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, a man who has been re-elected to that position by acclamation for two or three years. I have known the gentleman myself for a number of years and can say most emphatically that he has a character at which no one can point a finger; and before any hon. member in this House makes any charge against him, he should at least be armed with the proof; and I hope that before very long Mr. H. W. Wood will request the hon. member for Simcoe to prove his words. The hon. member tells us that a concern with which he is connected successfully competed in the foreign market to the tune of $9,000,000. Well, I am glad to know that, Mr. Speaker. The western farmers are glad to know that the Canadian manufacturers are able to compete in the foreign market against any manufacturer in the world, and if they can compete in the foreign market thousands of miles away from home, the query is why can they not compete right at home? He says—in order to scare us, I suppose—that the Canadian manufacturers are commencing to build factories in the United States because there is a fear of the tariff being interfered with. That may be so. I do not doubt the words of any hon. member of this House, but I would like to have the proof of that assertion; and if the manufacturers are doing that, the remedy is quite simple—lower the tariff to the same level as the American tariff, and then our Canadian manufacturers will have access to a field where there are one hundred millions of people, while the American manufacturers will have access to eight millions. I think that the advantages are on the side of the Canadian manufacturers, if they could see it. The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) says they cannot see it—but there are none so blind as those who will not see. Then the hon. member goes on to say that the farmers of the West are Bolshevists, that they are stirring up strife. Shortly after that, however, he evidently forgets himself, for he says that the farmers in the West mostly all came from Ontario. Now, if his first statement is correct, that the farmers of the West are mostly Bolshevists, then good old Ontario must be a cradle of Bolshevism. The hon. member says he became a convert to high protection when he sat at the feet of the late Sir John A. Macdonald. I am not at all surprised that the hon. member for North Simcoe became a convert to high protection when he had the great privilege of sitting at the feet of such an illustrious leader; but I am convinced of this that when the late Sir John A. Macdonald was buried, my hon. friend from North Simcoe buried his intellect in that grave and that he had nothing more to learn in connection with tariff. Another of his prophesies is this: he says that if anything is done to the tariff there will be a state funeral. I understand that the hon. member for North Simcoe was one of the foremost men—he was indeed a very prominent man—at a banquet in the city of Toronto where seven of the Ginger group were present. Now, Mr. Speaker, he threatens there is going to be a state funeral if the tariff is disturbed, and, Sir, I am of the opinion that the funeral he refers to will be the funeral of the Ginger Group which he represents. I am of the opinion that the Canadian manufacturers represent the situation for trade in a cartoon which appeared in the Grain Growers' Guide about two months ago. This is a farm scene, Mr. Speaker, and you will pardon me for citing it here. The cartoon pictured a calf about two years old and the farmer trying to wean it away from the cow. It was nip and tuck which one would win—the farmer or the calf. It is my opinion that the longer we give high protection to our Canadian manufacturers, the longer will they want it to be maintained.

Mr. McMASTER: Hear, hear.

Mr. J. F. REID: I am very glad to hear an hon. gentleman on the other side of the House say "Hear, hear." Then the hon. gentleman from Simcoe told us that the manufacturers did not make a profit of five per cent on their turn over. That statement is just a little misleading. Why did the hon. member for Simcoe not tell us what interest they made on their capital in-

vested? Then we would understand what their profit amounts to. To state that they do not make five per cent on their overturn is very misleading. Perhaps he will inform us later on what interest the manufacturers make on their invested capital and also on their watered stock.

Mr. Speaker, in passing, I wish to add my tribute of praise to the late, beloved and lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and in doing so would simply say "Amen" to all the good things which have been said of him who has crossed the bar. A year ago when this Parliament met for the first time we did so under the great cloud of war, and the victory which has since been achieved was still hanging in the balance, and to many of us it seemed that victory was doubtful or at least a long way off, but to-day, as part of the British Empire, we rejoice with her and our Allies that victory has come to us, and the whole world breathes easier and our gallant victorious soldiers are now returning home to us. The task of taking care of our men and re-establishing them back in civil life will be equally as large an undertaking as the prosecution of the war and will bring up many new problems for our Government to handle. As an independent supporter of Union Government, it is my opinion, Sir, that it is well for Canada that we have a Union Government and not a party Government to grapple with the gigantic problem of reconstruction, and, Mr. Speaker, while the remark has been made by hon. members opposite that our Union Government, and especially the Minister of Immigration, was in a state of unpreparedness when the armistice was signed; even if that is so, Sir, I do not think it is very much to be wondered at, because we know that even the British Government, who were very much nearer the seat of war than we were, were of the opinion, and in fact, had made preparations for continuing the campaign for at least another winter. But, Mr. Speaker, at this late stage of the debate I do not wish to occupy the time of the House very long, but I wish to make a few remarks in passing on some of the problems that immediately confront us.

I would like first to say a word on the land policy of the present Government, which also applies to previous Governments, both Grit and Tory. We are informed, Sir, that there are about 15,000 homesteads available within 15 miles of our railways and that only 2,000 of them are fit for cultivation. I am informed we have over 4,000 soldiers at the present time ready and willing to go on to the land. To ask our returned soliders to go beyond the fifteen mile limit to homestead would be a crime, when we have 31 million acres of alienated, uncultivated and unoccupied land lying within the fifteen mile railway belt. This condition, Mr. Speaker, has not been brought about by this Government or by the policy of this Government but by the policies of past Governments, Liberal and Conservative; and we now find that our Dominion Government have got to go into the open market to buy back the lands which were previously sold for a trifle to speculators and corporations. When I say sold I would perhaps express it better if I said were given away for a trifle, for I understand that from $1 to $3 per acre was about the prevailing price received for our lands years ago.

I will now point out to you, Sir, some of the evils of the unoccupied lands. In the first place our unoccupied lands do not contribute anything towards the cost of construction of our railways other than the trifling amount for which they were sold. Then again, miles of railroads must be built past unoccupied lands to reach the occupied lands. While the occupied lands produce traffic for the road, and the exportable products help to pay the nation's debts, unoccupied lands produce no revenue and create no trade for the benefit of the road and further our unoccupied lands do not contribute anything towards paying the debts of the country; they retard the progress of settlement and in many cases prevent the establishment of schools; in many cases also they are not taxable and do not help to build or maintain public highways.

I would like to point out, Sir, to this Government the evil of selling lands to the individual or corporation without duties of occupancy attached. I would recommend to the careful consideration of this Government the selling of lands only to actual settlers. It is not the price obtained by the State by the sale of lands that enriches the state but rather the products of the soil which feeds the population, creates business and the exportable surplus must help pay the debt of our country. I would like also to point out to you the spirit of the West. When famine stared the British Empire and her Allies in the face, and our Government urged greater production, the West responded with a very large increased acreage put under cultivation. This was brought about partly by the fact that small tractors were brought into the country free of duty, and thereby the price was very materially reduced. But, Sir, the West

might have taken the stand which Ireland took with the British Empire. We might have taken advantage of the critical time and said to our Government: No greater production and no more production until you give us the implements which we have to till the soil with duty free. But we did not. That is not the spirit of the West. Sir, we believe in a square deal; we believe in a fair fight. We believed that it was our duty to support our Government and to produce men, munitions and food to feed not only ourselves but to feed as far as we possibly could our brothers across the sea and the Allies. Then again, in recruiting the West responded nobly. On account of the very large percentage of foreign element which composes our settlers in the West the English-speaking citizens of the West recruited to a larger percent than any other province in the Dominion of Canada. It must also be borne in mind that a very large percentage of our population in the three Prairie Provinces are engaged in agriculture.

In the matter of prohibition the West today stands as strongly as ever for total prohibition, and I wish to inform you, Sir, that in the first place the Grain Growers' movement in the West was responsible to a very large degree for the bringing about of that policy. I noticed in our daily press that quite recently in the West organized labour in the cities of Calgary and Winnipeg declared that they do not want the liquor traffic re-introduced as it was before.

When the Union Government was formed at Ottawa in 1917 the West laid aside those questions which were considered contentious matters, and sent to Ottawa a practically solid support for that Government, believing that this form of administration was the best adapted to prosecuting the war and carrying on the business of the country. This may be largely accounted for by the fact that our Grain Growers' movement throughout the Prairie Provinces has been putting forward educational propaganda amongst our rural communities, showing our people the errors and the corruption of party government, and setting forth the high ideals of non-party government. The West, Sir, is still of opinion that the ideal is right, and it is up to this Government to bring forward legislation that will prove, not only to the West but to the entire Dominion of Canada, that Union Government is the ideal form, and that the days of party rule and party government are banished for all time.

Now, Sir, I wish to say a word or two in regard to our returned soldiers and some of the things which we should do for them. In the first place, I would recommend to the Government the establishment of a life insurance bureau for the returned soldiers who, prior to enlistment did not carry any life insurance and now find themselves physically unfit and unable to obtain life insurance in the old-line life insurance companies. This is something which I believe it is the duty of the State to carefully consider, and I think it is possible for the Government to establish such a bureau for our returned soldiers as will give them the necessary protection which life insurance affords and which, if economically managed, would be very little extra expense to the State.

Also in the matter of pensions it is the desire of our people that returned soldiers not only privates, but many officers as well, should be on an equality irrespective of rank, and in proof of my contention let me quote one instance. Two architects in the city of Regina enlisted. One of them rushed to the colours and joined up as a private. The other was a little more cautious; he went and took an officer's training. Both men went to the front, one as a private, and the other as an officer, and as good fortune would have it both returned to this country in the positions they had occupied overseas and were discharged from service. They were both entitled to a pension. Now, Mr. Speaker, is it right that the man who rushed to the colours at first, who did not think of what might come afterwards—as to whether or not he would get a pension—but enlisted right off, should only receive the pension of a private, whilst the other man is awarded the pension of an officer? I say most emphatically, no.

The State owes a duty to the orphans of our soldiers who sleep in the battlefields of France and Flanders. The State should make ample provision for these orphans and see that they go to school and receive a liberal education.

As to the soldiers who wish to go on the land, I would divide them into three classes. First, there is the farmer's son and the farm labourer who worked on the farm. These two, I consider, should make a success of farming; they should be encouraged to go on to the farms as speedily and with as little red tape as is possible. Another class is the clerks who have worked perhaps in banks, law offices and stores—men who never did any real, physical hard work, men who previously never did any farming. This should apply also to mechanics. Is it reasonable, Mr. Speaker, for us to think that men who never had any experience in

farming—and farming is a science—when they go on to the land will make a success of it from the start? I say, no. It has been my duty and privilege to meet with Great War Veterans' Associations in the West and to address them. I have advised them strongly that if there are amongst them any amateurs who think they want to go farming, these men should take up a training, an apprenticeship of at least twelve months' actual work on the farm. Then at the end of that period they would know whether or not they wanted to go farming, and I venture to say, Mr Speaker, that the amateurs who take that training at the end of five years would be very much farther ahead than the man who might slip through, get his land and his loan and start without any previous experience.

Then again I find that many of our soldiers are apt to believe that they should be permitted to settle in groups or communities. I think, Mr. Speaker, that not only the Government, but those who are conversant with farming should know that the community system is doomed to be a failure from the word go. Each individual soldier should be encouraged to get on to his own land, because if the men are grouped together they will not have the benefit of living alongside a practical farmer—one who has made a success of farming—they will not have the advantage of going out and watching what the other farmer is doing so that they will do their work in the right way and at the proper time.

Now, as to the price of land. This perhaps is one of the most serious questions for us to consider. The price of land to-day in the West has, in my opinion, gone too high to enable wheat to be grown at a profit a few years hence when the price will be down to a normal basis. If I remember correctly Dean Rutherford, of the College of Agriculture in Saskatchewan, has said that $15 per acre for the average wheat land in that province was in his estimation the highest that should be paid. Many of you know that Dean Rutherford is one of the best authorities on agriculture in the West; and many farmers in this House from the West know the struggle they have had to pay for land which did not cost $15 an acre. I would urge upon the Government in the purchase of land for the soldiers to be very careful and not pay a price exceeding $15 an acre. I venture to say that very few indeed of our soldiers will come through successfully if more than that amount is paid for the land.

We cannot do too much for the returned soldier. We cannot do too much for the returned soldier who wishes to go on to the land to build up a home for himself. In purchasing his outfit he will need agricultural implements and harness. In the West the farmers use at least a four-horse team. The returned soldier will need two sets of harness, and he will find that to-day harness is very expensive. I notice that under our customs regulations the duty on harness is 30 per cent. Well, if our Government could see its way to remove the duty from everything that the soldier has to buy in the shape of an outfit, including agricultural implements, it would be one of the best things that could be done.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I come to the contentious matter, the tariff. I shall not enter into a long array of figures to show why the tariff should be reduced; I wish merely to deliver a message, first, from the people of my constituency who sent me here to represent them, and, second, from the province of Saskatchewan. I do this as a grain grower and a farmer.

I have lived on the prairies for thirty-six years; I know a little about farming and about buying agricultural implements. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) said in this House last session that he faced his first parliament in 1883. Well, I took up my homestead in 1883. I tried to build a home for myself and my family, and in doing so I was helping to develop the West. As soon as my necessities got beyond the first plough that I bought and I wanted to buy another to break more land and grow more grain and create more trade, what did I find? I was penalized by the tariff, which said to me: If you buy that plough, you must pay so much tariff for doing so. To say the least, it was not encouraging to a man to come all the way from free-trade Scotland into a country that penalized him because he was trying to do something to develop it.

For years organized agriculture in the West has petitioned the Government for relief with regard to the tariff. Now we make a request, and we do so in all earnestness. I will read a wire which I received from the president of the Canadian Council of Agriculture:

> Feeling of Western farmers on tariff very intense. Will not stand for any temporizing. My own opinion is there should be a general sharp levelling of tariff downward rather than undue reduction on a few articles, which will give no real relief. Tell Western members we are in dead earnest and expect them to stand by their guns.

Here is another from my constituency:

The question of ways and means is so basic in relation to all other matters that after much consideration would urge you not to be satisfied with anything less this session than a distinct step toward fiscal programme Canadian Council of Agriculture. If Government balks, let it take the responsibility; the sun will still rise and set.

Now, Mr. Speaker, the West believes that the Union Government will be able to read the handwriting on the wall. This is the ultimatum of organized agriculture. If you do not listen to the members who are here to-day, you certainly will have to deal with the West at no distant date.

I want to say a word with regard to the Canadian manufacturers, particularly the manufacturers of agricultural implements. Why is it, Sir, that our manufacturers will not treat us, the farmers of Canada, the same as they treat farmers in the British Isles, Australia, New Zealand, and European countries, where they sell their machinery in the open market, competing with other manufacturers of the world? I am informed on very reliable authority that the prices at which these implements are sold in Europe, Australia and New Zealand, are very much below the prices at which they are sold to the Canadian farmers. This applies particularly to us in the West. We are Canadians, and we wish to be treated at least the same as farmers are treated in other countries by our Canadian manufacturers. I do not think that is asking too much.

We know, Sir, that our Canadian mechanics are second to none in the world and that our Canadian manufacturers are stronger than many of the manufacturing concerns in the United States. Manufacturers have told us that electrical power in Canada, of which they use a good deal, is dearer than it is in the United States. I have a book issued by a commission in the United States before which Sir Adam Beck gave some very valuable information. I find from it that electrical power on this side of the line is about fifty per cent less than the price in the state of New York.

Organized agriculture does not for a minute want to put the Canadian manufacturer out of business, but we want to see him get down to competition. The wider field for him is the wider market. The necessary change in our tariff laws will open up to the Canadian manufacturer a field where there are 100,000,000 people and enable the American manufacturer to get into a field where there are 8,000,000 people.

The Second Vice-President of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association, Mr. J. S. McKinnon, in an address to one of the clubs in Toronto, said that the Grain Growers wanted to escape practically all taxation. That is not so. If you read the platform of the Organized Farmers you will find that we have set forth a system of taxation which we believe would be suitable to conditions in Canada to-day. The Second Vice-President of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association is not a strong high protectionist, as some members of this House are. He says:

The present tariff is imperfect. It has many contradictions and imperfections. As it has not been revised since 1907 and as there have been many changes in our national life since that date, especially on account of the war, it is obvious that the present tariff may not be suited to the conditions of the day. We believe that it should be revised, but revised scientifically.

Referring to the first statement made by Mr. McKinnon, the Organized Farmers' platform clearly sets forth the fact that the Grain Growers do not want to escape taxation; that they are willing and anxious to pay their full share. But we do object strenuously to paying taxes to bolster up the manufacturers under the present iniquitous tariff system. We are willing to pay taxes to the Dominion treasury, but not to the coffers of the manufacturers. Then Mr. McKinnon goes on to prophesy the bankruptcy which will come about in Canada if the tariff is removed. He asks whether the soldiers must wait and possibly be prevented from obtaining employment before the tariff laws are changed. I say emphatically, no. The soldier who goes on the land to farm is just as anxious as any other farmer that the tariff be reduced.

It must be distinctly understood that agriculture, being the basic industry of Canada, is the foundation stone upon which all our industries rest, and if that basic industry is not attractive as well as profitable, our industries will all suffer accordingly. The Government of Canada, therefore, must see to it that our basic industry prospers; if it does not, all industries will come to ruin which the member for North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) has predicted.

I pray for the indulgence of this House while I read a short extract from some literature which the Canadian Manufacturers' Association have supplied me with. Before doing so, I will read just two paragraphs from a statement made by Mr. Tom Moore, President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada, in an address which he delivered to the Canadian Club in the city of Toronto yesterday:—

I tell you if you are content to wait until revolution has taken place, you will have the upheaval in Canada as well as they had it in

Russia and everywhere else. So declared Tom Moore, President of the Trades and Labour Congress of Canada in an address to the Canadian Club here to-day, speaking on the subject of "industrial unrest of the present day."

He further stated:

Mr. Moore declared it was the duty of the Government to set the example for all employers in placing its own contracts. The Government should base its contracts on the best conditions of wages and employment that exists in the country, and not according to the local conditions, which were often unfavourable.

'Labour forces and many employing forces,' Mr. Moore said, 'believe that a greater measure of nationalization of some of the monopolies of the country should take place.'

Mr. Moore touched on the Tariff question. 'Any industry which needs a protective tariff should be prepared to place its books under Government inspections, and the inspection of its workmen and should show why it needs the tariff,' he declared. 'If you leave it to one side, I'm afraid you will have a hard time convincing the workers that a tariff is necessary.'

Let me quote just an extract from the Toronto Globe under date of January 30:

The manifesto of the Manufacturers' Association on the tariff leaves no room for doubt as to the attitude of the association towards the removal of the war tax on imported goods. . . . The issue between the high tariff manufacturers, who constitute what is relatively small proportion of the manufacturing interests of the Dominion and the consumer, is put plainly in the manifesto. An indefinite delay in tariff revision is proposed permitting the continuance of a fiscal system under which three-quarters of the taxation of the country is to be drawn from customs and war taxes upon imported goods and raw materials. A system of taxation so one-sided cannot be continued indefinitely. It oppresses the poor and unduly favours the rich, because the taxation is levied most heavily on food, clothing and household utensils which are as necessary in the homes of the poor as of the rich. . . . The conditions admitted by the Manufacturers' Association in its statement, that customs taxation on consumption yields over 75 per cent of all our federal revenue from taxes, ought not to be continued indefinitely. They stifle Canadian enterprise and overload the shoulders of the bread winner in humble circumstances upon whom customs taxation falls relatively far more heavily than the well-to-do.

Then the Ottawa Citizen says in effect:

The statement issued by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association replying to the platform of the organized Canadian Farmers says that the tariff reform policy of the farmers will revolutionize our present fiscal system. There is nothing to be afraid of in this reference to a possible fiscal revolution in Canada. People should be prepared for it, young people especially; for the time must undoubtedly come when Canada will be again a young man's country, emancipated from the control of the old men who staked everything on a belief in city industries. . . . . Whatever the outcome may be, the organized farmers should press forward with their educational propaganda. There can be nothing to fear from a policy of free trade with Great Britain in five years, and of the other proposed fiscal reforms in the platform of the Canadian Council of Agriculture, provided that Canada is ready to become a young man's country again.

Then the Beacon, a newspaper published in the city of Stratford, says under date of January 31:

The Manufacturers' Association does not want any disturbance in the trade of the country which would be caused by a discussion on the tariff.

This is from the Montreal Star under date of February 5:

Let us get at the facts, promptly, radically, and in a spirit of justice, make a beginning first with the necessities of agricultural production. Let us work out a new national policy based upon the new national needs and freed from the old shibboleths.

Then the Manitoba Free Press has these words to say:

The statement published by the Canadian Manufacturers' Association yesterday in reply to the tariff planks in the Farmers' Platform evinces no desire to find a middle way between high protection and free trade. It admits that a revision of the tariff is due, urges its postponement until after the reconstruction period, and claims that their services to the country and the Allies during the war entitles the manufacturers to a free hand in transforming Canadian industry back again from war to peace conditions. The proposal to postpone even this technical consideration of the tariff until after the period of reconstruction is over shows the manufacturers to be as blind as ever to the real imperfections of the present situation. . . . The complete lack of statesmanlike vision among the manufacturers make more than ever imperative the discovery of it among the political leaders of the country. The farmers have spoken; the manufacturers have replied; and it remains for the Union Government, in its turn, to adumbrate a policy which will by firm reasonableness disarm the potential combatants and enable Canada to turn a united front towards the great task of meeting its obligations while building up a contented and prosperous community.

The Grain Growers' Guide has as usual something to say on the tariff. It has this article on February 5:

The main argument which the Canadian Manufacturers' Association advances against the tariff demands of the Farmers' Platform is that the present is not a wise nor safe time to lower the tariff. This argument may be accepted as pure camouflage. So far as the manufacturers are concerned, there never was and never will be a time when they will be willing to lower the tariff in any way, shape or form. They want the tariff as high as they can get it and to be kept there as long as it is possible.

I will read just one more extract, and that is from the Morning Leader of Regina, Sask., under date of February 1:

The people of Canada have listened to many a wailing appeal from the manufacturers of

Canada in the years that have elapsed since the Conservative party, away back in the seventies, committed this country to the pernicious policy of high tariff protection. During a period of over forty years every hint or suggestion of a reduction of tariff, no matter how small, or how restricted it may have been to a few items, has been the signal for the manufacturers to put up a poor mouth, and cry like the infants they at such times profess their industries to be. On other occasions, however, they puff themselves and ask admiring people to gaze upon their strength and greatness, and the pre-eminent place they occupy in making Canada a nation and giving to it its present stability and prosperity. Canadian manufacturers are puny, weak infants when they are clamouring for favours, or when anything threatens them; but they are giants, bold and unafraid, when they are in a position to dictate to the Government and the masses of the people. It is questionable, however, if during all these years the manufacturers ever issued such a palpable, dishonest, snivelling disgusted appeal as that handed out this week by the general manager of the Canadian Manufacturers' Association by direction of the executive council of that body. It is worthy of the despicable, unspeakable Hun, who, having plundered, destroyed and mutilated to the limit of his ability, throws up his hands when the hour of retribution comes, and like a coward shrieks "Kamerad! Kamerad!" The present wailing appeal of the manufacturers indicates how thoroughly frightened they have become on account of the rising tide of national indignation against the present high tariff which is robbing the people and draining the very life-blood of the nation into the pocket-book and safety vaults of the big interest magnates.

There are several other quotations that I could read, but I wish merely to show to the House that the press of Canada is fairly equally divided on the issue. In fact, I believe, if the balance were found, that the majority of the press would be on the side of the organized farmers.

Motion (Mr. Redman), that an Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General in reply to the speech from the Throne, agreed to.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister) it was ordered that the Address to His Excellency the Governor General, be engrossed and presented to His Excellency by such members of the House as are of the honourable the Privy Council.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 22, respecting the London and Port Stanley Railway Company—Mr. Cronyn.

SUPPLY.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister) it was ordered that this House do on Wednesday next resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister) it was ordered that this House do on Wednesday next resolve itself into a committee to consider of the Ways and Means for raising the Supply to be granted to His Majesty.

RAILWAY BELT ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. Meighen (Minister of the Interior) Bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Belt Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—issue of patent for land held by deceased settler.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The clause adopted last session permitted the patent to issue in the name of the deceased person, but did not go on to state what the legal effect of that would be. Another clause similar to this was passed with relation to Dominion lands, and did go on to state what the legal effect would be, namely, to vest the land in the heirs and devisees according to the law of the province. The Deputy Minister of Justice takes the view that the legal effect is doubtful under the amendment of last session, and that an amendment should be made to the same effect as in the clause with relation to Dominion lands.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

YUKON ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 4, to amend the Yukon Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Council reduced from ten members to three,

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the Minister will give some explanation as to the necessity of this Bill and what its purpose is.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Bill has three clauses. The first clause provides for the reduction of the Yukon Council from ten members to three. The Act of last session empowered the Governor in Council to abolish the Yukon council altogether and establish in its place an appointive body if the Governor in Council saw fit, or an appointive organization of any kind. After conferring with the Yukon Commission, I

have come to the conclusion, with the approval of my colleagues, that it would be better to maintain the elective body, but that there is no necessity for so large a body; and it is therefore intended to reduce it from ten to three. It is also intended by clause 3 of the Bill, which I may refer to now, to reduce the annual indemnity from $600 to $400. This is necessitated by the reduction in the estimates, and justified by the reduction of the population in the Yukon.

Mr. DEVLIN: Might I ask the minister if it is the desire of the Yukon council that this Bill should be put through, or if any communication has been received from the Yukon council respecting the Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No communication has been received from the Yukon council respecting the Bill that I am aware of.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: In the early history I stood for an elective council and against the appointive council. I have not changed my views on this important question, and I am glad to see that the elective principle is retained, and that the people will be able to carry on their affairs as they have been accustomed to carry them on, and in accordance with the principles of democracy.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does it not appear to the hon. Minister that any deliberative body managing the affairs of any territory and consisting of only three persons is very small? It seems to me that it would be almost impossible to carry on the business of any considerable country by a body consisting of only three members. It has to be a miniature assembly. It must have a chairman, or a speaker, and that leaves only two men on the floor; and if one moves a motion and the other refuses to second it, there is a deadlock. It would appear to me that there should be at least five men, as the smallest possible number charged with managing the affairs of any province; and I really think the hon. minister should allow this Bill to stand and have a very serious consultation with the representative from the Yukon with a view to seeing whether it is not advisable to make this body larger than is proposed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is true the body is not very large; but while the territory over which it would have jurisdiction is large, the population is very small. The population of the Yukon Territory to-day is only the population of a very small town. I have had the privilege and advantage of a conference with the member for the Yukon on this subject and also with the Yukon Commissioner, who has been for many years associated with the administration of that territory, and I thought it was advisable to reduce the total expenditure to something commensurate with the size of the population; and in doing so I find it necessary to recommend the reduction that is contained in the Bill. This reduction meets with the approval of the Commissioner of the Yukon Territory. Regard must also be had to the fact that it is a very circumscribed area of jurisdiction they exercise. A great deal of the administration under the Act is vested in the Minister of the Interior and in the Yukon Branch of that department.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: May I ask how the members of the council are elected?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is provided for by another section. They are elected by districts.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Does this include Dawson City?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: I might say for the information of the hon. gentleman that it is proposed to have three districts, each electing one member. The city of Dawson will be one district, the gold-producing creeks in the vicinity of Dawson and the Stewart river will be district No. 2, and the country around White Horse will be district No. 3.

Mr. DEVLIN: What is the jurisdiction of the Yukon council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That is really a question that would require some study of the Act in order to answer, and it would take some time.

Mr. DEVLIN: Roughly speaking?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have jurisdiction analogous to that of a town council. They maintain a sort of municipal organization.

Mr. DEVLIN: They have roads to deal with, and I presume they must have something to do with the internal legislation of the country.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not very much.

Mr. DEVLIN: Have they a Speaker?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, it is a council, not a parliament.

Mr. DEVLIN: It is something in the form of a commission?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Very much.

Mr. DEVLIN: And besides the council there is a regular commissioner?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the regular commissioner is an officer of the Government and performs the active functions of Governor of the Territory. The great bulk of administrative work is on him, and he attends meetings of the council.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: Perhaps I can answer the hon. member. The Yukon council is an advisory body. Any Money Bill must originate with the Commissioner of the Territory who is a direct representative of the Federal Government and through whom all moneys voted by Parliament are expended. Money Bills originate with the Governor and he presents them to the council. No money Bill can originate with the council. The council may meet and make ordinances for the good of the country.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE: Have they got the power to impose taxation for municipal purposes?

Mr. MEIGHEN: They have a limited power of taxation.

Mr. ROBB: This advisory council was originally composed of ten members and the minister proposes to reduce it to three. What is the difference between the per capita representation as the council originally stood and as the minister proposes to reduce it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not sure that I know the maximum population which the Yukon reached, but it seems to me that it will bear to the present population not far from the ratio of ten to three. The hon. member for Yukon would perhaps answer that question more accurately than I.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: It is very difficult to tell what the population of the Yukon was when it reached its highest point. It was estimated at from 25,000 to 40,000.

Mr. ROBB: Was the council of ten formed at the time when the population was at its greatest?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: When the population was at its greatest the territory was governed by a council appointed by the Federal Government. Judge Dugas, afterwards the Chief Justice of the Territorial Court, served on that council, as did the Commissioner of the Territory, the Controller, the head of the Northwest Mounted Police and the Gold Commissioner. They were all Federal officials. At first the Government permitted the people of the territory to elect two representatives. That was in 1902. In 1904 they were given the right to elect five and at the next election after that they were given the right to elect the whole council of ten. I think that perhaps the population of the territory had reached the apex of the curve by the time the council was made elective.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the hon. gentleman state whether this Bill is satisfactory to him as the representative of the Yukon?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: Yes, Mr. Chairman, I take the responsibility of saying that it is satisfactory to me after having consulted with the Commissioner of the Territory, a number of people in the territory and the Minister of the Interior. Some people in the territory would like to have the council abolished and an appointive council created under this statute, but as I said a moment ago I could not convince myself that that was quite in keeping with the spirit of the times, and I am glad to know that the elective principle is being maintained.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Sections 11 and 12 give power to the Commissioner in Council to impose taxes for any purpose within his jurisdiction; respecting the summoning of juries and the enforcement of the attendance of jurors for the trial of civil and criminal cases; the control and regulation of the sale of and traffic in intoxicating liquor in the territory, which is drawing to its close as no liquor has been allowed in for a time, and the preservation of game in the territory.

On section 2—franchise extended to women for election of council:

Mr. MEIGHEN: That extends woman's suffrage to the Yukon Territory.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister please read the section as it is amended?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Section 9 as amended in 1908 reads as follows:

> The Commissioner in Council may prescribe the qualifications of those entitled to vote at an election of Members to the Council; provided that only those persons shall be entitled to so vote who are natural born or naturalized male British subjects of the full age of twenty-one years, and who have resided in the Territory for a period of twelve months prior to the date of the election.

This adds, after the word "male" the words "or female."

Mr. McKENZIE: That is universal suffrage?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It puts the female suffrage on the same basis as the male suffrage.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is no qualification except that they shall be British subjects and 21 years of age?

Mr. MEIGHEN: And shall have resided in the territory for twelve months prior to the date of the election.

On section 3—indemnity of councillors reduced from $600 to $400:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This reduces the indemnity from $600 to $400 which is considered sufficient.

Mr. A. THOMPSON: Representations have been made to me from the Yukon that the indemnity should be left as it is; that is to say at $600. The minister has already stated that one of the objects of this legislation is to give a more economical legislature for the territory. However, in view of the fact that we are cutting down the number from ten to three, I think the minister would be well advised if he left the indemnity as it is at $600. They make that suggestion to me. It is only a matter of $600 as between the $400 and $600 for the three members.

Mr. DEVLIN: How long do they sit in a year?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: Like our Parliament here, they do not sit any particular number of days in a year. They sit until the business of the territory has been finished. They sit once a year.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Do they sit at night?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: Sometimes they sit at night.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: They sit only once a year?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: Once a year, the same as Parliament.

Mr. DEVLIN: As a general rule, how long does the session last?

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Have they Orders in Council?

Mr. McMASTER: How long does the session last?

Mr. A. THOMPSON: I think from ten to fifteen days. Three weeks would be a fairly long session of the council. They sat for four weeks one year but from two to three weeks would be about right.

Mr. MEIGHEN: In answer to the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) I may say that they do legislate by Order in Council as empowered by the Act of 1908 which hon. gentlemen passed.

Bill reported

STATISTICS' ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN moved the second reading of Bill No. 16, to amend the Statistics Act.

Mr. ROBB: It is now nearly eleven o'clock, and I think we had better adjourn. We have done a pretty fair day's work.

Mr. MACLEAN: The Bill which I am asking the House now to consider is a very short one. I have another which is also very short and will not detain the House at any great length. I should like to make some progress, and I hope that hon. gentlemen will consent to consider these two very short and harmless Bills.

Motion agreed to.

On section 1—transportation returns excepted from operation of section 15 respecting secrecy,

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the minister be good enough to explain the provisions of this Bill?

Mr. MACLEAN: Under section 15 of the Statistics Act, which was passed at the last session of Parliament, it is provided that all returns made by any individual or corporation upon the request of the officials of the Statistical Bureau are entitled to secrecy. That is, any information they may give is deemed to be secret, and cannot be made public by any body in the department. Of course if that relates to private affairs it is a very proper provision. Section 28 of the same Act provides that statistics furnished by transportation companies is merely privileged. But section 15 is held to override the provisions of section 28. The result is that under a strict interpretation of the Act, statistics given by transportation companies could not be published. The purpose of this section is merely to restore the provision which existed in the statute law in respect to transportation statistics, prior to the passage of the Act.

Mr. DEVLIN: I would ask the minister if there have been any steps taken in his department to try and co-ordinate the statistics that go to the different departments, with a view to bringing all statistics under one heading?

Mr. MACLEAN: The Act passed last session, respecting the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, had in mind the very thing which my hon. friend has mentioned. I cannot,

I am sorry to say, inform the hon. gentleman just how far the transfer has been accomplished. I do know that a great deal of the statistics heretofore published by the Customs Department is being transferred to the Dominion Bureau of Statistics, and it is expected that the railway statistics will also be transferred to that bureau. Our statistical system is being extended, and I think the Act passed last session will have a very beneficial effect in affording to the public a wider ranged and better prepared statistics than we have had heretofore.

Mr. DEVLIN: Statistics, I might remind the minister, would be more useful under the one heading. For instance, under the Dominion Bureau of Statistics the members of this House, and other persons throughout the Dominion, might have one office to apply to in order to get the statistics relating to any particular subject they may be interested in. At the present moment we might apply to that Bureau for certain statistics, and again be referred by it to perhaps my hon. friend's department, or to the Railway Department, for certain other statistics.

Mr. MACLEAN: I might inform my hon. friend that to-day the Bureau of Statistics will obtain for any hon. gentleman any statistical information he requires, no matter to what department it relates. The railway statistical branch has not yet been transferred to the Statistical Bureau, but I trust they will be very shortly.

Mr. DEVLIN: I want to say that Mr. Coats is a highly efficient public servant, and I would like to render him that testimony here.

Mr. JOHN H. SINCLAIR: I presume that the statistics referred to include the information obtained in answer to questions sent to manufacturers. Now manufacturers write to me that they have a great many returns to make in connection with their business, that it is becoming an onerous thing, and that some of them have to employ special clerks to look after the returns that the Government call for. I would like to know what use is made of these statistics after they are forwarded. It will be satisfactory to the people who are incurring this expense in compiling and forwarding these statistics, to know that they are utilized by the department and placed before the people in some shape or other. Will the minister tell us what is done in that direction?

Mr. MACLEAN: I am quite aware of the fact that during the latter part of the war, various departments of government were seeking information of one kind or another, and I fear there was a great deal of overlapping, and in some instances our business men were perhaps unnecessarily put to expense and annoyance to afford statistical information to more than one branch or department of government. For instance, the Canada Food Board required at times certain information. Later it would transpire that the Cost of Living Commissioner of the Labour Department might be wanting statistical information along these same lines, and in consequence my hon. friend is quite correct in saying that many business men have been protesting recently against the vast amount of statistical information demanded of them. However, the intention of the Government, and of the various departments, now is to centre in the Bureau of Statistics all work relating to statistics. The Statistical Bureau is attempting to build up statistical information in reference to our internal trade, which figures were never available in this country before. If the Bureau succeeds in compiling reliable information concerning our internal trade it will be of very great interest and benefit to the public. Of course this will mean that the public must vouchsafe on request certain information, but while it may entail some little additional work on the part of certain members of the community, still it will be in the public interest to have that information. However, I can assure my hon. friend from Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that it is the purpose of the Government—in fact that was the intention of the Act passed last session—to centre all statistics in the one branch.

Mr. CAHILL: What is the difficulty in the way of getting railway statistics into the Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. MACLEAN: I cannot answer my hon. friend exactly. There has been some delay. I am not sure whether the Railway Department are facilitating matters very much; and that might be true of any Department—they naturally wish to hold on to their statistical branches as long as they can. I have not had an opportunity of knowing why the railway statistics have not already been brought under this statistical bureau, but they will be very shortly.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: We have been collecting these statistics now for some time. Is anything being done in the way of utilizing them?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, a great deal of statistical information has already been compiled. I hope that the report of the Bureau will be presented to the House shortly.

Mr. ROBB: The minister is aware of the trouble and expense that business men have been subjected to in providing statistical information for different departments of the Government. As he has truly said, the country is sick and tired of it, and this is a good time for the minister to make a reassuring statement to the country that, the war being over, business men will no longer be required to employ extra labour in the compiling of these statistics. Moreover, when this information comes into Ottawa an army of employees is required to dig it out and put it into shape. Great economy would result, not only to business men throughout Canada but to the Government as well, if a good deal of the statistical information that has been required during the past year could be done away with.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose of the passing of the Statistical Act of last session was to centre in one branch of the public service the compilation of all statistics. The Bureau created for that purpose should be able to co-ordinate the work and minimize the demands upon the public for information. I think I can very sincerely assure my hon. friend that henceforth demands made upon the public for statistics will be very much less than they have been during the last year or two. Statistics were required from the public for many reasons during the last two years, but with the ending of the war the need for obtaining much of this information has passed away.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is the Food Board still calling for returns from the business people?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think not.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: What is the estimated cost of establishing this Bureau?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bureau of Statistics, in a certain form, has been in existence for a long time. The Director of the new Bureau of Statistics was the Census Commissioner.

Mr. MURPHY: Prior to that, editor of the Labour Gazette.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think so. Last session the Dominion Bureau of Statistics was established, under the Department of Trade and Commerce. It is intended that all statistics shall be compiled in that Bureau.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: Do you propose to extend the work of that Bureau?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER: What I want to get is the difference between the cost of the present system and that of the new system which it is proposed to establish.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall endeavour to give my hon. friend that information. The expenditures of the Customs Department, for instance, in compiling their statistics will be very much lessened by the work of this Bureau.

Mr. ROBB: The complaint is not that information is sought; it is that there is duplication in this respect, with resulting duplication of expense both on the part of the business men throughout the country and of the Government. The minister has said that the Bureau of Statistics was established with a view to gathering all this information, but since that Act was passed the Government of which he is a member has authorized other departments to seek information and has made the business men of the country liable to penalties if that information is not supplied. That is what we are complaining of; we wish that these penalties be withdrawn.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Prior to the establishment of the Bureau of Statistics, the Canada Food Board, the War Trade Board and other war organizations were established. Properly or improperly, they thought they required certain statistics and demands were accordingly made upon the public for the information. In the meantime, the Bureau of Statistics was not completely organized; as a matter of fact it is not fully organized yet. When the organization of the Bureau is complete, so far as I know there is no reason why any demands should be made on the public for statistical information except through this one body; therefore duplication should be eliminated.

Mr. McKENZIE: Do I understand that the statistical information gathered by the officials of the Railway Department—I am taking the Railway Department as an example—is now passed on to this Bureau of Statistics; and that the information thus obtained will appear not in the report of the Railway Department, but in the report of this Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is the intention. The Railway Department have a Statistical Branch which publishes a blue book of railway and transportation statis-

tics. In a short time that branch will pass over to the Bureau of Statistics, the publication now issuing from the Railway Department will cease, and that information will appear in the general statistical book to be published by the Bureau of Statistics.

Mr. MURPHY: In other words, a person requiring information regarding statistics of any character will apply not to the particular department with which that information is connected, but to this Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, for instance, in reference to customs statistics, it is expected that the Bureau of Statistics will have more complete and fuller information than is to be found in the customs return I think it is likely that the Customs Department will continue to publish an annual blue book showing the customs duties paid upon importations, but the Bureau of Statistics will take the customs returns and interpret them in a different way and make them more valuable to the public.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: What did this Bureau of Statistics cost last year?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I could not give that information to my hon. friend. That will be made available to him when the estimates relating to the Bureau of Statistics are before Parliament.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is there a large staff?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I should not like to venture an answer to my hon. friend. The staff is probably larger now than it was at the close of the last session of Parliament. It shall likely grow, I cannot say.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Who is at the head of it?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Mr. Coats, who was formerly Commissioner of Census.

Mr. DEVLIN: I do not want to prevent the minister from getting his Bill through, but he has, I take it, given to the House the assurance that the statistics now going to the Railway Department will in future go to the Bureau of Statistics. Am I right?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: Without wishing to anticipate any of the work of the session, might I ask if there is not in the Railway Bill that is at the present moment going through the Senate a clause with an amendment to it to the very effect that that branch of statistics will go to the Railway Department?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I understand that an application will be made to strike those clauses out. They were in the Bill, I understand, as originally introduced, and I think at the last session of Parliament, either in committee or in the House, they were struck out, but the Bill was republished with those clauses incorporated.

Mr. DEVLIN: They will be struck out?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I hope they will be struck out. I intend to ask that they be struck out.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—dates of making and forwarding transportation returns changed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The purpose of section 2 is simply to change the year for which transportation statistics may be collected. The year required by the Act as at present is the old Government fiscal year ending on June 30, and it is proposed by this section of the Bill to change it to the calendar year, as this corresponds with the financial year of most transportation companies.

Mr. McKENZIE: Why not attempt uniformity in the financial statistical years of the Government? Our financial year at present ends with the last day of March. Would it not be very much easier to get information for men who take an interest in such matters, if we had all our years coterminous; that is, if our statistical year, our financial year and all our other years in the business of the Government ended with the same day? It is confusing that one year ends with the last day of March, another ends with the last day of June, and another ends with the last day of December. If they could be co-ordinated and systematized so that when we were talking about a statistical or financial year in Government matters we would all have in mind the same period, it would be much better.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I quite agree with the leader of the Opposition that it would be very desirable to bring about the end he suggests, but that is, of course, impossible. The section of the Bill which we are now considering refers merely to transportation statistics, and as these are always controlled by individuals or private corporations, we must accept their fiscal year; at least it makes it less difficult for them if we adopt the calendar year as the period for which they must furnish the annual statistics. That has been the experience of the Bureau of Statistics. Nearly all the

railway companies have their fiscal year corresponding with the calendar year, and this will promote the suggestion made by my hon. friend from Chateauguay (Mr. Robb), because it will make it easier for transportation companies to give this information at the end of the calendar year which corresponds usually with their business year.

Section agreed to.

On the preamble.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Have the statistics obtained by the Canada Registration Board been transferred to the Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They have been, or will be transferred.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Is the Canada Registration Board still in existence?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: No, it has passed out of existence and all the information gathered by that board, which was according to the card system, has been or will be transferred to the Bureau of Statistics and will be available there for any information which it contains. I do not know whether that information will be of very much interest hereafter or not, but I remember that Mr. Coats, Director of the Bureau, told me the other day that he could tell, by reason of the information gathered by the Canada Registration Board, how many farmers or how many carpenters there were in any county in Canada. Whether such information will be helpful in the future or not I do not know.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I read the other day in one of the Montreal newspapers that the bachelors of that city were protesting very strongly because the Canada Registration Board had sold to the city or to the commissioners of Montreal, for the sum of $500, or a little more than that, the statistics which they had gathered, in order that the city might collect a tax from the poor, unfortunate bachelors. Is that the case?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That is a case in which the Dominion will be assisting in the assertion of provincial or municipal rights.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: But the rule of secrecy will, in that case, have been broken for a price.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not know that that information was given under the secrecy clause of the Statistics Act or not, but we shall allow the bachelors to raise that question.

Mr. ROBB: Will the next census be taken under the direction of the Bureau of Statistics?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

Bill reported.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean for the adjournment of the House:

Mr. McKENZIE: What business shall we take up to-morrow?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Questions first, and notices of motion next. I assume that will exhaust the day, but if not we shall proceed to Public Bills. The Resolution that will be taken up first will probably be the one standing in the name of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) relating to the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. ROBB: I should like to make a suggestion to the minister who is leading the House, which he might take up with his colleagues. In the British House of Commons, on Thursday of each week, the minister who is leading the House gives a statement of the business for each day of the following week. I think the Government might very well adopt that practice. It would enable members and people throughout the country who are interested in a particular item of legislation to know when it was coming up in Parliament.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I shall be very glad to call the attention of my colleagues to my hon. friend's suggestion as it will appear in Hansard to-morrow.

Motion agreed to, and the House adjourned at 11.30 p.m.

Wednesday, March 19, 1919.

The SPEAKER took the Chair at Two o'clock.

ESTIMATES FOR FISCAL YEAR 1920.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General, transmitting Estimates for the year ending March 31, 1920, was presented by Sir Thomas White (Minister of Finance), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

QUESTIONS.

[Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.]

GRAIN ON THE GREAT LAKES.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. How many bushels of wheat, oats, barley and flax were moved during the season of navi-

gation on the Great Lakes from Fort William and Port Arthur for the years 1916, 1917, 1918?

2. What portion of shipments of wheat, oats, barley and flax shipped from Fort William and Port Arthur during open season of navigation of 1918 was of the crop of 1918?

3. What portion of the wheat, oats, barley, flax and corn in storage in elevators, or in storage on ships in Canadian ports east of Lake Superior is Canadian grain, and what portion of American origin?

4. How many ships carrying grain cleared from Fort William and Port Arthur during season of navigation of 1917, and how many in 1918?

5. How many charters for grain carrying ships were granted during season of navigation of 1917, and how many in 1918, by the Board of Grain Supervisors?

6. Were any application for charters for grain shipments refused by the Board of Grain Supervisors during season of navigation 1918? If so, how many were Canadian or British register and how many American, and why were such charters not granted?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax):

1. Grain moved from Fort William and Port Arthur during season of navigation 1916, 1917, 1918.

	Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Flax.	Total.
	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
1916.....	181,685,991	57,821,239	8,887,282	5,574,987	253,969,499
1917.....	138,574,037	47,686,685	6,810,834	6,358,096	199,429,652
1918..... ...	63,295,048	10,290,510	3,174,393	2,036,308	787,96,259

2. Lake shipments of grain from Fort William and Port Arthur during season of navigation 1918, which were of 1918 crop.

	Bushels.
Wheat	50,565,345-40
Oats	
Barley	373;202-31
Flax	530,347-46

3. Grain in storage in elevators or on ships in Canadian ports east of Lake Superior on February 14, 1919, showing what portion is Canadian grain and what portion is American.

Wheat.	Oats.	Barley.	Flax.	Rye.	Corn.	Total.
Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.	Bush.
Canadian—						
16,464,296	1,047,130	714,572	14,776	106,373	.....	18,347,147
American—						
4,244,606	1,805,655	....	.....	... .	141,585	6,191,846

4. Vessels carrying grain which cleared from Fort William and Port Arthur during the years 1917 and 1918.

	Canadian vessels.	U.S. vessels.
1917	622	507
1918	317	118

5. Charters are made between the shipper of the grain and the vessel agents direct, and the Board of Grain Supervisors has no official record of the number or nature of charters made either for the season of navigation 1917 or 1918.

6. Answered by No. 5.

LT.-COLONEL PICHE.

Mr. POWER:

1. What position is occupied overseas by Lt.-Colonel Piché, of Montreal?

2. By whom was he recommended for such position?

[Mr. Stevens.]

3. Has he ever served in any capacity in France?

4. If not, what special qualifications justify his appointment to a position in England?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Overseas representative of the Director of Records, Militia Headquarters, and, in addition to these duties, at the request of the Overseas Minister, is acting as liaison officer.

2. Adjutant-General.

3. No.

4. This officer, throughout his service in the Canadian Militia and Canadian Expeditionary Force, has shown excellent administrative ability, has a thorough training in Records as required in Canada, and is possessed of considerably more than the average amount of tact,—an essential attribute in carrying out his present duties.

P.E.I. GREATER PRODUCTION GRANT.

Mr. J. E. SINCLAIR (Queens, P.E.I.):

1. What amount of money, if any, was granted or given to the Province of Prince Edward Island or to the Government of said province during the year 1918 for the purpose of promoting greater production of agricultural foodstuffs?

2. Was the said grant absolute or conditional?

3. What disposition of the grant was made by the Government of Prince Edward Island?

4. Was it agreed between the Government of Canada and the Government of Prince Edward Island that promissory notes or other security should be taken from the farmers, to whom such grant was made, for a return of the money?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. $5,000.

2. Conditional.

3. (a) To pay salaries and travelling and other expenses of men employed by the Provincial Department of Agriculture for Prince Edward Island in connection with this work. (b) To pay for newspaper advertising. (c) For the purchase of supplies necessary for the work.

4. It was agreed between this Government and the Government of Prince Edward Island that such arrangements should be made as would insure that farmers or others short of seed would get the necessary supplies. It was not stated that notes would be accepted.

QUEBEC HARBOUR COMMISSION.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the Quebec Harbour Commission during the year 1918 sold any harbour equipment, tugs or dredges?

2. If so, to whom, at what prices, and under what conditions?

3. Were prices asked for from any others than the actual purchasers?

4. If so, from whom?

5. Is the property of the Quebec Harbour Commission insured against fire?

6. If so, through what agents are risks placed?

7. Were any other agents asked to give prices?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes, Dredge No. 1.

2. To La Cie. Generale d'Enterprises Publiques for $185,000, to be paid cash in full before dredge left harbour of Quebec. Payment was made as agreed.

3. Yes, inquiries and offers of sale were made without avail by the Quebec Harbour Commissioners, before the agreement was entered into with Purchasing Company, through the:

4. Marine Department, Ottawa; the Canadian Salvage Association, of Montreal and Quebec; T. A. Scott Company, New London, Connecticut; The Merritt & Chapman Derrick & Wrecking Co., New York; War Department, United States Government; The Clinchfield Navigation Co., Ltd., New York; J. Ellwell & Co., New York.

5. Yes.

6. Dominion Brokerage, per Douglas T. Taylor, Arthur Scott; C. & W. Champion; C. J. Lockwell; P. A. Boutin; Belleau & Auger; H. B. Bignell; Oliver & Coolican; Barry & MacManamy.

7. No. Prices are regulated by Underwriters.

AYRSHIRE AND HOLSTEIN BULLS.

Mr. KAY:

1. How many Ayrshire bulls were purchased and distributed by the Government in Canada in 1918, and what was the average price paid for them?

2. How many Holstein bulls were purchased and distributed by the Government in Canada in 1918, and what was the average price paid for them?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. 45. $140.77.

2. 12. $144.16.

PAYMENTS TO MILITARY REPRESENTATIVES.

Mr. KAY:

How much money was paid to the respective Military representatives on the Tribunal Boards, 1917-18, at the following places: Ormstown, Que.; Huntingdon, Que.; Knowlton, Que.; Adamsville, Que.; Quebec City, Que.?

Major General MEWBURN: Ormstown, $562; Huntingdon, $442; Knowlton, $411; Adamsville, $584.35; Quebec City, $9,586.

MR. WILLIAM T. GREGORY.

Mr. POWER:

1. What is the military standing, if any, of Mr. William T. Gregory, of Leamington, Ont.?

2. Is the Government aware that Mr. Gregory has appeared in public many times under the title of Colonel, and in uniform?

3. Is it within the knowledge of the Government that Mr. Gregory appeared in uniform in Halifax, at or about the time of the embarkation of the 241st Battalion, wearing the red band of the Headquarters' Staff around his cap, and was be ordered to remove this insignia by some official?

4. Have any returned soldiers or others been punished for wearing uniforms or for assuming officers' titles without authority?

5. What steps, if any, have been or will be taken in the case of Mr. Gregory?

Major General MEWBURN:

1. None.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Yes.

5. None.

THE BRONZE STAR.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

Referring to a statement published in the Canadian Official Record of January 21, 1919, why is the Bronze Star for Naval Service confined to men who were mobilized and served prior to December 31, 1915?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bronze Star is a decoration granted by the King to all those on Active Service in the Imperial or Dominion Navies during the Great War prior to December 31, 1915

Mr. JAMES I. HART.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Did Mr. James I. Hart, of Orillia, receive an appointment with the C.E.F.?
2. If so, with what battalion, what was his rank, and what is it at present?
3. What active service did Mr. Hart perform outside of England?
4. What was the date of his return to Canada, and did he return on leave?
5. After being in Canada, did he return to active service in England or France? If so, when, and in what capacity?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.
2. With 177th Battalion as Honorary Captain and Paymaster. Present rank, Major on Reserve of Officers, C.E.F.
3. In France from June 22, 1917, to January 21, 1918, and from May 8, 1918, until returned to Canada in August, 1918.
4. Returned to Canada on leave for session of Ontario Legislative Assembly, January 31, 1918.
5. Yes. Returned to England April 22, 1918. To France May 8, 1918. Promoted to temporary major May 28, 1918.

CANADA FOOD BOARD LICENSES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How many licenses for the sale of foodstuffs, were issued by the Canada Food Board up to December 31, 1918?
2. How much was charged in fees for these licenses?
3. Are these licenses still in force?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the issue of such licenses?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. 78,016.
2. $336,261.69.
3. Millers' licenses still in force; also packers' licenses, under Order in Council No. 580 of date March 9, 1918.
4. Not beyond expiration of present licenses.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

CANADA FOOD BOARD EXPENDITURE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What was the total expenditure of every kind made by or on behalf of the Government in connection with food control since the appointment of W. J. Hanna on June 21, 1917?
2. How many employees did the Canada Food Board have in its employ during any part of the year 1918?
3. How many employees are now in the employ of the Board?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the operations of the Canada Food Board.

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. Total expenditure from June 21, 1917, to December 31, 1918, $623,111.91.
2. February 11, 1918, 109; September 1, 1918, 210; December 31, 1918, 177.
3. Forty-one.
4. No.

PORT GEORGE POSTMISTRESS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Who is the postmaster or postmistress at Port George, Annapolis County, N.S.?
2. When was said position filled?
3. Was said position filled by application through the Civil Service Commission?
4. Was any recommendation made to the Civil Service Commission? If so, by whom?
5. How many applications did the said Civil Service Commission receive in connection with this appointment?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Miss Vera M. Slocomb.
2. March 1, 1919.
3. Yes.
4. Yes, Miss Vera M. Slocomb, recommended by W. E. MacLellan, Post Office Inspector, Halifax, N.S.
5. Post Office Department advised that two applications had been received.

ENLISTMENTS IN HULL, PONTIAC AND WRIGHT COUNTIES.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Do the counties of Hull, Pontiac and Wright form part of Military District No. 3, Kingston-Ottawa, for military purposes?
2. How many men belonging to said counties of Hull, Pontiac and Wright were enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force, under the volunteer system?
3. How many men belonging to the said counties were recruited by virtue of the Military Service Act of 1917?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.
2. 252.
3. 2,444.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

In the statement given to the House on the 25th of April, 1918, in connection with the number of volunteer enlistments by provinces, were the men belonging to the counties of Pontiac, Hull and Wright, included in this statement, credited to the province of Quebec or to the province of Ontario?

Major-General MEWBURN:

In April, 1918, separate figures not being available, they were included with total reported by Military District No. 3, which is in the province of Ontario. As soon as separate figures were obtained, they were credited to the province of Quebec.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

In the statement given to the House on the 25th of April, 1918, in connection with the number of men who were recruited by virtue of the Military Service Act of 1917, were the men belonging to the counties of Pontiac, Hull and Wright, included in this statement, attributed to the Province of Quebec or to the Province of Ontario?

Major-General MEWBURN: In April, 1918, separate figures not being available, they were included with total reported by Military District No. 3, which is in the province of Ontario.

As soon as separate figures were obtained, they were credited to the province of Quebec.

MASSETT GOVERNMENT WHARF.

Lt.-Col. PECK:

1. Did a Government wharf at Massett, B.C., collapse?
2. If so, did this wharf belong to the Dominion Government?
3. Had the Government received any requests for repairs to this wharf prior to its collapse?
4. Were any goods belonging to merchants of the district lost when the wharf collapsed?
5. Have any claims been made to the Minister of Public Works or other members of the Government for payment for the loss of these goods?
6. Is it the intention of this Government to give any recognition to such claims?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. Yes.
2. Yes.
3. Yes.
4. Yes.
5. Yes.
6. No.

ROYAL NAVAL CANADIAN VOLUNTEER RESERVE.

Mr. MAYRAND:

1. Did the British Government at any time during the war make any request or suggestion regarding Canada recruiting or sending overseas a division of the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve?
2. If so, by whom was the request made and when?
3. Was the request acted upon?
4. When was the division of the R.N.C.V.R. sent overseas?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): 1, 2, 3, 4. In the spring of 1916 Imperial authorities suggested that recruiting be carried on in Canada for service in the British Navy. The British Admiralty sent Captain the Hon. Rupert Guinness to Canada in charge of a recruiting party. As it was not feasible to recruit for entry in the Royal Navy owing to the different rates of pay in the Imperial and Canadian services an agreement was arrived at between the Canadian Government and the British Admiralty whereby a division of the R.N.C.V.R. should be recruited for overseas service to form a part of the total forces that Canada proposed to put on active service in the war. Captain Guinness delivered addresses at different points throughout Canada for the purpose of stimulating recruiting. Between the spring of 1916 and December 1917, 1,715 men were enrolled for the R.N.C.V.R. Overseas Division.

Mr. MAYRAND:

1. At any time during the war did the Hon. Rupert Guinness visit Canada for the purpose of recruiting a division of the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve?
2. Did the Hon. Rupert Guinness bring a request from the Admiralty or British Government asking Canada to recruit a division of the R.N.C.V.R.?
3. If so, was the request acted upon?
4. Did the Hon. Mr. Guinness tour Canada?
5. If so, what was the purpose of the tour?
6. Did the Hon. Mr. Guinness make any report regarding the enlistment of a division of the R.N.C.V.R.?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): 1, 2, 3, 5, 6. In the spring of 1916 Imperial authorities suggested that recruiting be carried on in Canada for service in the British Navy. The British Admiralty sent Captain the Hon. Rupert Guinness to Canada in charge of a recruiting party. As it was not feasible to recruit for entry in the Royal Navy owing to the different rates of pay in the Imperial and Canadian services an agreement was arrived at between the Canadian Government and the British Admiralty whereby a division of the R.N.C.V.R. would be recruited for overseas service to form a part of the total forces that Canada proposed to put on active service in the war. Captain Guinness delivered addresses at different points throughout Canada for the purpose of stimulating recruiting. Between the spring of 1916 and December 1917, 1,715 men were enrolled for the R.N.C.V.R. Overseas Division.

ST. LOUIS ROAD PROPERTY.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has the Government taken possession of the property situated on St. Louis Road, bequeathed by the late Gustave Stuart, K.C., of Quebec?
2. For what purpose was this property bequeathed?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to make any use of it? If so, what?

Mr. CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

WELLAND CANAL LOCK TENDERS.

Mr. FRASER:

1. What are the names and what were the former occupations of the various lock tenders appointed on the New Welland Ship Canal since April 1, 1918?
2. By whom were these men recommended?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The new Welland Ship Canal is under construction—no lock tenders have been appointed and will not be until canal is completed for operation.
2. Answered by No. 1.

CASH SUBVENTIONS TO RAILWAYS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What is the gross amount expended in cash subventions to aid in the construction of railways in each of the provinces of Canada since 1867?
2. What is the gross amount expended on Government owned railways in each province of Canada since 1867?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. The Dominion Government, up to 30th June last, had paid $111,428,695.38 in cash subsidies to railways; but it is quite impracticable to show the distribution of that aid among the various provinces.

2. This question cannot be answered in a practical manner, except as shown in the following statement:

CAPITAL EXPENDITURE.

Nova Scotia:	
Canada Eastern Railway ..	$ 819,000.00
Cape Breton Railway	3,860,679.14
Eastern Extension Railway ..	1,324,042.81
Oxford and New Glasgow Railway	1,949,063.21
European and North American Railway..	88,363.18
Nova Scotia Railway	208,509.72
Annapolis and Digby Railway..	660,683.09
	$8,910,341.15
New Brunswick:	
Montreal and European Short Line..	$ 333,942.72
International Railway of New Brunswick	13,031.96
New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island Railway ..	391,454.27
Carleton Branch Railway ..	48,410.48
	$ 786,839.43
Quebec:	
Quebec bridge	$14,175,861.85
Drummond County Railway	1,464,000.00
Quebec and Saguenay Railway	1,703,589.90
	$17,343,451.75
Prince Edward Island:	
Prince Edward Island Railway.	11,829,557.44
Manitoba:	
Hudson Bay Railway.	20,233,887.37
British Columbia:	
Stikine Teslin Railway.	283,323.55
Railways Covering Several Provinces:	
Intercolonial Railway	116,366,437.51
National Transcontinental Railway..	164,488,236.85
Canadian Pacific Railway ..	62,789,776.09
Expenditure not Apportioned to any Particular Railway:	
Canadian Government Railways General; rolling stock	31,148,529.09
Construction and betterments (1918-19) to Dec. 31, 1918..	8,055,229.65
Sundries: (1918-19) to Dec. 31, 1918—	
Governor General's cars	71,538.82
Sundries..	103,986.57
A grand total to Dec. 31, 1918, date of last adjusting entries..	$442,411,135.27

FORT WILLIAM AND PORT ARTHUR ELEVATORS.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Are the elevators, formerly owned by the Canadian Northern and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways, at Fort William and Port Arthur, now operated by the Government?
2. If not, by whom are they operated, are they held under lease, and from whom were such leases obtained?
3. If leased from the Government, what is the amount of annual rental?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Canadian Northern elevator at Port Arthur operated by the Port Arthur Elevator Company, under lease from Canadian Northern Railway Company.
2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Annual rental is $127,876, plus one quarter of a cent per bushel for every bushel entering said elevator in any year in excess of 10,000,000 bushels.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Did the Dominion Government acquire the Grand Trunk Pacific elevator at Fort William?
2. If so, was it by expropriation, lease or otherwise?
3. If purchased, what was the price paid?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

BOARD OF PENSION COMMISSIONERS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. What appointments in connection with the Board of Pension Commissioners have been made by the Civil Service Commission since the coming into effect of the Civil Service Act of 1918?
2. What number have been made by the Pension Commissioners?
3. How many of these positions have been given to returned soldiers who have served in the actual theatre of war, and how many to men who have not?
4. What are the aggregate and average salaries attached to the positions mentioned in questions 2 and 3?

Mr. CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. 193.

2. 8, all approved by the Civil Service Commission.

3. 190 returned soldiers (zone of service not available); 11 civilians.

4. Question 4, aggregate $23,600, average $2,700; Question 3, aggregate, $309,800, average $1,630.52.

QUEBEC ORIENTAL RAILWAY.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Are negotiations pending for the acquisition by purchase, lease or otherwise, of the Quebec Oriental Railway and the Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway as feeders and branches of the Canadian National Railways?
2. If so, with whom are these negotiations carried on?
3. Has any decision been arrived at? If so, what is it?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.

BOARD OF INTERNAL ECONOMY.

*Mr. BUREAU:

1. Did the Board of Internal Economy meet during the last session, or at any time since the beginning of the present parliament?
2. If so, why have not the minutes of these meetings been laid on the table of the House, as prescribed by Rule 9 of the rules of this House?
3. Is it the intention of the Speaker to lay them on the Table in the near future?
4. If the Board of Internal Economy has not yet met, what are the reasons?

Mr. SPEAKER:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. Partly because the bulk of the business of the commissioners was in connection with the staff of the House, matters now almost altogether in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, partly because no important matter arose to be dealt with, and partly because the pressure of business upon the ministers in consequence of the war has been very heavy, and the Speaker did not feel justified in calling the commissioners together except for very important business.

I have to thank the hon. member for calling my attention to Rule 9 of the House, as there was a meeting of the commissioners in February, 1917, which should have been reported to the House last session. My attention had not previously been drawn to the rule, and so, by inadvertence, the necessary report was not made. I now, however, lay the report upon the Table.

INTERCOLONIAL PENSION FUND.

* Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Has the Honourable the Minister of Railways received applications, petitions or letters from the superannuated employees of the Intercolonial Railway between Montreal and Halifax for an increase of pension over their present allowance?
2. If so, is it the intention of the Honourable Minister, during the present session, to take favourable action upon such requests and grant increases respecting the minimum and maximum amounts of pension now granted?
3. Is the Honourable Minister aware that the present rates of pension respecting the minimum and maximum amounts granted are based upon salaries paid many years ago when the cost of living was much lower than at present?
4. If so, does the Honourable Minister propose to increase the contributional rates to pensions fund with a view to enable present and future pensioners to receive a reasonable allowance in keeping with present-day necessities?

Hon. J. D. REID:

1. Yes.

2. The Intercolonial Railway is now being operated as a part of the Canadian National Railway System. This matter will be considered and dealt with by the management of such system.

3. Yes.

4. Answered by No. 2.

STEAMSHIP HOCHELAGA.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Was the Steamship Hochelaga purchased by the Government during the period of the war?
2. If so, from whom?
3. What was the price paid?
4. Was the Hochelaga employed in connection with the Naval Service work?
5. What have the refit repairs to the "Hochelaga" cost each year since being purchased by the Government?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Randal Morgan.
3. Seventy thousand dollars ($70,000).
4. East Coast Patrol.
5. On purchase, $22,642.18; 115-16, $19,650.10; 1916-17, $10,214.29; 1917-18, $29,547.44.

CANADIAN OFFICERS IN GRAND FLEET.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Did any of the Royal Canadian Navy Officers, graduates of the Naval College of Canada, serve in the British Grand Fleet during the period of the war?
2. If so, how many?
3. Are these officers with the Grand Fleet at the present time?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to bring these officers back for duty in Canada?
5. Have any communications been exchanged with the Imperial authorities with regard to these officers?
6. Have the Imperial authorities signified their desire to have these officers remain with the Royal Navy?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Fifty.
3. Yes, except 7 (5 who lost their lives and 2 now serving in Canada).
4. When required.
5. Yes.
6. No communication has been received from the Admiralty on this point.

LIFE SAVING STATIONS.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. How many life saving stations in Canada are directly under the supervision of the Canadian Naval Service?
2. In what condition are these stations at the present time?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Twenty-nine.
2. These stations are regularly inspected and suitably maintained. At the present time many of them are closed down for the winter.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. During the first month of the war, August 1914, was the H.M.C.S. Canada despatched to a point off Glace Bay, N.S.?

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

2. If so, who gave to Canada the instructions to proceed to this point?
3. Was the Ottawa Naval authorities informed of any trouble at Glace Bay at that time?
4. If so, what was the nature of the trouble?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Department of the Naval Service.
3. No.
4. Answered by No. 3.

H.M.C.S. CANADA.

Mr. DUFF:

Referring to the Report of the Auditor General, 1916-17, page ZZ 262, item of expenditure charged to H.M.C.S. Canada paid through the High Commissioner for Canada, British Admiralty, Welsh coal at $8.45 per ton —$561.41.

1. From whom was this coal purchased?
2. When was it received on board the Canada?
3. At what port was it received?
4. Who negotiated for the purchase of this coal?
5. Who signed vouchers for its receipt?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1, 2, 3, 4. This coal was not specially purchased for the "Canada," but was drawn from the large stock of Welsh coal maintained in Halifax dockyard by the Admiralty for the use of their own cruisers calling at that port. The issue price was the Admiralty contract price plus freight to Halifax and handling costs. The superintendent of the dockyard authorized the issue for special duties to be performed. The date of issue was June 28th, 1915.

5. Alfred Ross, engineer.

NEWFOUNDLAND RATINGS IN NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. At any time during 1917 and 1918 were any Newfoundland R.N.R. ratings serving in the Canadian Naval Service?
2. If so, how many?
3. Why were they taken in preference to Canadians?
4. Were these Newfoundland ratings, while serving in the Canadian Navy paid Imperial rates of pay?
5. Did they at any time receive Canadian rates of pay?
6. If so, when?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. 188.
3. They were not taken in preference to Canadians but were entered at the same time as the Canadian ratings to make up the required number of trained men.
4. No.

5 and 6. While serving in the Canadian Navy they were paid Canadian rates of pay.

PROCLAMATIONS BY SIR ARTHUR CURRIE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. How many proclamations were issued by General Sir Arthur Currie to the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force and to the people of Canada during the year 1917?
2. How much has been expended by the Government to have these proclamations cabled to Canada?
3. How much has been expended for their publication in Canada?

Major-General MEWBURN:

The following cable has been received from the Overseas Minister of Militia and Defence:—

Your 1964 Proclamation. General Currie states answer to first question is None. Second question is answered by Number One. Third question answered by Number One.

NAVAL COURTS MARTIAL.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Since the outbreak of hostilities how many courts martial have been held in connection with the Canadian Naval Service?
2. How many Canadian Naval Officers have either presided or attended as members of the court at these courts martial?
3. At what time and at what place were said proceedings held?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Eighteen.
2. At 15 Courts held in Canada one Canadian officer sat as President and four other Canadian officers sat as members on each Court.
3. At Davenport, Eng., 14tn Jan., and 6th May, 1918; at Halifax, N.S., in 1918, 8th May, 12th June, 25th August, 25th September (2); 4th October, 18th December; in 1919, 29th January, 30th January, 31st January, 4th February. At Sydney, N.S., 6th August, 15th August, 15th September, 31st October, 1918. At Bermuda, 18th November, 1918.

INCREASES OF PAY IN CANADIAN NAVY.

Mr. DUFF:

1. In view of the fact that officers and men in the British Navy have recently received a substantial increase of pay, is it the intention of the Canadian Naval Department to correspondingly increase the pay of the officers and men serving in the Canadian Naval Service?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: The matter is now under consideration.

CANADIAN SEAMEN AND PRIZE MONEY.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Do the officers and men who have served or are now serving in the Canadian Naval Service participate in all prize money the same as officers and men serving in the Royal Navy?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes.

BOYS IN CANADIAN NAVY.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Are there any boys now undergoing training in the Canadian Navy Service?
2. If so, how many?
3. Where are they undergoing this training?
4. What rate of pay are they receiving per diem?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Eighty-three.
3. H.M.C.S. Shearwater, on the Atlantic coast.
4. Fifty cents per diem.

CANADIAN VESSELS IN ACTION.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Have any of the vessels of the Canadian Naval Service ever been in action?
2. If so, when and where?
3. Did the steamer Hochelaga during the month of August, 1918, sight or believe she sighted an enemy submarine?
4. If so, what was the action of her commanding officer?
5. Was the commanding officer tried by court martial?
6. If so, under what charge?
7. Was he dismissed from the service in disgrace?
8. If so, was any additional punishment meted out to him?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Yes, on 25th August, 1918.
4. He altered course and steered towards his senior Officer's ship.
5. Yes.
6. That he did not from negligence or other default, on sight of a ship of the enemy which it was his duty to engage, use his utmost exertions to bring his ship into action.
7. He was dismissed His Majesty's service by sentence of court-martial.
8. No, the Naval authorities have no power over an officer when he has been dismissed the service.

MR. J. K. FORAN.

Mr. HOCKEN:

1. Is there a person employed in the House of Commons named J. K. Foran?
2. If so, how long has he been in the employ of the Government?
3. What is his salary or other remuneration?
4. How many days was he present at his office duties between 15th October, 1917, and 20th February, 1919?
5. If absent, did his pay go on during his absence, and what was the cause of his absence?
6. Is the above J. K. Foran the party who organized the Sein Fein meeting in Montreal on the 9th February, and took the chair at the said meeting?

7. If the allegations in question No. 6 are true, what is the Government going to do in the matter, seeing that the above meeting was of a rebel character?

Mr. SPEAKER:

1. Yes.

2. Since June 1, 1902, permanently.

3. $2,800 per annum.

4. There is no record showing the exact number of days, but he was absent most of the time during the session of 1918.

5. Yes. Leave of absence was granted him on account of illness of his wife and two children and the state of his own health in consequence.

6. He did not organize the meeting but he was chairman.

7. The Government has not considered the matter, but as soon as I saw the newspaper accounts of the meeting I expressed very strong disapproval of any officer in the employment of the House taking an active part in any meeting which could be considered as of a political character, and directed that Dr. Foran should be at once ordered to resume his official duties. The matter will be considered at the first meeting that is held of the Board of Internal Economy of the House.

In justice to the official who is the subject of the question, I feel that a letter which he has written, addressed to myself, ought to be in possession of the House. It is somewhat lengthy, and perhaps not of such importance as to call for its publication in Hansard; I therefore lay it on the Table.

COMMANDERS THURSTON AND SEDDON.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. During the summer of 1917, were Flight Commander Thurston and Wing Commander Seddon, of the Royal Navy Air Force, detached to Canada with two baby seaplanes and entire equipment for the purpose of protection duty in Canada?

2. If so, by whom were these two officers sent?

3. Were they sent at the request of the Canadian Naval Service?

4. Did the Canadian Naval Department utilize their service?

5. If not, why?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. These officers were sent to Canada in March, 1917, to advise as regards a seaplane service in Canada. No information is available as to what equipment they brought with them.

2. By the British Admiralty.

Nos. 3, 4 and 5. Yes.

[Mr. Hocken.]

SERVICE OF CANADIAN NAVAL RATINGS.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. At any time during the war, did the Government of Canada make any requests to the British Admiralty to be allowed to send Canadian naval ratings to serve in the British Grand Fleet?

2. Did the Government attempt to disband the Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserves at Esquimalt shortly after the outbreak of hostilities in 1914?

3. Did the Government disband a company of R.N.C.V.R. in the city of Quebec shortly after the outbreak of hostilities in 1914?

4. If so, what officer gave the instructions for the disbandment of these reserves?

5. On whose instructions was the officer acting?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. In the spring of 1916, Imperial authorities suggested that recruiting be carried on in Canada for service in the British Navy. The British Admiralty sent Captain the Hon. Rupert Guinness to Canada in charge of a recruiting party. As it was not feasible to recruit for entry in the Royal Navy owing to different rates of pay in the Imperial and Canadian services, an agreement was arrived at whereby a division of the R.N.C.V.R. should be recruited for Overseas Service to form a part of the total forces that Canada proposed to put on active service in the war. Captain Guinness delivered addresses at different points throughout Canada for the purpose of stimulating recruiting. Between the spring of 1916, and December, 1917, 1,715 men were enrolled in the R.N.C.V.R. (Overseas Division).

Nos. 2, 3, 4 and 5. No.

STEAMER BAYFIELD.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has the Government a boat by the name of Bayfield?

2. If so, what department has control of this boat?

3. Was she at any time turned over to the Pilot Commission at Halifax, N.S.?

4. If so, on whose recommendations, and on what conditions?

5. Is the Bayfield now in commission?

6. If not, why?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. The ship is owned by the Department of the Naval Service.

3 and 4. The ship was loaned temporarily to the Marine Department in April, 1918, for pilotage duties at Halifax upon the request of the Marine Department.

5. No.

6. It is now at Halifax awaiting refit and is to be returned to the Naval Department

for service in the Great Lakes upon the opening of St. Lawrence navigation.

STEAMER HOCHELAGA.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. Did Lieutenant Jarvis, R.C.N., at any time during the war, make a report in regard to the condition of the steamer Hochelaga, purchased by the Government?

2. If so, is a copy of that report on file in the department?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1.

VOLUNTARY ENLISTMENTS MAY-DECEMBER, 1917.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

What were the total voluntary enlistments for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces during the months of May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December, 1917, respectively?

Major-General MEWBURN:

The total number of voluntary enlistments in Canada for the Canadian Expeditionary Forces during the months of May, June, July, August, September, October, November and December, 1917, were as follows:

May	6,406
June	6,314
July	3,871
August	3,110
September	3,512
October	4,871
November	4,012
December	3,909
	36,005

OYSTER CULTURE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Are there any indications that there will be, this year, an increase in Eastern Canada of the areas reserved for the artificial culture and cultivation of the oyster? If so, in what provinces?

2. Has any progress been made in this work lately and what has it consisted of?

3. Is the condition of the oyster industry in Canada deemed satisfactory at the present time?

4. Does the Government intend assisting it by new methods? If so, what is proposed to be done?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. The Department of the Naval Service has no information. By virtue of agreements made under the provisions of section 61 of the Fisheries Act, Chapter 8, of the Statutes of 1914, leases for the private culture or cultivation of oysters in the three Maritime Provinces are granted by the provincial authorities.

3. This is a matter of opinion and the Department of Naval Service does not wish to express an opinion on a subject which is controlled by the provincial authorities.

4. The Federal Government is not in a position to do more than assist by affording information and advice to those desiring it, and to prosecute investigations into the life history of the oyster, etc., which are being done.

FISHERIES JURISDICTION.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. What progress, if any, has been made since last session towards a final settlement of the questions of control of fisheries claimed by the Dominion and the provinces?

2. Is any legislation to be introduced this session on this subject?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. This question has been settled by the Privy Council decisions of 1898 and 1913 on Fishery References, except so far as the province of Quebec is concerned. It is expected that the appeal from the decision of the Court of King's Bench (appeal side) in the Quebec Fisheries Reference, will be heard by the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council during the next July session.

2. No.

LOBSTER HATCHERY, PORT DANIEL WEST.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Is the lobster hatchery at Port Daniel West, Quebec, to be operated this year? If not, why?

2. If so, who is to be placed in charge?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. No. Experience and investigation have shown that lobster hatching is not the best method of developing and maintaining the lobster fishery. Consequently all the lobster hatcheries have been closed.

EMPLOYEES ON GOVERNMENT VESSELS.

Mr. MARCIL:

(a) Is it the intention of the Government during the present session to accede to the request made to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries on April 6, 1914, in a memorandum relating to their salaries sent him by the captains, deck officers, wireless operators and engineers employed on the vessels operated by the Government. (b) And will such employees be brought under the operation of the Civil Service Act?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

(a) Since the receipt of the memorial in 1914 the salaries of nearly all the officers and crews of the steamers operated by the Marine Department have been increased. (b) It is not proposed to bring the crews of the ships under the operation of the Civil Service Act.

RESTIGOUCHE INDIAN RESERVE.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Has any application been made within the last twelve months for the purchase or

alienation of any portion of the Micmac reserve at Restigouche, Que.? If so, by whom?
2. Has any action been taken? If so, what is it?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.
2. No.

CIVIL SERVICE CLASSIFICATION.

Mr. MARCIL:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to lay on the table of the House, at an early date, the report of the classification of the civil service employees of the Dominion, made by the special commission appointed last year?
2. Is it the intention of the Government to give effect to the recommendations of the said Commission?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. It is anticipated that the report on classification of the civil service will be laid on the Table of the House during the Session.
2. The recommendations will be submitted to Parliament for approval.

M.S.A.—SOLDIERS IN ACTIVE SERVICE.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many soldiers enlisted under the provisions of the Military Service Act, 1917, were in active service in France before the signing of the armistice?
2. How many were killed or wounded?

Major General MEWBURN: 1 and 2. This information is not available.

OFFERS OF LAND TO GOVERNMENT.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Have any individuals or companies owning or holding land in Western Canada offered to sell same to the Government?
2. If so, what are the names of said companies and individuals?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The Department here has no information on the matter referred to. Presumably the information could be obtained by a very prolonged and laborious process of searching every office of the Department throughout the Dominion; but no record is kept in such form as would enable the information to be produced easily. Being at a loss to know of what service it would be at the present time, I would like to suggest to the questioner that perhaps if he has any specific case in mind he might put the question in that form, or not press the question further. It would mean considerable expense to obtain the information.

DEFAULTING RECRUITS.

Mr. LESAGE:

1. How much did the registration of the defaulting recruits cost per head in Military District No. 4, from January 20, 1918, to May 1, 1918?
2. To which Department of the Government was the control of such registration given?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

These questions are open to various interpretations. The term "defaulting recruits" may mean all apprehended unregistered defaulters of physique or apprehended unregistered defaulters of physique that warranted their being put and kept on military strength, or it may mean Group III. defaulters, that is, registrants who disobeyed Registrars' orders to report for duty. The expression "registration" of defaulting recruits is not understood. Does "registration" as used in this connection mean apprehension or does it mean the registration of registrants who later defaulted Registrars' orders? Does the term "cost" used in this query mean the cost of apprehension, that is, police cost, or is the enquiry for the total expenditure under the Military Service Act distributed per capita over the total number of "defaulting recruits"?

Part 2 of each question cannot be answered unless meaning of "registration" and "defaulting recruits" is defined.

SHIPS BUILT BY GOVERNMENT SINCE 1917.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What is the total number of ships built by the Government since 1917?
2. What is the total tonnage?
3. How many of these were steel ships?
4. What was the cost per ton?
5. How many were wooden ships?
6. What was their cost per ton?
7. Were they built by contract or day labour or on a percentage basis?
8. If by contract, what steps have the Government taken to prevent profiteering?
9. What steps have the Government taken to ascertain the total cost of labour for construction, total cost of material used, total overhead expenses, gross profit and net profit, respectively?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Has the hon. gentleman (Mr. J. F. REID) in mind an inquiry in respect of the ships now under construction as well as those that we have constructed?

Mr. J. F. REID: Yes.

Question stands.

BUILDING AT DORVAL.

Mr. LEDUC:

1. Has the Hon. the Minister of Public Works called for tenders for the erection of thirty-four buildings at Dorval, in the province of Quebec, of which one-third was to have been erected in sixty days and two-thirds in ninety days?
2. Has the Hon. Minister received any tenders therefor with cheques accompanying same amounting to ten per cent of cost, respecting said buildings?

3. If so, how many tenders were received, and what are the names of those who tendered?

4. Has the contract for such erection of buildings been given? If not, for what reason?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. Seven tenders were received as follows:

Quinlan & Robertson, Montreal.. ..	$389,000 00	
	*2 00	
The Atlas Construction Co., Montreal..	439,500 00	
	*1 38	
Russell-Navin Construction Co. Montreal..	439,700 00	
	*1 50	
The U. Pauze & fils Co. Montreal..	448,000 00	
	*1 25	
Bate, McMahon & Co., Ottawa...	455,427 00	
	*1 50	
The James Shearer Co., Montreal.	476,000 00	
	*1 25	
(Alternative offer of 5 per cent commission plus costs.)		
Leger, Charlton & White, Montreal.	557,471 52	
	*1 00	

*(Price per cubic yard for grading site.)

4. (a) No; (b) It was found that the buildings were not required.

FOOD BOARD REVENUES.

Mr. KAY:

How much money was collected through licenses issued by the Canada Food Board in 1918?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Amount collected, $366,261.69.

PENSIONS BOARD EMPLOYEES.

Mr. PREVOST:

1. Does the staff of the Military Pensions Board, for the District of Montreal, use the two official languages?

2. If so, how many of such staff can becomingly speak and write the French language?

3. If not, is it the intention of the Government to remedy the situation so as to enable the Board to furnish the information requested in French, and have better knowledge of the conditions which are of interest to the French-Canadian families, who very largely make up the population of the vast district where such Board has jurisdiction?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. Yes.

2. Total staff, 35. French-Canadian born, 16; English with a working knowledge of both languages, 14.

3. Answered by No. 2.

INCOME TAX EXEMPTIONS.

*Mr. PREVOST:

1. Has the Government received payments under the Income Tax from persons who are being paid superannuation pensions, namely, retired judges, magistrates or officials of any category?

2. If so, what were the amounts received from the judges of every jurisdiction?

3. What is the annual payment of each member of the Government, based upon salary received?

4. What amount has been received by the Finance Minister from each of such members?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Yes, to the extent to which they were legally liable.

2. Subsection 3 of section 27 of the Judges Act provides that,—"The salaries and retiring allowances or annuities shall be free and clear of all taxes and deductions whatsoever imposed under any Act of the Parliament of Canada."

3. The amount determined in accordance with the rates and exemptions provided for in the Income War Tax Act, 1917.

4. All members of the Government have paid the amount assessed against them with the exception of one who is overseas. In the case of another minister who has been ill it has not been possible to finally adjust and make the assessment owing to his illness.

WAR TAX ACT INCOME EXEMPTION.

*Mr. PREVOST:

1. Were any persons exempted, during the last fiscal year, from paying the income tax under the Act of 1917?

2. If so, who are such persons? What is their occupation and where do they reside?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Yes.

2. Section 5 of the Income War Tax Act, 1917, enumerates the persons whose incomes shall not be liable to taxation under that Act.

COAL USED BY GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. McKENZIE:

1. How many tons of American coal were used on the Government Railway east of Montreal during the year 1918, and what was the cost per ton?

2. How many tons of American coal were purchased and used by the Department of Marine and Fisheries east of Montreal during the year 1918, and what was the price paid per ton?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. To be answered by State Department.

2. The steam coal used by the Department of Marine and Fisheries during the year 1918, was purchased from the Dominion Coal Company, whose head office is at Glace Bay, N.S., and the Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Company, whose head office is at New Glasgow, N.S. The department has no information as to where the coal was mined.

Hon. Mr. REID: 1. 366,393 net tons American coal for the calendar year 1918, were

used on Government railways east of Montreal. Cannot give the exact cost of this coal per ton; but the railways purchased from companies 516,624 tons of coal at a total cost of $3,837,216.76, which will give average price per net ton $7.43 f.o.b. cars on line of Government railways, this price includes freight duty and war tax and cost of discharging from boats to cars at Levis.

FUEL CONTROL.

Hon. Mr. LEMIEUX:

Is it the intention of the Government to maintain the present commission on fuel control?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: No.

Mr. MARCIL: I would like to ask if copies of these answers are being supplied to members as formerly.

Mr. SPEAKER: As far as I am aware, I have not had my attention called to the fact that answers were not being supplied.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Mine are in duplicate.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: Mine also are in duplicate.

Mr. MARCIL: I am informed that two copies of the answers to questions are sent to the officers of the House. One copy is sent to Hansard; the other goes to the Votes and Proceedings Office, but none are furnished to members. It was the custom in past sessions to supply members with copies of answers given to questions. If this practice is carried out, answers will have to be prepared in triplicate instead of duplicate, for the reasons which I have given.

Mr. SPEAKER: I shall make inquiry, and if the custom that obtained heretofore is not being complied with, I shall endeavour to see that it is.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS DIRECTORS.

Mr. COPP:

1. How many persons comprise the Board of Directors of the Canadian National Railways, and what are their names?

2. When were said Directors appointed, and what were their respective occupations immediately prior to their appointment?

3. Where did said Directors reside immediately prior to their appointment, and where do they reside at present?

4. Do said Directors give their full time to work in connection with said railway? If not, in what other business are they engaged?

5. What salaries do they receive, respectively, as Directors of said railways?

6. Were said Directors appointed because of their experience in railway operation? If not, what qualifications were required?

7. How many assistants, secretaries, stenographers and other officials are attached to said Board of Directors and what are their respective salaries?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Board consists of eleven directors, as follows: D. B. Hanna, Major Graham A. Bell, A. J. Mitchell, E. R. Wood, Robert Hobson, F. P. Jones, R. T. Riley, C. M. Hamilton, Sir Hormisdas Laporte, Colonel Thomas Cantley, A. P. Barnhill.

2. D. B. Hanna, December 26th, 1914, railway official; Major Graham A. Bell, November 5th, 1916, assistant to Minister of Railways and Canals; A. J. Mitchell, September 6th, 1918, railway official; E. R. Wood, September 17th, 1916, banker and director various financial companies; Robert Hobson, September 17th, 1918, president Steel Company of Canada, etc.; F. P. Jones, September 17th, 1918, vice-chairman War Trade Board and vice-president Canada Cement Company; R. T. Riley, September 18th, 1918, financier and managing director Trust & Loan Companies; C. M. Hamilton, September 18th, 1918, farmer; Sir Hormisdas Laporte, November 22nd, 1918, chairman War Purchases Commission and Merchant; Colonel Thomas Cantley, November 22nd, 1918, chairman Nova Scotia Steel Company; A. P. Barnhill, November 22nd, 1918, barrister.

3. Residence of directors as follows: D. B. Hanna, Toronto; Major Graham A. Bell, Ottawa; A. J. Mitchell, Toronto; E. R. Wood, Toronto; Robert Hobson, Hamilton; F. P. Jones, Montreal; R. T. Riley, Winnipeg; C. M. Hamilton, McTaggart, Sask.; Sir Hormisdas Laporte, Montreal; Colonel Thomas Cantley, New Glasgow, N.S.; A. P. Barnhill, St. John, N.B. No change has been made in residence since appointments.

4. Directors with the exception of Messrs. Hanna and Mitchell do not give their full time to railway.

5. The directors receive no salaries as such, but receive an annual honorarium of two thousand dollars ($2,000) each.

6. Messrs. Bell, Hanna and Mitchell were appointed because of their long experience in railroad matters, but the others were appointed because of their wide experience in various financial and business enterprises.

7. There are no assistants, secretaries, stenographers or other officials attached to the Board of Directors.

BUILDINGS OCCUPIED IN TORONTO.

Mr. COPP:

1. What building or buildings, in the City of Toronto, are occupied by the officials of the Canadian National Railways?

2. What rental is being paid for such buildings?

Hon. Mr. REID:

No. 1.—

	Square Feet	Yearly Rental
Royal Bank Building, King and Yonge Sts.	6,250	$12,500.00
Wellington Buildings, 68-74 King St. E.	31,436	33,270.00
Royal Insurance Bldg., Wellington St. E.	7,216	2,800.00
Imperial Hotel Building, Adelaide St. E.	11,080	7,200.00
Canadian Northern Ry. Building, 1 Toronto St.	15,576	Owned by the Co.
Canadian Northern Ry. Building, 9 Toronto St.	18,440	" "
Express Building, Wellington St. East	9,030	" "

2. Answered by No. 1.

MR. FRANK GRIERSON.

Mr. LANG:

1. What position in the Civil Service is held by Frank Grierson?
2. When was he appointed to the service?
3. What are his duties?
4. How many hours per day does he work?
5. What salary does he receive?
6. What increases has he received, and when?
7. Is he President of the Civil Service Federation.

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Clerk.
2. 1st July, 1901.
3. Clerical.
4. Those prescribed by the Civil Service regulations.
5. $2,700.
6. Salary at appointment $800 per annum. 1st January, 1902, promoted to second class clerk at $1,100 per annum. 1st April, 1912, promoted to Division 1B at $2,100 per annum. In addition he received the usual statutory increases each year.
7. Yes.

NEWSPRINT CONTROL.

Mr. KAY:

1. What has been the total cost to the country, to date, of the Commission appointed to investigate the price of newsprint, presided over by Mr. R. A. Pringle?
2. Has the commissioner finished his investigation? If so, what has been his finding?
3. In what manner and to what extent has this investigation contributed to the winning of the war?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. The total cost to March 12, 1919, $75,945.26.
2. No. Various interim reports made from time to time all approved by the Governor General in Council.
3. It enabled the various newspapers to continue by regulating the supply and cost of paper thus making it possible for the Government to give greater publicity to the various war loans and other necessary measures.

COMMISSION TO SIBERIA.

Mr. ROBB:

1. Who are the members of the Canadian Economic Commission to Siberia?
2. What salary is paid to the chairman and members of said commission?
3. What allowance is made for travelling and other expenses of this commission?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Col. J. S. Dennis, chairman; Liaison Officer of the Canadian Siberian Expedition. C. F. Just, Chief Canadian Trade Commissioner in Russia. L. D. Wilgress, Canadian Trade Commissioner at Vladivostok. Ross Owen, Transportation Officer in Russia of the C.P.R. A. D. Braithwaite, late of the Bank of Montreal.
2. None; although Mr. Just receives $4,000 a year, and Mr. Wilgress $3,500 a year, as Canadian Trade Commissioners.
3. Such actual travelling expenses as may be incurred. Col. Dennis and Messrs. Owen and Braithwaite also received their actual living expenses.

COST OF REPATRIATION COMMITTEE.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What is the total cost to date of the work of the Repatriation Committee?
2. How many persons are employed in this work at the present time?
3. What is the total amount of salaries paid up to date in connection with this work?
4. What is the total amount paid for advertisements to date?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. The total cost to March 11, 1919, is $60,720.43.
2. Fifty.
3. $20,364.13.
4. $234. The committee's advertising account is not yet paid in full.

CANADA FOOD BOARD.

Mr. COPP.

What has been the total cost of the Food Controller and the Canada Food Board to date?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR: Total cost of the Food Controller, $131,143.34; total cost of the Canada Food Board to March 13, 1919, $569,417.93.

CONTRACTS TO SHIPBUILDING FIRMS.

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many shipyards are there in operation in Canada to-day?

2. What contracts did the Canadian Government let to the various shipbuilding plants, giving, (a) The date of contract; (b) The tonnage of the ships contracted for; (c) The amount paid per ton; (d) The date of delivery in each case; (e) The name of the ship; (f) When completed or to be completed?

3. Is the Government contemplating the letting out of other contracts to shipbuilding firms?

4. If so, what is the shipbuilding programme of Canada, present and future?

5. Have there been any restrictions imposed by the Canadian Government on the shipbuilders of Canada preventing them from contracting for other countries or other concerns than the Canadian Government?

6. If so, under what authority were these restrictions enacted, and what are they?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Nineteen steel shipyards, of which 13 are constructing vessels under the Government shipbuilding programme.

2. Attached schedule laid on the desk of the Clerk of the House.

3. Matter under consideration.

4. (a) Answered in No. 2 above, (b) answered in No. 3 above.

5. Yes.

6. By Order in Council 23rd January, 1915, prohibiting the exportation of vessels from Canada to all destinations, except to the United Kingdom, or any British possession.

ENLISTMENTS IN CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE.

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many people enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force: (a) Under the voluntary system; (b) Under the Military Service Act?

2. How many of these were British born and how many Canadian born?

3. How many British born members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force enlisted in each province: (a) Under the voluntary system; (b) Under the Military Service Act?

4. How many Canadian born members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force enlisted in each province: (a) Under the voluntary system; (b) Under the Military Service Act?

5. How many French Canadians enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force in each province: (a) Under the voluntary system; (b) Under the Military Service Act?

Major General MEWBURN:

1.The number who enlisted in the Canadian Expeditionary Force: (a) Under the Voluntary System, 465,984, (b) Under the Military Service Act, 83,355. In addition to the above, under the Military Service Act, there were:—1. On leave without pay under the Orders in Council relating to Compassionate and Hardship cases, or subsequently discharged, 24,933.—II. Struck off strength and returned to Records of Registrars appointed by the Military Service Branch of the Justice Department as liable only to non-combatant service (either as conscientious objectors or by reason of the War-time Elections Act), or as being of a category which ought not to have been ordered to report, 16,300.

2. British born, 228,751; Canadian born, 286,705.

3, 4 and 5. No attempt has been or is being made to maintain a record of the Canadian Expeditionary Force by nationality by provinces. To procure the information required to answer these questions, it would be necessary to scrutinize the records of every individual of the C.E.F.—a task which would entail the employment of an additional staff of some 200 clerks for about two weeks at night at a cost of approximately $5,000. The records so obtained would be inaccurate, inasmuch as the entire First Contingent was attested at Valcartier.

SHIPMENTS OF GOLD.

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many shipments of gold were made by the Canadian Government during the years 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919: (a) from the Canadian Treasury; (b) from the deposits held in trust by the Canadian Minister of Finance?

2. What were the respective dates, amounts and destinations of each shipment?

3. What was the reason of each shipment?

4. How many shipments of gold were received in this country during the same years, giving: (a) the date; (b) the amount, (c) the name of the shipper; (d) the purpose of the shipment; (e) the use to which it was applied?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: This question refers to the gold held in trust by the Minister of Finance for the Imperial Treasury. It is not in the public interest to give publicity to this information.

CIRCULATION AND RESERVE.

Mr. VIEN:

1. What was the amount of gold in reserve pertaining to the Dominion Exchequer, on the 1st March instant?

2. What was the amount of Dominion notes in circulation?

3. How much gold should be held in reserve by the Government in order to guarantee the Dominion notes that are in circulation?

4. Has the Government always held specie in reserve, as provided by law?

5. If not, for what reason?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. $121,062,418.15, of which $5,154,841.50 is held against deposits in Government savings banks and $115,907,576.65 against issue of Dominion Notes.

2. $306,405,399.

3. Of the total issue $136,528,000 is against approved securities under the Finance Act and $16,000,000 against Railway Securities under Cap. 4—Geo. V. Gold required to be held against balance of issue, 75 per cent= $115,408,049.25.

4. Yes.

5. Answered by Number 4.

CANADIAN TROOPS AT SANTA LUCIA.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. Has the Government given attention to the question of repatriating the Canadian garrisoned troops who are now at Santa Lucia, in the West Indies?

2. If so, about what date will they be repatriated?

Major General MEWBURN:

1. Yes. Attention has been given to the repatriation of troops composing St. Lucia Garrison. By an arrangement with the Imperial Authorities, this Garrison is to be taken over by details of the Royal Garrison Artillery, to be supplied from Jamaica.

2. The return of the Canadian troops composing this garrison was intended to have taken place at the commencement of the year, but on the advice of the Director General of Medical Services, it was decided to defer this movement until April or May, owing to the danger of bringing the men from a tropical climate to Canada during the winter months.

STEAMER PRINCESS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Has the Government disposed of the steamer Princess?

2. What is her gross and net tonnage?

3. How many tenders were received, from whom, and for what amount?

4. Whose tender was accepted?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. 542 gross tonnage; 252 net tonnage.

3. Six tenders were received as follows: Kirkwood & Sons, Toronto, $10,000; W. B. & W. J. Christie, Ottawa, $15,255; Great Lakes Transportation Co., Ltd., Midland, Ont., $26,250; A. A. LaRocque, Montreal, $35,000; The St. Lawrence Shipping & Trading Co., Quebec, $40,000; J. A. Farquhar, Halifax, $46,555. After tenders had been opened and considered a tender was received from La Compagnie d'Entreprises Publiques, Levis, at $61,000, conditional on the department granting them permission to transfer the vessel to a foreign flag.

4. The tender of J. A. Farquhar, being the highest received within the time specified was accepted.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT—REGISTRATION.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Are young men who now attain the age of nineteen years obliged to register under the provisions of the Military Service Act, 1917, as amended by Order in Council?

2. If not, since when has this registration been dispensed with?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.

2. December 16, 1918.

POPULATION LAST CENSUS AND TO-DAY.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What was the total population of Canada at the time of the last census?

2. What is the total estimated population of Canada to-day?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. 7,206,643.

2. 8,835,000.

GENERAL GUY CARLETON JONES.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. Is one General Guy Carleton Jones in the employ of the Canadian Government? If so, what are his duties?

2. Did the said officer visit Toronto a few months ago for the purpose of inspecting the Military hospitals there, and report everything in a satisfactory condition without being inside or inspecting the said hospitals?

3. If so, does the Government intend to continue the officer in his position?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes, he is the Officer in charge of Hospitalization under the Director General of Medical Services.

2. No.

3. It is the intention of the department to continue this officer in his position so long as his services are required.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES—PATIENTS IN ENGLAND.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. Are there any patients belonging to the Canadian Expeditionary Forces still in England? If so, how many?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to remove these to Canada? If so, when?

3. What provision has been made in Canada for receiving and treating the same?

4. Is it a fact that the St. Andrew's College, Toronto, is not to be fixed up for a military hospital?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes, on February 28, 1919, the number was 19,828.

2. Yes, they are arriving at the rate of about 1,500 per month, and this rate of return will be maintained.

3. There are 12,000 military beds available in the various military hospitals in Canada.
4. No.

PRINCESS PATRICIA'S REGIMENT.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Is the Princess Patricia's Regiment to be officially reviewed in Ottawa at an early date on its return?
2. Are members of that battalion, resident in Toronto, Montreal and points even more convenient to Ottawa, to be given the privilege of re-joining for the time being, their old battalion?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. There is to be no official "review," but the regiment will be inspected and addressed by His Excellency the Governor General, and a welcome will be given by the city authorities.
2. Yes.

CANADIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES—HALL STARRER.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Is Hall Starrar, of Spa Springs, Annapolis County, N.S., a member of any branch of the C.E.F. at present?
2. Was he ever at any time in such service?
3. At what date was he discharged and for what cause?
4. Was he ever called up for service under the Military Service Act?
5. If not, why?
6. Is he at present taking any course for returned soldiers at the expense of the Government?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. There is no record of any man of that name serving now or heretofore in the C.E.F.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. Answered by No. 1.
4. No record in the Militia Department.
5. No record in the Militia Department.
6. For Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Commission.

N.T.R.—CLAIMS FOR DAMAGES.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the Government paid out certain amounts to various persons in the Parishes of St. Anselme, Ste. Claire, St. Malachi and St. Isidore, in the County of Dorchester, for damages caused by construction, maintenance and repairs along the National Transcontinental Railway, during the year 1917?
2. If so, what amounts were paid, to whom, by whom, on what dates, and on what account?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2. Parish of St. Claire: Eugene Roger, Jan. 23, 1917, $150, damages by water and all other damages; Hilaire Roy, $1,000, damages and destruction of a bridge; Joseph More, $200, damages by water; Cleophas Boutin, $500, damages and destruction of bridges; Philibert Lamontagne, $200 damages by diversion of a ditch; Omer Garant, $100, damages by water; Nap. Laclerc, $400, damages caused by diversion of a ditch; Onesime Marceau, $250, damages by water; Joseph Leclerc, $150, damages by diversion of a ditch; F. X. Fournier, $375, damages by water. Parish of St. Isidore, Octave Fontaine, $650, damages for lack of farm crossing. Parish of St. Malachie, Jos. Beaulieu, $300, damages by flooding and destruction of bridge; Pierre Beaulieu, $100, damages by flooding and destruction of fence; Sol. Bilodeau, $100, damages by diversion of water. Parish of St. Anselme, nil.

GOVERNMENT STEAMER CHAMPLAIN.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Have the boilers of the Government steamer Champlain been duly examined and inspected this year?
2. If so, is it true that they have not been found in a good state and condition?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to substitute new boilers on the said steamer?
4. Why was this steamer taken suddenly from her route in the first week of the month of December last?

Hon. Mr. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. No.
4. For overhaul to put in good condition for winter service.

ISSUES OF DOMINION BILLS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

How many bills of $1, $2 and $4, respectively, have been issued within the last three years?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

One Dollar Bills.	Issued.	Cancelled and destroyed during same period.
Fiscal year 1915-16	$14,040,000	$13,134,612
Fiscal year 1916-17	14,860,000	13,963,343
Fiscal year 1917-18	14,828,000	13,847,050
Two Dollar Bills.		
Fiscal year 1915-16	$9,976,000	$9,180,939
Fiscal year 1916-17	11,312,000	10,359,892
Fiscal year 1917-18	11,936,000	10,871,283

Four Dollar Bills.
None issued during last three years.

NATURALIZATION OF ALIENS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many aliens received naturalization certificates during 1918?
2. How many people of German birth received naturalization certificates during 1918?
3. How many people of Austrian birth received naturalization certificates during 1918?
4. How many people of Russian birth received naturalization certificates during 1918?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. 189.
2. 1.
3. None.
4. 9.

STEAMER WILLIHAD.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Did the steamer Willihad clear from the port of Quebec in 1914? If so, on what date, and for what destination?
2. Where was this steamer registered?
3. Who were her owners at the date of such clearance?
4. What cargo did she have aboard?

Hon. Mr. REID (Grenville):

1. Steamer Willihad did not clear outward from the port of Quebec in 1914 but cleared from the port of Montreal on August 1, 1914, for Hamburg and Rotterdam via Portland, Boston and New York.
2. Hamburg.
3. North German Lloyd Company.
4. Flour, wheat, oil cake, barley and acetate lead.

CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. How many committees have been appointed by the Civil Service Commission during the past year?
2. For what purposes were said committees appointed and what was the personnel in each case?
3. Were the members of said committees paid for their services? If so, what amount per day in each case and what has been the total amount so paid?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Thirty-five.
2. (a) To act in an advisory capacity to the commission in the consideration of applications for positions advertised.

(b) The personnel in each case was as follows:

Assistant to Chairman, Public Archives—Prof. Wrong, University of Toronto; Dr. Doughty, C.M.G., Dominion Archivist, Ottawa; Hon. T. C. Chapais, Quebec; Professor C. C. Colby, McGill University, Montreal.

Assistant Director, War Purchasing Commission—Ralph Connable, Gen. Mgr. F. W. Woolworth Co., Toronto; F. W. French, Chief of Staff, Canada Food Board, Ottawa; Major George Stiff, S. A. and A. P. Branch, Departmeent of Militia, Ottawa.

Assistant Receivers General, Department of Finance—D. M. Finnie, Gen. Mgr., Bank of Ottawa, Ottawa; Tancrede Bienvenu, Gen. Mgr. and Vice-President, Provincial Bank of Canada, Montreal; J. C. Saunders, Asst. Deputy Minister of Finance, Ottawa.

Assistant Entomologist, Department of Agriculture—Dr. Gordon Hewitt, Dominion Entomologist, Ottawa.

Assistant Chief Engineer, Irrigation Branch, Department of the Interior—E. F. Drake, Superintendent of Irrigation Branch, Department of the Interior.

Ornithologist, Department of the Interior—Dr. Gordon Hewitt, Dominion Entomologist, Ottawa; R. M. Anderson, Dominion Zoologist, J. B. Harkin, Commissioner Dominion Parks Branch, Department of the Interior.

Motion Picture Editor, Department of Trade and Commerce—B. E. Norrish, Director of Exhibits and Publicity Branch, Department of Trade and Commerce; W. J. Sykes, Librarian, Carnegie Library, Ottawa. Jobson Paradis, Department of Mines, Ottawa.

Officer, Seed Branch, Department of Agriculture—George H. Clark, Seed Commissioner, Ottawa.

Photographer, Natural Resources and Intelligence Branch, Department of the Interior—F. C. C. Lynch, Superintendent Natural Resources and Intelligence Branch, Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

Still Photographer, Department of Trade and Commerce—Dr. Deville, Surveyor General, Ottawa. B. E. Norrish, Director Exhibits, and Publicity Branch, Department of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa; W. de C. Topley, Photographer, Ottawa.

Engineer, Hydrometric Survey, Department of the Interior—R. Bruce, Superintending Engineer, Ottawa river works, Ottawa. N. Cauchon, C. E., Ottawa. J. B. Challies, Superintendent Water Power Branch, Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

Chief Trade Instructor, Department of Justice—Professor Ramsay Traquair, McGill University, Montreal. Paul Beau, Beau & Beau, Metal Workers, Montreal. E. L. Wren, Bromsgrove Guild, Montreal.

Process Photographer, Topographical Surveys Branch, Department of the Interior—H. K. Carruthers, Photographer, Topographical Surveys Branch, Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

Clerk, Statistical and Research Branch, Department of Labour—R. H. Coats, Dominion Statistician; W. C. Clark, M. A., Ph. D., Kingston, Ont. Bryce M. Stewart, Editor, Labour Gazette, Department of Labour, Ottawa.

District Inspector, Forest Reserves, Saskatchewan, Department of the Interior—T. W. Dwight, Acting Director, Forestry Branch, Department of the Interior, Ottawa. Clyde Leavitt, Chief Forester, Commission of Conservation, Ottawa. A. Graham, Chief

Fire Inspector, Lower Ottawa Forest Protective Association, Ottawa.

Public Analyst, Trade and Commerce—Dr. McGill, Chief Analyst, Ottawa.

Laboratory Assistant, Department of the Interior—Dr. F. T. Shutt, Dominion Chemist; Dr. Hollingsworth, Chief Inspector of Foods and Medical Health Officer, Ottawa.

Assistant Engineer, Dorchester Penitentiary, Department of Justice—George Scott, Superintendent Electric Light Plant, Moncton, N. B.; J. Metcalf, Electrical Engineer, Moncton, N. B.; A. D. Pipes, Warden, Dorchester Penitentiary, Dorchester, N.B.

Assistant Engineer, B. C., Hydrometric Survey, Department of the Interior—J. M. Challies, C. E., Superintendent, Water Power Branch, Department of the Interior. John Murphy, Electrical Engineer, Department of Railways and Canals; Thos, Shanks, Assistant Surveyor, Gen. Topographical Surveys Branch, Department of the Interior, Ottawa.

Superintendent of Penitentaries, Department of Justice—Dr. C. K. Clark, Superintendent, General Hospital, Toronto. F. H. Chrysler, K. C., Ottawa. Dr. J. D. Page, Quebec. Surg. Gen. J. T. Fotheringham, Acting Director General, Medical Services, Ottawa. C. A. Macgrath, Fuel Controller, Ottawa.

Female Clerk, Department of Labour—R. H. Coats, Dominion Statistician. F. A. Jones, Principal, Normal School, Ottawa. M. J. Patton, Chief Editor, Commission of Conservation.

Indian Agent, Department of Indian Affairs—D. C. Scott, Deputy Superintendent General, Department of Indian Affairs. Dr. F. T. Shutt, Dominion Chemist. Dr. J. H. Putman, Inspector of Public Schools, Ottawa.

Superintendent Agricultural Instruction, Soldier Settlement Board—G. C. Creelman, B. S. A., L.L.D., President Ontario Agricultural College, Guelph, Ontario.

Two Agricultural Engineers, Department of the Interior—Professor Wm. Lochhead, B.A.M.Sc., Macdonald College, Quebec, J. H. Grisdale, D. Sc. A., Deputy Minister, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

Hydrometric Engineer, Department of the Interior—N. Cauchon, C.E., Ottawa; E. F. Drake, Superintendent Irrigation Branch, Department of the Interior, R. Bruce, Superintending Engineer, Ottawa river works, Ottawa.

Departmental Solicitor, Department of Public Works—Hon. Justice Audette, Ottawa; W. D. Hogg, K.C.; Ottawa; J. F. Orde, K.C., Ottawa.

Analyst, Halifax Laboratory, Department of Trade and Commerce—M. J. Connor, Chemist, Department of Mines; J. G. A. Valin, Assistant Analyst, Department of Inland Revenue; C. H. Robinson, Assistant Chemist, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

7 Pressfeeders, Printing Bureau—J. de L. Taché, King's Printer.

Assistant, Motion Picture Division, Department of Trade and Commerce—H. K. Carruthers, Chief Photographer, Topographical Surveys Branch, Department of the Interior; A. G. Pittaway, Photographer, Ottawa; B. E. Norrish, M.Sc., Director Exhibits and Publicity Branch, Department of Trade and Commerce, Ottawa.

Superintendent of Construction, Department of Public Works—J. A. Ewart, Architect, Ottawa; W. E. Noffke, Architect, Ottawa; J. P. McLaren, Architect, Ottawa.

French Assistant to Dominion Poultry Husbandman, Department of Agriculture—Dr. Robert Barnes, V.S., Chief Meat Inspector, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa; F. C. Elford, Dominion Poultry Husbandman; W. A. Brown, Poultry Specialist, Department of Agriculture, Ottawa.

Mechanician, Department of the Interior—Dr. Robert Klotz, Dominion Astronomer; Capt. R. J. Durley, Imperial Munitions Board, Ottawa; A. H. W. Cleave, Superintendent of the Royal Mint, Ottawa.

Publicity Agent, Department of Immigration and Colonization—Sir John Willison, Toronto; P. D. Ross, Editor, Ottawa Journal-Press; W. W. Cory, Deputy Minister, Department of the Interior; A. D. DeCelles, Parliamentary Librarian, Ottawa.

Two Assistant Engineers and one Fireman, Department of Justice—H. Chandler, Master Plumber, Ottawa; Paul Marchand, Electrician, Ottawa; R. A. Henry, Assistant Engineer, Department of Railways and Canals, Ottawa.

Engineer, B. C. Hydrometric Survey, Department of the Interior—C. F. X. Chaloner, Engineer in charge of Geodetic Levelling, Department of Public Works; W. E. Reid, Water Power Branch, Department of the Interior; R. C. F. Alexander, Assistant Engineer, Department of Railways and Canals, Ottawa.

Plumber, Government Buildings, Department of Public Works—John McKinley, Master Plumber, Ottawa; S. Doughtrey, Master Plumber, Ottawa; J. Shearer, Superintendent Public Buildings, Department of Public Works.

Eleven Superintendents and two Assistants, Department of Labour—Bryce M.

Stewart, Editor, Labour Gazette, Department of Labour; C. G. McNeil, Dominion Secretary, G.W.V.A., Ottawa; R. H. Coats, Dominion Statistician.

3. With one exception, no. Total amount paid, $70.

PRINCESS RADZIWELL.

Mr. JACOBS:

1. Is the Government aware that a woman, calling hersolf Princess Radziwell, is presently touring Western Canada delivering lectures, in which she charges Jews generally as being in alliance with the Bolsheviki?

2. Is the Government aware that the woman in question is a convicted felon, and served a term of imprisonment, at the time of the South African war, for forgery and attempted blackmail, and that her victim was the late Right Honourable Cecil Rhodes?

3. Is the Government aware that the delivery of lectures such as those mentioned above, in districts where Jews reside, is calculated to stir up strife and produce breaches of the peace?

4. Will the Government state why the woman in question was permitted by the Immigration authorities to enter Canada?

5. Does the Government intend to take steps for the expulsion from the country of this so-called princess, should the matters hereinbefore cited, after investigation, be found to be correct?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. No.

2. No.

3. No.

4. Information was received by the department on the 10th of January last that Princess Catherine Radziwell, accompanied by a maid, would apply for entry to Canada at Niagara Falls, with the object of lecturing under the direction of Ellison White Dominion Lyceum. It was stated that Princess Radziwell held a permit from the British Government. This information was conveyed to the Immigration Inspector-in-Charge at Niagara Falls, Ont., but so far as the department is aware, Princess Radziwell did not enter Canada at that port and there is no information available showing when or where Princess Radziwell entered Canada.

5. If Princess Radziwell is shown to have entered Canada illegally, or if, having entered, she is shown to have conducted herself in such a way as to bring her within any of the deportation provisions of the Immigration Act, her deportation will be considered.

STRIKES IN CANADA.

Mr. POWER:

1. How many strikes have there been in Canada during the year 1918?

2. How many men were involved?

3. How many working days were lost?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. 196.

2. 68,489, approximately.

3. 763,341, approximately.

GOBEIL-SIMARD INVESTIGATION.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Order of the House issued last session, on the 24th of April, 1918, for the production of copies of all documents and correspondence, concerning the Gobeil-Simard investigation, held before Mr. Justice Duff in December, 1917, in Ottawa, been complied with?

2. If not, why?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to lay before the House these documents at an early date this session?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. The papers may be laid on the Table to-day.

2 and 3. Answered by No. 1.

COLD STORAGE ON STEAMERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

How many steamers are furnished with cold storage apparatus?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: To what steamer does the hon. gentleman refer—Government steamers or privately owned vessels? If Government steamers, what department has the hon. gentleman in mind?

Mr. SPEAKER: Stands.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Toronto Globe for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Ottawa Journal for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Hamilton Spectator for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Ottawa Citizen for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Toronto Star for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Have the Canadian authorities been in supreme command of the Canadian Naval vessels since the outbreak of hostilities?

2. How many vessels comprised the Canadian Naval Service on December 31, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918, respectively?

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Toronto World for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many Canadian soldiers enlisted under the provisions of the Military Service Act 1917 are now in Siberia?

2. Did any of the said soldiers object to doing military service in Siberia?

3. If so, to whom were such objections referred?

4. What ruling was given upon said objections?

Mr. POWER:

1. Who are the officers employed on the Headquarters Staff of Military Districts Numbers 2, 3, 4, 6, 7, 10, 11, 12, and 13, respectively?

2. When was each appointed?

3. What are his particular qualifications for the position?

4. Has he seen service overseas (a) in England; (b) in France? If so, in what capacity, and with what battalion?

5. If he has not seen service overseas, for what reason is he retained in the position which he now occupies?

6. What are his pay and allowances per month?

7. What is his military record?

Mr. CANNON:

1. Who are the officers employed on the Headquarters Staff of Military District No. 1?

2. When was each appointed?

3. What are his particular qualifications for the position?

4. Has he seen service overseas (a) in England; (b) in France? If so, in what capacity and with what battalion?

5. If he has not seen service overseas, for what reason is he retained in the position which he now occupies?

6. What are his pay and allowances per month?

7. What is his military record?

*Mr. MURPHY:

1. Was a man named Cooke employed by the Immigration Branch of the Interior Department, or by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, during the past year?

2. If so, what were his duties, and what remuneration did he receive, or is he to receive?

3. Did the said Cooke, in the capacity of a Government employee, visit Immigration Offices and Immigration Officials in the West? If so, did he make any changes therein?

4. What changes were made, what are the names of the officials who were retired, given different positions, or newly employed?

5. Under what authority did the said Cooke perform the mission referred to?

[Mr. Deslauriers.]

6. Is the said Cooke still in the employ of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization? If so, what duties is he now performing?

7. Is the said Cooke the Sheriff of Regina?

Mr. MAYRAND:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Montreal Star for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. MAYRAND:

What amounts, if any, were paid by the Government to the Montreal Gazette for printing, advertising, job or other work, for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. MAYRAND:

What amounts, if any, were paid by the Government to the Winnipeg Telegram for printing, advertising, job or other work, for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. MAYRAND:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Manitoba Free Press for printing, advertising, job or other work, for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. PROULX:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Halifax Herald for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. PROULX:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Halifax Chronicle for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. PROULX:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Toronto News for printing, advertising, job or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. PROULX:

What amount, if any, was paid by the Government to the Toronto Mail and Empire for printing, advertising, job, or other work for each of the following five fiscal years: 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918?

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many of the men who enlisted under the Military Service Act are to-day still in service in Canada?

2. What number of these are from each military district?

Mr. VIEN:

1. How many Civil Servants, permanent or temporary, including the supernumeraries, were employed by the Department of Militia and Defence during the years 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918, giving the number per year: (a) At Ottawa; (b) At London, England?

2. How many officers of the Canadian Militia or the Canadian Expeditionary Force were em-

ployed by the Department of Militia and Defence during the same years: (a) At Ottawa; (b) At London, England?

3. How many officers, non-commissioned officers and men were employed by the same Department during the same years, in the Pay Branch: (a) At Ottawa; (b) At London, England?

4. How many Civil Servants were employed in the same branch during the same years: (a) At Ottawa; (b) At London?

Mr. VIEN:

1. What was the amount of the public debt of Canada on the 21st September, 1911?

2. What new loans were made by the Dominion of Canada since said date, indicating for each of said loans: (a) the date; (b) the amount; (c) the rate of interest; (d) the name of the place where such loan was floated; (e) the date of purchase; (f) the object for which said additional loans were made?

3. What was the amount of the public debt on the 10th March, 1919?

4. What was the result obtained through the last National Loan in Canada, indicating the amount subscribed in each Province?

5. Of the amount raised through the last National Loan, what sums were expended (a) for war purposes; (b) for other purposes?

6. How much did the floating of our last National Loan cost giving the figures in detail?

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many times was the Military Service Act, 1917, amended by Order in Council?

2. What are the dates and the numbers of the said Orders in Council?

Mr. PEDLOW:

1. How many propaganda publications are now issued by the Government, and what is the annual cost of each?

2. How many of these publications concern the Canadian soldiers at home and overseas?

3. What is the remuneration of their editors and how many of them are former journalists?

4. How many newspaper men are now employed by the Government in the various Departments arising out of the war, and what are their names and present salaries?

5. How many newspaper men are employed in the Publicity Department of the Repatriation Committee and Employment Committee, and what are their names and salaries?

6. Do any of them hold other positions outside the Government Service? If so, what are their names?

Mr. PEDLOW:

1. How much money has the Government spent during the last twelve months advertising in the daily and weekly papers and periodicals or magazines (a) in Canada, and (b) outside of Canada?

2. Did the Government pay a higher rate for this advertising than if they had placed it through the regular advertising agencies?

Mr. BOYCE:

1. What are the names and present addresses of the last three hundred appointees to the Inside Civil Service, whose appointments were made by the Civil Service Commission?

2. In what Department were they placed when appointed, and what is the salary paid in each case?

Mr. WALLACE:

1. How many medical officers are employed in Ontario who have not been overseas?

2. How many of these doctors hold the rank of Captain, and how many the rank of Major?

3. How many medical officers who have served overseas are junior to these officers?

4. How many officers who have been wounded are junior in Canada to men who signed up after these officers went overseas?

5. Is it the intention of the Militia Department to still subordinate medical officers who have served in France?

Mr. DUFF:

1. What amount has been paid the Bridgewater Bulletin, of Bridgewater, Nova Scotia, for advertising since January 1, 1912?

2. What amount has been paid the Daily and Weekly News, of Lunenburg, Nova Scotia, for advertising since January 1, 1912?

Mr. DUFF:

1. What was the cost to the Government for advertising and printing in connection with the Victory Loan of 1917, giving amounts for advertising and printing separately?

2. What was the cost to the Government for advertising and printing in connection with the Victory Loan of 1918, giving amounts for advertising and printing separately?

3. What amount was paid in commissions in connection with said loans for 1917 and 1918?

4. What was the total cost in connection with the campaign for the said Victory Loans of 1197 and 1918?

Mr. BLAKE:

1. What was the total number of men recruited during the war, combatants and non-combatants, (a) in the whole of Canada; (b) in each province?

2. What was the total number of men recruited during the war in Canada, (a) as per nationality; (b) as per religion; (c) as per nationality provincially; and (d) as per religion provincially?

3. What was the total number of men defranchised in Canada, (a) in the whole of Canada; (b) in each province?

4. What was the total number of men and women engaged in war work, (a) in Canada; (b) in each province?

UNOPPOSED AND UNDISCUSSED MOTIONS.

Mr. STEVENS:

Copy of all correspondence between the Minister of Trade and Commerce or any officials of the Government and the Board of Grain Supervisors and Board of Grain Commissioners regarding the commandeering of wheat in 1916, and a copy of the Order in Council authorizing same.

Mr. STEVENS:

Copy of the Order in Council authorizing the Board of Grain Commissioners to investigate county and public terminal elevators, transportation, etc., of Canadian grain, and also a copy of all correspondence, letters and telegrams referring to same.

Mr. STEVENS:

Copy of the Order in Council authorizing the audit of public terminal elevators and copy of the Auditor's report.

Mr. STEVENS:

Copy of the Order in Council instructing the Board of Grain Commissioners to investigate the commandeering of Canadian grain and all settlements or adjustments connected therewith.

Mr. STEVENS:

Copy of the Order in Council appointing the Board of Grain Supervisors for Canada.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

Return showing the names and post office addresses of all postmasters appointed in the Province of Nova Scotia since June 1, 1917, along with a copy of all correspondence with the Post Office Department or with the Civil Service Commission relating to such appointments.

Mr. STEVENS:

Copy of a memorial submitted by Dr. McGill, Secretary of the Winnipeg Grain Exchange, to the Right Honourable Sir George E. Foster, Minister of Trade and Commerce, setting forth some reasons for the appointment of a Board of Grain Supervisors, which was later given effect by Order in Council.

Mr. McMASTER:

Copy of all correspondence had between the Customs Department and the Customs House authorities at the port of Sutton-Abercorn touching the dismissal of William Lassonde.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

Return showing the names, post office addresses, length of service, date of appointment, and yearly remuneration of all fishery guardians in the Province of Nova Scotia, along with a list of the names of the parties by whom the said guardians were recommended.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

Return showing the names and home post office addresses and date of appointment of all employees of the Department of Railways and Canals engaged in the ferry boats or otherwise connected with the transfer service on the Straits of Canso; and also, a copy of all correspondence in the possession of the said Department, or in possession of the Civil Service Commission, relating to the appointment of the said employees.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

Return showing the age, names, tonnage, port of registry, ownership, rate of speed, original purchase price, and in separate columns the gross amount paid each owner under each separate charter, and also separately, the cost of repairs of all vessels and boats of every description, chartered, purchased or built by or on behalf of the Government, for purposes connected with naval or coastal defence since August 4, 1914.

[Mr. Stevens.]

Mr. TOBIN:

Return showing the number of boats rented, loaned or chartered by the Naval Department during the period of the war, giving the name of each boat, from whom it was purchased, rented, loaned or chartered, the purchase price or the rental paid, and the total expense for refits and upkeep for each boat, and on what service employed while in the service of the Navy Department.

Mr. TOBIN:

Copy of the Marconi Wireless Company's contract with the Department of Naval Service, showing the date the contract was made and signed.

Mr. KAY.

Copy of all correspondence, letters and other documents exchanged between the Government or any Department or Commission thereof and Lieutenant Commander J. K. L. Ross, relating to appointments to the staff of the Board of Pension Commissioners, by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. PROULX:

For a return showing the names of all persons employed up to March 1, 1919, in connection with the work of the Repatriation Committee, giving the class of work each person is doing, their salary or wages, the living or other expenses paid, and the former occupation of each person, along with a statement showing what other work, if any, said persons are employed in.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

Copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions and other documents in any way referring to a proposed mail route from Eden Siding to Marble Mountain, Inverness County, N.S.

Mr. STEVENS:

Copy of all correspondence between the Militia Department and C. N. Davidson, of Vancouver, having reference to the illness and death of Pte. Davidson, Cadet Pilot, No. 173757, at Toronto, and also correspondence with the officer i/c Records, R.A.F., Toronto; also copies of evidence and findings of coroner's inquest in the death of said Pte. Davidson.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

Copy of all papers and correspondence regarding the Commissions granted to Canadian officers during the present war.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

Return showing the total cost and general expenses of the 1918 Victory Loan, including detailed statements of the amounts paid to brokers, banks, newspapers, advertising agencies, and all other persons, corporations, firms and agencies to whom payments were made, giving the names of such persons, banks, newspapers, agencies or firms in each case.

Mr. BLAKE:

Copy of all letters, telegrams and other documents exchanged between any Department of the Government and any person or persons, relative to charges of sedition made against Bishop Budka, of Winnipeg.

Mr. STEELE:

Copy of all correspondence during the year 1918 between the Government or any member thereof and representatives of the Inside Civil Service relating to increased remuneration for Civil Servants.

WIRELESS ON GOVERNMENT STEAMERS.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome) moved for a copy of all papers and correspondence concerning the installation of wireless equipment upon the steamers built or to be built for the Government, as well as a copy of all tenders submitted and contracts executed in that connection. He said: It has been suggested to me that I should amend this motion as it would cause too much inconvenience in the preparation of the information asked for in its present form. I am willing to amend the motion by adding the words "since 4th August, 1914," if I am in order in so doing.

Mr. SPEAKER: There cannot be any objection to the resolution being so amended.

Motion as amended agreed to.

VESSELS ENGAGED BY GOVERNMENT.

Mr. TOBIN moved for a return showing the number of boats rented, loaned or chartered by the Naval Department during the period of the war, giving the name of each boat, from whom it was purchased, rented, loaned or chartered, the purchase price or the rental paid, and the total expense for refits and upkeep for each boat, and on what service employed while in the service of the Navy Department.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: I should like to ask my hon. friend if he would be content to have his motion combined with the one moved by the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair). They really cover the same ground, although strictly speaking, the present motion asks for some additional information.

Mr. TOBIN: I am quite satisfied for that to be done.

Mr. SPEAKER: The information brought down will be in answer to both the motions combined.

MAGDALEN ISLANDS AND PICTOU STEAMSHIP SERVICE.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve and Gaspé) moved:

For a copy of all correspondence, petitions and other papers concerning the steamer service between Magdalen Islands and Pictou, N.S.

He said: We are peculiarly situated in the county of Gaspé, which comprises the peninsula on the Baie des Chaleurs and the river St. Lawrence and also the Magdalen Islands in the Gulf of St. Lawrence, about one hundred miles from the coast. The Magdalen Islands were, in former years, served by a steamer running between Pictou and the islands, touching en route at two or three ports of Prince Edward Island. Twenty years ago we had a weekly service, and I had that service changed into a semi-weekly one. For many years we had an excellent steamer—I forget the name now,—for passengers, mails, and freight. At the beginning of the war the steamer was chartered by another company and was, I think, finally sold to the British Government. There is, on the Magdalen Islands, a very interesting fishing population, comprising about 7,000 people who are living and prospering there. Since the war began the service has unfortunately been exceedingly bad. I do not wish to blame the Government at all for the steamer service to the islands since the outbreak of the war, because the Government called for tenders and had to accept whatever boat was offered. During the winter season, which begins generally around Christmas, and continues until the end of March or the beginning of April, there is no navigation between the mainland and the Magdalen Islands. It is, therefore, important that during the early spring, the summer months, and the fall of the year, there should be a regular service of the best kind for that population of 7,000 Canadians.

During the last four years it is regrettable, but it is not the fault of the Government, that the islanders have had practically no steamer service. A very small boat was put on the route, but it was not of sufficient capacity to transport the freight and the passengers. So much was that the case that I had to appeal every year to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to be so good as to divert from its service the steamer Stanley, a good ice-breaker, or the steamer Laurentian. And I must offer my sincere thanks to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries who, last year and this year, was kind enough to send the Stanley and the Laurentian, much to the advantage of those islanders. During the last fall, on account of the influenza which broke out on the Magdalen Islands, the situation was very difficult and awkward. I, therefore, appealed to the Minister of Marine and Fisheries and he sent on board one of his steamers, doctors and nurses, and also a supply of medicine. Even during that time the regular service was maintained, but it is such a poor service that it is of no ad-

vantage at all to the islands. Many articles of consumption are imported into the Magdalen Islands from parts of Canada, chiefly from Nova Scotia, New Brunswick and Prince Edward Island. When there is a poor steamer service, as there has been during the last four years, the Government must rush to their rescue, and during the two or three weeks before Christmas, the Stanley or the Laurentian has to make several hurried trips, and even then at times, on account of weather conditions, the goods cannot be landed. Therefore, having conferred with the leaders on the islands, I have come to the conclusion that it is time for the Government to give to the islanders a steamer service controlled by the Government themselves. I do not believe in privately-owned steamers. A large subsidy is paid for the carriage of the mails, and there is general dissatisfaction as to the way in which those private owners conduct the service. That has been the case during the twenty years I have had the honour to represent the islands. I would ask the Government to treat the Magdalen islands, with their population of 7,000 people, as they treat Prince Edward Island. There is a regular service between Prince Edward Island and New Brunswick, and the Government could well afford to put a steamer on the route between Pictou and Magdalen Islands.

I have not the figures before me, but the islanders are great producers in this sense that they are splendid fishermen, and the best fish of the Dominion comes from Magdalen Islands. The Government should take into consideration the fact that during several months of the year the islands have no communication whatsoever with the mainland, and, during the season of navigation the best service should be given to those taxpayers. I appeal to the acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Maclean) again to put the Stanley or the Laurentian on the route, because I have received from the warden of the county, Mr. Gaudet, a telegram which I have referred to the deputy minister. On the 8th of March last, this telegram was sent to me:

3 p.m.

Have wired O'Hara—

The Deputy Minister of Trade and Commerce.

—to-day as follows referring yours fourth instant. Delay in collecting freight was caused by goods having been landed at different points of these islands other than their intended destiation and the difficulties of communication from one island to another at that particular season. The goods have not yet all been delivered, but people are paying their freight in the regular manner as they get delivery of their goods. I can definitely state this to be true as I am the freight agent at Amherst Island notwithstanding any report you may have received. The trip of the Stanley is urgently required and there would be no justification for your department to refuse sending her for reason quoted. Therefore our request being so much needed we hope to have a prompt and favourable answer. Please use every effort to have Stanley sent down.

(Sgd) A. J. Gaudet,
Warden.

I have received ten such telegrams from the different merchants and business men of the Islands. Surely, it is not fair to exclude these seven thousand people from the favours of the Government. They should have good and frequent communication with the mainland, as early as possible in the spring. We are unable to get an ice-breaker for the Islands, as the Stanley is in the Government service. I trust that the Government will do for the people of Magdalen Islands what they are doing for the people on the north shore below Quebec. I spend the summer at Murray Bay every year, travelling by the Intercolonial to Rivière Quelle; and from there an excellent service is provided by the steamer Champlain which plies between the north and the south the whole year round. I think it would be an easy matter for the Government to put one of their best steamers on the service between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands. I would again urge upon the Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries the absolute necessity of sending the steamer Stanley at the earliest possible moment to carry the goods which were left last fall on the wharves at Pictou, and to distribute the freight among the different ports of the Islands.

Mr. JAMES McISAAC (Kings, P.E.I.): I am interested in this particular service, as it touches two ports in my riding. It is a very important service, as a considerable amount of business is done on this route, particularly between Prince Edward Island and the Magdalen Islands, and between Pictou and Prince Edward Island. Prior to the war there was an excellent steamer on this route, but during the war the Government have not been able to provide us with a suitable boat. Last year the Enterprise, a small steamer which had formerly plied between Pictou, Georgetown, and Murray Harbour, was put on this route, but she was too small for the service. The Government also sent the Stanley in winter time, and she certainly did wonderful work. I am glad the hon. member for Maisonneuve

(Mr. Lemieux) has brought this matter up, and I trust the Government will provide the people of the Islands this year with a suitable boat large enough for the business. There are ports other than those of the Magdalen Islands which would be served by such a steamer. The service is of very great importance, indeed.

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: I am sorry I am not at the moment in possession of such facts as would enable me to inform the mover of the resolution (Mr. Lemieux) as to the probable service that will be provided this season between Pictou and the Magdalen Islands. Of course, no objection whatever can be taken to his statement that this is an important route. During the war the subsidized coastal steamship services have been very much demoralized, and it has been impossible to keep them up to normal. I trust, however, that in the near future the services will be restored to something like their pre-war standard. There is generally considerable difficulty in the spring and fall of the year in securing suitable boats to carry to the Magdalen Islands the freight required at those particular seasons. It is also true that a great deal of the difficulty is due to the fact that the merchants of the Magdalen Islands postpone until a very late date getting in their goods; but I suppose there may be a very good answer to that from their standpoint.

Let me say on behalf of the Department of Trade and Commerce that we are very heartily in sympathy with the observations made by the mover of the resolution, and we shall do everything possible to give a proper service between Pictou and the Islands. I shall be very glad to confer with the hon. member privately with respect to this matter. I know that there has been a request for the steamer Stanley or some similar boat to convey certain goods from the mainland of Nova Scotia to the Magdalen Islands, the goods consisting chiefly of fishermen's supplies which will be required for their fishing operations in the course of the next few weeks. The Department of Marine and Fisheries and the Department of Trade and Commerce are doing everything possible to meet this request of the people of the Magdalen Islands. I assure my hon. friend we shall give this matter constant attention, and if at all possible this request will be complied with.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I must thank the minister for his sympathetic hearing of my request. The Islanders, as I stated a moment ago, are very grateful for what the department has done during the last two or three years. For the present I shall content myself with urging upon my hon. friend the necessity of providing a boat early this month to relieve the present situation. Will the department or the Government also consider favourably the suggestion I have made that in order to obviate difficulties in the future they undertake that service themselves, as they do between Prince Edward Island and the mainland. I think that would be the only satisfactory thing to do for that population.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think there is a great deal to say in favour of the suggestion of my hon. friend and between now and the time when the Supplementary Estimates are before the House possibly I may have an opportunity to give fuller consideration to the suggestion.

Motion agreed to.

REPRESENTATION ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Mr. Stacey, Bill No. 2, to amend the Representation Act of 1914, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand the hon. member in whose name the Bill stands is not present. I do not think we should proceed with the Bill until he is present, and I therefore beg to move that the committee rise and report progress, and ask leave to sit again.

Progress reported.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 3, to amend the Railway Belt Act.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Bill No. 4, to amend the Yukon Act.—Hon. Mr. Calder.

Bill No. 16, to amend the Statistics Act.—Hon. A. K. MACLEAN.

SEED GRAIN—SECURITY FOR LOANS.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

That it is expedient to make provisions respecting advances for the purchase of seed grain, and to provide, on such terms and conditions as may be agreed on with any bank advancing moneys for the purchase of seed grain, that a guarantee by the Crown may be given to the said bank for the payment of the principal sum of such advances and interest

thereon at five per centum per annum; and that upon payment of the principal sum, or any part thereof remaining unpaid, the security held by the bank shall be endorsed to the Minister; and further, to prescribe the nature of the security to be taken for loans, the rate of interest thereon and date of payment thereof, the form of application for loans, and the officials to whom application is to be made and by whom the application shall be verified and approved, the commission to be paid to the banks, and such other provisions as may be necessary for the better securing of the advances.

Mr. McKENZIE: We should have a very full explanation from the minister of the necessity for this action on the part of the Government and the steps that they propose to take in connection with it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Chairman, hitherto, and for many years, the Department of the Interior has advanced moneys which were essential in necessitous cases to the holders of unpatented lands for seed grain purposes. In each case they have taken security on the unpatented land which was still in their possession; that is to say, on the Government title which the entrant had not yet earned. In the year 1915 the Dominion Government was compelled to extend its activity in seed grain distribution to the holders of patented lands as well taking in that case the same security upon the title under the authority of the provincial legislature. When the subject had to be attacked for the year 1919, it was my desire that the Government of Canada should confine its responsibility to unpatented lands only and that the responsibility for providing seed with regard to patented lands should rest upon the local or provincial authorities. At a conference of the representatives of the Governments affected an arrangement to that end was made. Thereupon, we being concerned only with unpatented lands, it occurred to us that a better arrangement could be made by co-operation with the banks for the distribution of this seed grain and particularly for the collection of the returns, than under the system which had hitherto prevailed whereby we advanced the money ourselves and took the means and the responsibility of collection. Consequently an Order in Council was put through ratifying an agreement which was to the effect that wherever seed grain was necessary on unpatented lands, the homesteader would make application to the agent of Dominion Lands within whose district his homestead lay. The agent of Dominion Lands, if necessary, would send a homestead inspector to ascertain the facts. If it was not deemed necessary he would certify without such investigation. Upon his certificate being presented to the bank as to the amount required and the character of each grade, certifying such requisites as the form prescribed, the bank was authorized to advance to the homesteader the money and take his note and a seed grain lien in accordance with the Bank Act as security therefor. The Government guaranteed the bank that the money so advanced would be returned with interest at five per cent. The note itself, and the lien, bore interest at seven per cent which amount the bank were authorized to collect and which they had the security for. The arrangement also provided that in so far as the bank collected, they would receive one per cent on the amount collected; consequently, when the bank collect, they get eight per cent. Where the bank does not collect it gets five per cent. This is an arrangement resulting in a very considerable inducement to the bank to collect the money. It eliminates from the Interior Department the rather expensive mechanism by which we have endeavoured in the past to collect these advances. Of course, as yet, it cannot be said to have been fully tried out, but we hope that it will result in much better collections and at much less cost to the country. The resolution authorizes legislation looking to the implementing of the Order in Council passed and the provision of such machinery for the future on a permanent basis.

Mr. NESBITT: I think that the minister explained that the Government have the right to take over the security given and he said that the security would be in the form of a note and a lien taken under the Bank Act on the seed grain. The Government take a lien on the land, do they not? The banks cannot take a lien on the land? Therefore, the Government are dropping that portion of the security that they otherwise had.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No, the land is unpatented land; consequently, we hold the land as security just as before if we take it over.

Mr. FIELDING: I think it is necessary that there should be some limitation of the amount. This appears to give a blank cheque to the Government, or to grant authority to advance for this purpose an unlimited sum. It may be that there is something in the preceding legislation to limit the outlay of the Government. I only draw the minister's attention to it. This is an authority to pay or guarantee money and there must be some limitation to the amount.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the previous legislation is different in that respect. I have not the exact terms of that legislation in my mind, but it enables the Government to advance money on unpatented land. Necessarily, we will have to have a vote of Parliament to pay the amount. The amount advanced in each case must be limited as it is only to be for the seed, certified by the agent of Dominion Lands, required for a man's homestead and not for any other purpose.

Mr. FIELDING: It may work out that way as between the department and its officials but when my hon. friend says that you would have to have a vote of Parliament I answer that this is the vote of Parliament. This gives unlimited authority to guarantee advances for that purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Last year the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) brought in legislation asking for an unlimited amount for railway equipment. The amount was not mentioned and when the question was raised by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) he withdrew his resolution and came back with a stated amount.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is very different. One might estimate what would be required to acquire a railway.

Mr. LEMIEUX: It was for railway equipment.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Whatever the case may have been, but we do not know what amount will be required to provide seed grain in any particular spring. It all depends on the conditions of the previous year and the condition of the farmers in any district. It has varied from year to year. I do not presume there has been anything like uniformity. I know there has not been. We have had to advance amounts beginning with almost nothing and running up to $12,000,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Cannot you suggest an average?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The average would be $5,000,000 but I would never suggest to Parliament that it would amount to $5,000,000 in any one year. I do not think the amount can be suggested.

Mr. NESBITT: The wording here is: "Any part thereof remaining unpaid." How long a time are the banks authorized to loan for?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The notes all fall due on or before the first of January.

Mr. NESBITT: In the succeeding year?

Mr. MEIGHEN: In the succeeding year and the bank has a certain time, unless it is extended by the minister, within which to call upon the department for payment. If the bank calls upon the department for payment, it then gets five per cent.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My recollection is that when we embarked upon the policy of advancing money for the purchase of seed grain to western farmers we were told that it was to be temporary and only to meet an emergency. It seems now to be renewed every year. I would like to know what view my hon. friend takes of the matter. Is it intended that this shall be a permanent advance, year after year, or is it only for a limited time?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The first question my hon. friend raises has reference to the advance of 1915, which was on a wholly different basis from any other advance. That was on patented and unpatented lands, and reached a total of between twelve and thirteen million dollars. Every year for I do not know how many years—I have no doubt for thirty—advances have been made on unpatented lands—that is on our own lands—to homesteaders, and that is all this legislation contemplates. Consequently there is no change at all. As to the second question, namely, that relating to repayments, I can answer that in so far as the large advance of 1915 was concerned. We have met with very considerable delay and not wholly satisfactory results in repayment. The sanguine hopes of many have not been met, and at the same time the pessimistic expectations of others have been surpassed. Of that $12,000,000, I think I am safe in saying, we have received between eight and eight and a half millions; it is not below that figure, it may possibly by this time have come up to about $9,000,000. That money, however, was not wholly advanced for seed grain—I will give the exact figures to the House at any time—it was advanced, to the extent of I think about five millions, for relief, the other seven millions being for seed grain. The relief money has been the most difficult to collect. All the security we were able to get was a lien on the land, over and above all registered liens at that time, therefore the difficulty in collecting. The lessons we have learned as the result of our experience in connection with seed grain liens has resulted in my decision to try this experiment.

Mr. MURPHY: Is it the intention of my hon. friend to continue the payment of 3 per cent for the collection as formerly?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is no rate of 3 per cent, and there never has been.

Mr. MURPHY: I understood my hon. friend to mention 5 per cent and that 3 per cent was collected in addition to that.

Mr. MEIGHEN: All that the farmer pays is 7 per cent, no matter to whom he pays. If he did not pay the bank the bank calls upon the department, and the department collects 7 per cent from the farmer.

Mr. NESBITT: The Government only pays 5 per cent to the bank?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The department guarantees 5 per cent to the bank, and for what it collects the bank receives 1 per cent.

Mr. ROBB: Is there any intention on the part of the department to handle seed grain throughout the country? For instance, the Department of Agriculture has a commission buying and handling seed grain. Has that any relation to the policy now under discussion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. The commission in connection with the Department of Agriculture—I know something of its operations, as I was Acting Minister of Agriculture for a time—has to do with the selection of seed grain and its distribution for cash to municipalities and others. It has nothing to do with the distribution of seed grain to homesteaders on liens. It simply selects, tests and issues when the seed grain from a germinating standpoint is good, and sells that seed grain at the price paid for it—sells for cash.

Mr. ROBB: Or less?

Mr. MEIGHEN: On the only occasion of which I am able to speak definitely, on account of the rise in the price of grain, the department came out very considerably ahead, although that was not intended.

Mr. CAHILL: I think the objection of the member for Queens and Shelburne is worthy of some consideration, and might be met by the minister making an estimate of what he expects will be required in the coming season. There is no doubt this matter should be brought before Parliament from year to year, and the amount voted which is expected to be required or to be guaranteed. It seems to me that the present system is rather loose. In the first place, the Government is a very poor collector at any time. The inducement of the bank is not very great and its responsibility is nothing at all; the bank simply lends the money and is guaranteed 5 per cent in any event, the same as if it were making advances to the Government. I think the bank should be made responsible in some way and assume some share of the responsibility if it is being guaranteed the money. It has a chance to make 8 per cent if it looks after the collections, but it gets 5 per cent in any event. I think it would be better if the bank were made responsible for the collection of this money. It will not sue any person under this arrangement, and there is no provision for it; it simply hands over the security when it gets tired of the arrangement to the Dominion Government, and leaves it to the latter to collect. If the Government were to guarantee the bank 80 per cent of the advances made, and stipulate that there should be no interest paid on what it did not collect, it would have some chance of getting a little better security and loaning it to a better class of people. If this were limited to the homesteader it might not involve so much money, but there is nothing in this regarding unpatented lands. A friendly immigration agent would manage to get a good deal of money at 7 per cent invested in Canada at the present time. If the banks loan money, and are not saddled with any greater responsibility than is here provided and can hand their securities over to the Dominion Government for it to take action at some future time, it seems to me such loans would be pretty easy for the banks to make, and the fellow who gets the money is not in any worse position but in a much better position than ever before.

Mr. SHEARD: May I ask the minister if he can give us any idea of the losses which have been incurred by the Government in connection with those advances?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is virtually no loss with respect to advances on unpatented lands, because in every case we have the land, and if the homesteader abandons it the seed grain lien is charged against it and must be paid by the next entrant. I know I am safe in saying that there is no need for consideration on the part of the House of the question of loss so far as our past history is concerned. There will be losses in connection with relief and seed grain advances on patented lands, particularly with relation to relief. Personally, I am very confident that loss will amount to a very small proportion, and even if we lost a substantial share of the sum that was advanced in 1915 the investment on the part of Canada would well have been an excellent one because the results to this country were pretty nearly in the Scriptural proportion of a hundred fold. I would like to meet the

point raised by the hon. member for Queens and Shelburne, if I could see any way of doing so, although that was not what was really discussed by the hon. member for Pontiac. I do not see any way to do so for this reason: Presuming we were to fix a figure, say of $1,000,000, and when the spring came that amount would not provide seed, thousands of acres of land are going to go unseeded, or else we would simply have to take the money by Governor General's warrant; we could not do anything else, we could not possibly stand by and see the land go unseeded. Therefore no very great object would be gained by fixing an amount for such a peculiar cause as this. However, if the resolution passes I will give further thought to the question, and when the Bill is before the House there will be an opportunity for an amendment to that effect.

Resolution reported, read the first and second times, and concurred in.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 24, respecting advances for the purchase of seed grain.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 7, to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the explanation of this Bill?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I can give no explanation of a general character that would be of advantage to the committee. The Yukon Placer Mining Act was passed in 1906 and has never been amended. This Bill makes certain amendments of more or less technical character. I do not think any of them are of major consequence, but they are considered important by the Yukon branch of the department. Each amendment will have to be discussed upon its own merits.

On section 1—definition:

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is merely to take care of the case of one stream meeting another and the intention of the Act that no claim shall extend over 500 feet. Further, the special meaning attaching to "base line" in mine surveying is given.

Section agreed to.

On section 2—side and end boundaries:

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): This is to provide for the running of the base line up the creek valley, but not the side lines, as the Act now provides. It has been found that the base line itself is sufficient. The end lines of the claims may be run at right angles to the base line, but it is not necessary to put the Government to the expense of running three lines parallel to the base line.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As a consequence of that, section 24 of the Act has to be repealed; and this is done by section 3 of this Bill.

Section agreed to.

On section 4—size of discovery claims:

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): As it stands, the Act penalizes discoverers of mining claims if there are more than two in the party. If there are two in the party they are entitled to 1,250 feet each, but if more than two, each member of the party is entitled to only 1,000 feet. It is the wish of the people of the territory that discoverers get 1,250 feet each for the claims which they locate. The idea is to induce prospectors to go into a new territory and discover new mines.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—right to relocate after forfeiture.

Mr. MEIGHEN: This is to enable the former owner to relocate a claim after the lapse of a year. Under the law as it stands he cannot do that.

Section agreed to.

On section 7—appeals.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon) This section is self-explanatory. There is no court en banc in the the Yukon Territory at the present time. The court en banc has been abolished. The only court to which appeals may be made is the Territorial Court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What is the meaning of the expression " court en bac?"

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): My hon. friend is a better authority on that than I am.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We always call it the full court.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Oh, court en banc. That makes a great difference. The word "bac" means a certain kind of boat.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The word should be "banc," not "bac."

Mr. McKENZIE: I have not had very much time to look over this Bill. Does it provide for an appeal? If so, where?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There is in the Yukon only one judge, Judge Macaulay. It appears that at one time, when the Act was passed, there was a court en banc. That was abolished. This is simply to strike out the words in the Act.

Mr. McMASTER: This discussion may be interesting and even amusing to those who are taking part in it. We, however, sitting at the back of the Chamber have not the pleasure of understanding what is going on.

Section agreed to.

On section 9—when owner does not renew claim, claim may be relocated, etc.

Mr. ROBB: This appears to be a section which may work great hardship at this particular time. We have been told by the hon. member for the Yukon (Mr. 4 p.m. A. Thompson) that many men from the Yukon went overseas. I can see where a soldier having gone overseas and abandoned his claim temporarily, may return to find some other person in possession of it, and it may be a valuable claim.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): My hon. friend will see, a little later on in the Bill and in these amendments, that soldiers' claims have been protected by the Bill.

Mr. ROBB: What section is that?

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): Section 10, of this Bill, subsection 45, under the heading "co-owners, one of whom served in war." This amendment provides simply for payment in the event of expenses having been incurred because of the claim owner's neglect to renew. It was drafted as the result of the experience of the Gold Commissioner, the man who administers this law.

Mr. NESBITT: I would like to ask a question as to the latter part of section 4 with reference to advertising. Is the advertisement sufficient to give every person notice? The section does not state what the extent of the advertisement shall be.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The section provides for the survey being published in the Yukon Official Gazette for twelve successive issues, and remaining unprotested during that period.

Mr. NESBITT: Not in any local paper?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. McMASTER: There is no Yukon official record?

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): There is a Gazette.

Mr. McMASTER: There is no Yukon official record similar to the Canadian official record?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think the people there can expect comforts of that kind.

Mr. McKENZIE: I notice provision is made here for the reinstatement of a person who may have lost his right to a mining claim, provided that he pays certain expenditures that may have been made by the parties who took over the claim. I find no provision for the adjustment of those expenditures. The man who made the expenditures may say that there were very large, and the man has to pay them may say that they are not just. Unless there is some provision already in the Act, there should be some competent authority to adjust the amount of those expenditures, that is to fix the amount that a man would have to pay in order to be reinstated, whether those expenditures are for betterments of the claim or anything else in connection with it.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): I am not sure whether this was specifically provided for in the original Act, but the way it works out is this, that the Gold Commissioner sends his inspector out to measure up the work done on a claim, and as the value of work done on these claims is fairly well-known, no trouble has, so far as my knowledge goes, occurred as the result of that method. Of course, with regard to the cost of relocating a claim, the fees and travelling expenses are easily verified. I think the Gold Commissioner himself determines the amount.

Mr. McKENZIE: I can readily understand he would be the proper authority to do so, but whether he has that jurisdiction I do not know. If not, I think we should insert in the Act a clause that the claim should be adjusted by the gold commissioner.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): I feel sure the gold commissioner has that power, and from his decision there would be an appeal to the Territorial Court.

Section agreed to.

On section 10—proportionate contribution of work, etc., in case of co-owners:

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister understand this section to be of practical value?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Act as it stood provided only for payment by co-owners of their share of the fees. This provides that each co-owner must also do his share of the work, and in the event of a co-owner not doing his especial work, the interests of the defaulting co-owner shall pass to those co-owners who remained and performed his share of the work.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): I may say that in order to hold these claims certain fees have to be paid and certain work must be done annually. The Act calls this work "representation work." As the law now stands, there is no provision for dealing with the owner who refuses to pay his share of the renewal fees, but only with the owner who fails to do his share of the work. The proposed amendment makes it necessary for a co-owner not only to do his share of representation work but also to pay his share of the fees. In the case of a defunct interest the intention is to give the claim to the co-owner or co-owners who actually did the work of the co-owner in default, and not to those co-owners who performed and paid only their portion.

Mr. McMASTER: Is the decision of the gold commissioner final? I can easily imagine a case where a man might be absent from his claim on business for some time, and when he comes back he finds that his two co-partners have in the meantime done certain work and paid certain fees, and in consequence have been vested with the whole claim by the gold commissioner. Now there might have been an arrangement made between these three men before this particular man went off, and what I want to know is whether the decision of the gold commissioner is final, or whether the matter could be opened up judicially or otherwise by the returned co-owner who had lost his interest.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): Of course, these amendments do not affect whatever rights of appeal there now are from the decisions of the gold commissioner to the Territorial Court. This Act has been in operation for many years, and, as in the case of all other Acts, certain defects have been found in its operation. The defects were discovered by the gold commissioner and his officers, and the proposed amendments are the outcome of the experience of the gold commissioner and his staff in administering the Act for a number of years. Ordinarily, there is an appeal from the gold commissioner to the Territorial Court, and I feel sure there would be the right of appeal in the case my hon. friend has suggested. The decision of the gold commissioner is not final in any of these matters. Subsection 3 is rather important. In the past a man holding a claim has sometimes been able to prevent a dredge working up or down on either side of his claim, and I might say just here that the dredging industry is a very important one in the Yukon at the present time, most of the gold being won by that method. This subsection is to prevent a man from holding up dredging operations, on either side of him. It makes it possible to assess the damages occasioned by going across the claim. It gives all the gold extracted to the claim owner, and provides for an appeal from the gold commissioner's findings to the Territorial Court.

Mr. L. A. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Does this appeal provided for in subsection 4 apply only to subsections 2 and 3, or does it apply to the original section which is now subsection 1? In the original subsection there was an appeal to the Board of Arbitration, and now the appeal is abolished by the present section.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): The practice of appeals to the Board of Arbitration to which the hon. member refers has been found unworkable, hence this amendment.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is this dredge a local dredge?

Mr. THOMPSON: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: We have in the province from which I come a law—although not in connection with gold mines—very much like this, in connection with other minerals. Our law provides that a man through whose property one has to pass, or on whose property he has to perform certain work, will be asked for permission, and if he refuses then there is an application. I think it would be well, unless provision is made already, that the permission should be obtained, and in the event of refusal, notice could be served on the owner that upon a certain day an application would be made before the commissioner; so that the owner of the property would be given an opportunity of being heard when that application was made; and if his property should be passed through, it might be done at a place where the least damage would occur. I think the general common law principle should be observed, that no person's property shall be interfered with without his permission; and there should

be some provision that the owner of property through which passage is to be made should have an opportunity of being heard when the application is being made before the Gold Commissioner.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): That is a fair criticism, and perhaps it might be well to insert a time clause, within which the dredge owner should notify the claim owner.

Section agreed to.

On section 12; subsection 1.—Board of Arbitrators to determine disputes.

Mr. G. W. ANDREWS (Winnipeg): No provision is made as to what form the notice shall take, and I think it might leave the operation of the Act open to a good deal of dispute in some cases as to whether or not notice was given. Nothing is said about written notices, and I think the words "in writing" should be inserted.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I see no objection to that. The section as it stands provides for notice, but does not provide that it shall be notice in writing. The purpose of this amendment is merely to express more clearly the intention of the old Act. No difficulty has arisen in the past with regard to notice, or the Gold Commissioner would undoubtedly have recommended the very amendment my friend proposes. I see no objection to accepting the words "in writing," because I cannot conceive that it could have been the practice that notification should be given in any other way.

Mr. ANDREWS: Whatever the other Act may have contained, it is now repealed, so that there is no provision of any kind except what is contained in this section; and it appears to me that difficulties might possibly arise. A man might claim that he had given notice, say, last Thursday at the hotel, and a denial might follow, and I think it would avoid any possibility of such a difficulty if the form of notification is definitely fixed.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I have no objection to the words "in writing" being inserted, but I am a little apprehensive that in some other section of the Bill it will be provided that all notices shall be in writing.

Mr. McMASTER: I suggest that it might be advisable to make provision at the end that all notices shall be in writing.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I think we had better leave the matter for the present, and if there is no provision for notice in writing I shall move it by way of amendment in the third reading.

Section agreed to.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

On section 15—Powers of Commissioner over property of deceased or insane owners.

Mr. THOMPSON (Yukon): As the Act now stands, if a miner owning even a small fraction of a claim dies the whole claim is exempt from renewal. Advantage has been taken of this section to hold very large blocks of ground. It is to prevent this sort of thing that this clause has been drafted.

On section 16—assignee of property of deceased or insane owner to apply for grant within two months:

Mr. MORPHY: What provision have you for giving notice in a country like the Yukon of an enactment of this kind so that the public may understand it? This is a most drastic section. A man may be out of the bounds of civilization and yet by the terms of this section he may have his claim taken from him without reasonable notice whatever.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Reference to the original Act as it stood will show there is nothing more drastic in this clause than in that for which it is substituted. It does sound, of course, somewhat drastic. But the working of it must have shown that it is necessary. In the Act as it now stands there is no penalty prescribed for a person who refuses or neglects to apply for a renewal of his claim. The amendment does prescribe such a penalty. Otherwise, it merely makes clear the law as it is.

Bill reported.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior) moved the second reading of Bill No. 8, to amend the Irrigation Act.

Mr. McKENZIE: This is possibly a new subject to most of the members of the House and perhaps the minister might give us an explanation of the Bill before the House goes into committee upon it.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Inasmuch as this Bill contains only individual and isolated amendments, there is no general explanation that can suitably be given. While I am on my feet, I might as well explain the first section. The Irrigation Act has been in effect, of course, for many years. Canada, by that Act, asserted its control over all waters which might be utilized for irrigation purposes. Virtually, it asserted its control over the power to divert water within the area covered by the Act. The Act just covers a certain defined area in western Canada. Clause 1 of this Bill makes the following provision:

No person shall divert or use any water from, and no person shall construct or cause to be constructed any dam or other works for the impounding of water in any river, stream, watercourse, creek, spring, ravine, canyon, lagoon, swamp, marsh, or other body of water, otherwise than under the provisions of this Act, except in the exercise of a legal right existing at the time of such diversion or use or construction.

While the Act as it stands prevents a diversion, the Justice Department has given the opinion that it does not extend to cover a dam, or work in the nature of a dam, for impounding water, although in one sense it is a diversion and, I think, was intended to be covered by the Act. This is to take care that the purpose of the Act shall not be defeated by the impounding of water by means of dams unless the right to do so existed at the time of such diversion or construction.

Motion agreed to, Bill read the second time and the House went into committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. McKENZIE: The last part of subsection 2 appeals to a lawyer as likely to create some difficulty about the existing legal rights. Will the minister make clear what is meant by "existing legal rights?" For instance, one man has a legal right to erect a dam, and somebody else has no right to do so. Wherein consists the legal right of the one over the other?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would presume that there might be a Crown grant by provincial or other authority of such legal right placing the man in a position to build the dam irrespective entirely of the rights of proprietors downstream or upstream. At all events, whatever it may mean, if the builder—the diverter by means of the dam of the water—is able to establish that he had the right to do so by a specific grant, or otherwise, he of course is free. But if he has not, then this prevents him doing it, and makes him subject to the penalties of the Act if he does it, and does not leave the matter merely to the action of some one else, by way of injunction, who may have an interest.

Section agreed to.

On subsection 2—grant of lands not to convey water rights.

Mr. MEIGHEN: As to the reason for this I have not the explanation before me, but I can remember it, I think, accurately. The Act was first passed on the 23rd July, 1894, but subsequently, on the revision, that date was not carried forward as the date of the prohibition, and it has been held that the date fixed in the revision, or rather the date not fixed, but the date of the Act after the revision, is the date which takes effect. This is to make certain that the original date prevails and the prohibition dates from the date the Act was passed.

Mr. McMASTER: Should there not be some saving of any rights acquired meanwhile?

Mr. MEIGHEN: There could not have been any legally acquired.

Bill reported.

EXCESS CIRCULATION CHARTERED BANKS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:—

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the proclamation dated the third day of September, 1914, made under the authority of the Provisions of the Finance Act, 1914, and Published in the Canada Gazette of the fifth day of September, 1914, except paragraph (c) thereof (hereinafter specially provided for) shall continue in force and effect until the end of two years after the conclusion of peace on the termination of the present war, unless an earlier date is proclaimed for the termination thereof; and that the provision of paragraph (c) of the said proclamation authorizing the chartered banks to issue excess circulation, as in the said Act defined from the first day of March, 1915, to and including the last day of August, 1915, shall apply to the period from and including the first day of March, 1919, to and including the last day of August next ensuing, and to the same period in 1920, and the chartered banks may issue such excess circulation accordingly, subject to termination on the same date as is proclaimed for the termination of the operation of the said proclamation.

Mr. McKENZIE: Surely the Government should offer some explanation as to the necessity for this resolution.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: During the war, and at the present time, certain provisions of the Finance Act of 1914 have been in operation under the authority of a proclamation issued by virtue of that Act. That proclamation authorized the making of advances by the Government to the chartered banks, and to certain savings banks, by the issue of Dominion notes upon the credit of securities deposited with the Minister of Finance of such kind and amounts as should be approved by the Treasury Board, such advances to be repayable at such times as the Board might determine, with interest at a rate of not less than 5 per cent per annum.

The proclamation also authorized the chartered banks to make payment in the

bank notes issued by such banks, instead of in gold or Dominion notes, the total amount of notes of any chartered banks in circulation at any time not to exceed the amount of its notes issued under the provisions of the Bank Act. It also authorized the several chartered banks to issue excess circulation, from and including the first day of March in any year up to and including the last day of August, to amounts not exceeding fifteen per cent of the combined unimpaired capital and rest or reserve fund of the respective banks as stated in their monthly returns to the minister for the month immediately preceding that in which the additional amount is issued.

Under the provisions of the Finance Act of 1914, the proclamation to which I have referred may be issued in case only of war, invasion, riot or insurrection, real or apprehended, and in case of any real or apprehended financial crisis. Now, when the war is officially declared at an end the provisions of the Finance Act in respect of the matters I have mentioned cannot be brought into operation unless there exists a real or apprehended financial crisis. But in view of the length of the war, the demands which it has made upon the resources of all countries and the unsettled conditions which it has produced, it is advisable that this legislation be continued in effect until conditions become normal. It is estimated that conditions will become normal in two years. We hope it will be earlier than that, but for a long time to come financial and economic conditions will be very greatly unsettled throughout the entire world. This legislation is necessary in order that the present conditions under which the banks are operating, and which have been found so effectual during the war, may be continued.

It may be of interest to the committee to know something of the conditions of our bank and Dominion note circulation at the end of the war. Comparing it with that of other countries, to me it is an exceedingly gratifying one. On January 31, 1919, the Dominion note circulation amounted to $319,315,689. That represents the total amount of outstanding Dominion notes. The percentage of gold and securities held against that total issue is 88 per cent; the percentage fully covered by securities is 51.8 per cent. The percentage of the balance of the issue covered by gold is 75·2 per cent, and the percentage of gold held against the total issue, irrespective of securities also held, is 36·2 per cent. Dominion notes to the extent of $82,275,000 are outstanding against securities under the Finance Act. The securities held against those notes are as follows:

Imperial Treasury Bill Certificates	$82,650,000
Dominion of Canada Treasury Bills	6,393,000
Municipal Bonds and debentures, Province of Nova Scotia Debentures, City of Toronto Bonds, Province of Ontario stock, City of Three Rivers Bonds, Province of Ontario Treasury Bills	1,189,333

This makes a total of over $90,000,000, in round figures, of the highest class of securities held against that amount of Dominion notes.

Then, we have Dominion notes issued against railway securities under legislation which was passed in 1914, to the amount of $16,000,000. The securities held are Grand Trunk Pacific 4 per cent bonds guaranteed by the Government, $7,500,000; and Canadian Northern Railway Company 4 per cent bonds guaranteed by the Government $12,500,000, making a total of $20,000,000.

In August 1917, in order to meet the very serious situation which arose in this country affecting imperial finance and to enable the Imperial Government to buy our cheese and other agricultural products, we made an issue of $50,000,000 of Dominion notes against securities to the total par value of £15,000,000 and to the stock exchange value of £11,000,000, deposited by the Imperial Government for account of the Dominion with the Bank of Montreal in London.

Now, the net result of what I have said is this: We hold against our Dominion note circulation—in addition to gold—Imperial Government, Dominion Government, provincial and municipal securities to the amount of $90,000,000, Railways securities guaranteed by the Dominion to the extent of $20,000,000, and securities owned by the Imperial Government and lodged with the Bank of Montreal for account of the Dominion in London to a market value of £11,000,000. Then, the Dominion holds gold against Dominion notes at the present time to the total amount, in round figures, of $120,000,000. The last named figure compares with $91,000,000 of gold which we held against circulation on July 31, 1914. It will be observed that the Dominion Government has in hand to-day $30,000,000 more in gold than it had on July 31, 1914. The total Dominion note circulation in 1914 was $112,000,000. That has been expanded during the war to $319,000,000.

I stated the percentage of gold in relation to total Dominion note circulation as

36 per cent. In order to give the committee an idea of what has happened in Great Britain and the United States—

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the minister leaves that point, will he explain to the committee how the percentage of gold as compared with the circulation of Dominion notes in 1914 compares with the percentage of gold as compared with the circulation of Dominion notes to-day?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In 1914, Dominion notes outstanding were, in round figures, $112,000,000. The total gold held against those notes was $90,000,000. The per centage would be about 80 per cent, but there were not other securities held against the note circulation at that time. While the note circulation has been expanded, a considerable portion of that expansion is due to the loans that have been made to banks on high class securities, to the loan which was made in Dominion notes to the Imperial Government upon the securities that I have mentioned, and to the loans made to the railway companies in 1914, which transaction was validated by legislation passed in that year by the House, amounting to $16,000,000.

Let me give the committee an idea of what has happened in other countries. Great Britain, of course, was in the war at the beginning. I asked the Bank of Montreal to make inquiry for me as to the percentage of gold held against the currency note issue of the Imperial Government. The committee realizes how stringent were the provisions in Great Britain before the war, that note circulation should be covered by gold. The position is as follows: Currency notes outstanding, £314,800,000, against gold £28,500,000, and treasury bills for the balance. The Bank of Montreal memorandum states that the ratio of gold against sterling notes outstanding is 9 per cent.

I asked the bank also to obtain for me the figures in the United States. The United States have been in the war since April, 1917. The information that the bank has obtained for me is as follows:

Federal Reserve Notes outstanding	$2,599,715,000
Gold held	1,381,125,000
United States notes of all varieties outstanding	1,886,204,720
Gold held	1,015,179,000

The total therefore of notes of the Federal Reserve banks and of the United States Government, outstanding, amount to $4,485,917,720, against which gold is held to the amount of $2,396,304,000. The percentage of gold held to notes in circulation is therefore 53 per cent.

Mr. CAHILL: Did we not, at the last session, make a permanent extension of credit to the banks, or something similar to this? The Government is proposing now to give them a fifteen per cent increase in circulation. Last session, it seems to me, we made a fifteen per cent increase in circulation permanent, the expansion being for the purpose of moving the crops. The Government is now proposing to give them authority to inflate the currency further by another issue of fiat money. Our gold deposits are small enough as against the note circulation we have now, and we are simply adding to the difficulty by increasing the issue of fiat money, because this does not seem to be anything else. It means increasing the high cost of living, making money cheaper and commodities dearer.

5 p.m.

I should also like to ask if there is still an embargo on gold going out of Canada, and if it is still against the law for the banks to pay out gold. If so, how long is this provision supposed to last, in order to regulate our exchange?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think my hon. friend must have reference to action taken to continue the provisions of the Finance Act in operation last year. The Finance Act, as I pointed out, contains provisions which can be invoked only in time of war or real or apprehended financial panic. The proclamations which have been issued and the action taken so far would come to an end with the official conclusion of the war. The result is we should be where we were before the war broke out in 1914. For the reasons that I have mentioned, the general unsettled financial conditions of the world and the necessity of conserving gold reserves, it is undesirable that we should revert to that condition. We, therefore, ask that the measures which have been so effectual during the war—and they have been exceedingly effectual and in the national interest—should be continued for a period not exceeding two years after the war, subject to being terminated by Order in Council at such time as we think they are no longer necessary. I think it is undoubtedly in the national interest that this legislation should be passed.

My hon. friend speaks of fiat money. I have no hesitation in saying that of all the belligerents that have been in the war since the beginning, the financial position of Canada is undoubtedly the best. There is no question about that. The United States, as I pointed out, was in the war for nearly two years. The position of the United

States with regard to its circulation is as I have indicated, but I do not believe it is more favourable than that of Canada in that respect.

My hon. friend has asked with regard to the regulations against the export of gold from Canada. Those regulations are still in effect, and will be continued in effect so long as we think it necessary to protect the gold reserves of the country. At the present time gold would be shipped to Asia or to other parts of the world where it might be in demand, for the purpose of building up gold reserves, and it is very necessary, by reason of the expansion of note issues in Great Britain, the United States, and this country that gold should be conserved. Generally speaking, with regard to restrictions and regulations, it has been the policy and is the policy of the Government to cancel them just as rapidly as in our judgment the national interests of the country will permit. Almost immediately upon the declaration of the armistice we removed the restrictions against issues in our market by provincial and municipal governments. A little later we removed all restrictions upon issues, when the Government no longer needed the market, and when it was clear that those issues would be made without any detriment to the national interest. I can assure my hon. friend that no one desires more keenly than I do to get rid of all restrictions imposed by Order in Council, and I am sure that would be the view of other ministers, because one effect of these Orders in Council is to increase our administrative duties. With regard to gold and silver, for instance, applications are made for license to export, and these applications have to be considered and decisions given upon them. My happiness as a minister will be greatly increased when all restrictions are removed. There is no object in the Government keeping in force any Order in Council a day beyond the time it is actually needed in the national interest. I realize, of course, there may be a difference of opinion as to just when an Order in Council should be cancelled, but the Government must exercise its discretion with regard to that having in view the national interest as it sees it at the time.

Mr. FIELDING: The hon. member for Pontiac seems to be under the impression that the facilities of the banks for issuing circulation are being increased by this legislation. I do not understand it to be so. What I understand is that the emergency provisions ought to be extended for a period after the war, and, speaking generally, in view of the very uncertain conditions prevailing and the large business enterprises that will have to be carried out in the reconstruction period, I think it is well that the power of the Government to assist the banks in that way—it is not a new power—should be extended for a reasonable time after the war. Did I hear my hon. friend read, amongst the securities against which we issue Canadian notes, Canadian treasury bills?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, but not owned by the Dominion of Canada; owned, let us say, by a bank.

Mr. FIELDING: Issued by the Dominion Government, and coming back to us as the property of others?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes.

Mr. FIELDING: Otherwise, it would be tantamount to a man putting his own note in the safe and thinking he was richer. With regard to the fifteen per cent excess circulation, the origin of that goes back some years, I think to 1907, when there was a very disturbed financial condition in the United States, and for a while it seemed as if we would have a very disturbed financial condition in Canada, particularly in the West The banks were largely restricting their credits, business men were becoming very much alarmed, and altogether the situation was very dangerous At that time, the Government of the day took upon themselves—straining their authority, I admit—to issue excess circulation, not bank circulation, but Dominion circulation, and to loan it to the banks if they wished to have it to meet the demands of the occasion, particularly with regard to the moving of the crop in Canada. My recollection is that the amount authorized to be issued, if you call it authority, was $10,000,000, and of that I think little more than half was actually issued. It was another case of the old lady who heard the bank where she deposited her money was in trouble and went to the bank and asked for her money, and when it was given to her, said: "Now I know you have it, I don't want it." When it was known that the Government of the day had the facilities and were willing to help the banks, the banks themselves loosened up and there was no need to issue the full amount proposed by the Government. Of course, it was a straining of authority, and at the following session of Parliament legislation had to be introduced

to authorize and indemnify those who were concerned in the issue of those notes. But out of that experience wisdom was learned. We learned that while our arrangements for circulation as between the Government and the banks were satisfactory for ordinary business, in the case of stress or emergency there was need of some greater power, and the result was that at the following session an Act was passed to provide for what might for convenience be called emergency circulation. In that case it was proposed that the circulation should be issued by the banks. In the actual transaction that had taken place just previously the circulation was issued by the Government. It was proposed that the banks during a certain period of the year,—the crop period,—should be allowed, in addition to their ordinary powers of circulation, to issue excess circulation to the extent of fifteen per cent of their combined paid-up capital and rest. That worked out, I think, very well. Some bankers at the beginning did not like it. I remember one very eminent banker who said that no self-respecting bank would ever use it, but I think his own bank saw fit to use it afterwards. I understand that the Finance Minister is proposing to continue for two years after the war that scheme, which was only intended in the first place to meet the emergency of the crop season. I think it is very desirable that the extension should not be made for a longer period than is absolutely necessary, but I do think the minister is wise in keeping this power in his hands in view of the very disturbed financial conditions which may reach us in the reconstruction period.

Mr. ELKIN: I should like to call the attention of the Minister of Finance to the fact that the American Government are trying to gather in all the gold they can. Not long ago I had the experience of taking some gold across into the United States, and at the border the gold was taken from me, as it is from everybody else, and American bank notes were given in exchange for it. The security may be just as good, but the object of the American Government is to strengthen their note issue by gathering in gold from every one who is passing into or out of their country. I do not see any effort of that kind being made in Canada, though possibly Americans are bringing across gold to this country and taking it over to Europe with them. There are no doubt many of our people who are holding a certain amount of gold, perhaps two or three hundred dollars, which in the aggregate would amount to quite a lot if we gathered it in to strengthen our gold reserve as the Americans are doing.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am interested in what my hon. friend has said. Perhaps I should inform the committee as to the gold holdings of the banks, before the resolution passes. I have pointed out that the gold holdings of the Dominion have increased from $97,000,000 in July, 1914, to $121,000,000 at the end of January of this year; an increase of $24,000,000. The gold held by Canadian banks has also been substantially increased. In July, 1914, it amounted to $54,000,000 roughly speaking. On January 31st, 1919, it amounted to $91,000,000, an increase of $37,000,000. So that we have come through the war, both the banks and the Dominion Government, with a very substantial increase in the gold reserves which we hold.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

CURRENCY ACT 1910 AMENDMENT—BRONZE COINS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Minister of Finance) moved:

That it is expedient to amend the Currency Act, 1910, by providing for the standard weight, fineness and remedy allowance of the bronze cent, and that bronze coins heretofore struck by authority of the Crown shall continue to be current and a legal tender; and those provisions shall come into force upon such date as may be prescribed by proclamation issued by the Governor in Council.

He said: The Bill which this resolution precedes provides authority for the issue of a one-cent piece, smaller than the one at present in use. It has long been pointed out to the Finance Department that the present cent, while a beautiful coin, is too large, and that it is very desirable that a smaller one should be substituted in its stead. I had the matter under consideration some time before the war, but during the war owing to pressure of other matters I did not go on with it. The weight of the present one-cent piece is 87½ grains, and it is proposed to make the weight of the new piece, 50 grains. For the information of the committee I may say that 80 of the present one-cent pieces make an avoirdupois pound, on which a remedy of 140 grains is allowed. Of the new pieces at 50 grains each, 140 would make an avoirdupois pound, and the same remedy of 140 grains will be provided by the Bill. A similar practice in regard to remedy is followed by the London mint. The proposed new piece will approximate in size the American bronze cent, the weight of the latter being 48 grains. It is not pre-

cisely similar to the American piece, but it approximates it. The weight of the American bronze cent is 48 grains and it is thought by the mint that a weight of 50 grains would be more convenient for handling. It is a little larger than the ten-cent piece, and thicker, so that it can be easily distinguished from that coin by touch. The Bill will also provide that the present one-cent piece will continue to be a legal coin as at present. The Act which we have in mind will be brought into force by proclamation. For the information of the committee I have had my office prepare a statement showing the total issue of bronze coins in Canada, less the smooth and mutilated coins which have been redeemed. From that statement it appears that up to January 31, 1919, there have been issued, less coins redeemed, an aggregate of $1,578,904 in bronze coins. As to the amount of bronze cent coinage struck in recent years I find that in 1896 the amount was $20,000; in 1906, $41,000; in 1911, $54,480; in 1914, $35,100; and in 1918, $112,200. I thought that was all the information the committee would require to enable them to consider the resolution.

Mr. McKENZIE: Perhaps the committee would like to know something about the intrinsic value of these coins. There is a certain value in a cent. The metal composing the present cent has some intrinsic value apart from its being a coin. Perhaps the minister can tell us if there is any difference in the value of the two coins. Would one be as valuable as the other? The minister no doubt understands what I mean as to value. Our five-dollar gold piece might be changed in such a way that it would not have the amount of gold in it that it has at present. Of course, the change from one-cent coin to another is on a very much smaller scale, but it might be asked if the intrinsic value is there.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: With regard to gold coins, of course they are full value, and legal tender in ordinary times really is based upon gold standard, and gold or Dominion notes may be asked for. But with regard to the subsidiary coinage, silver and bronze, they do not represent the intrinsic value which they appear to have in gold. It is desirable they should approximate, particularly in the case of silver. The value of silver, of course, fluctuates from time to time, and the intrinsic value of our fifty, twenty-five, ten and five-cent pieces is not at any time equal to their face value, much less are our bronze one-cent pieces. The smaller coin has less intrinsic value; but having regard to the fact that it is in general circulation, and is a convenience to the public, I think no serious question is likely to arise on that score. Of course, reducing the amount of bronze in it reduces its intrinsic value, but I do not think that is a serious objection to the change which we propose. Ours weighs a little more than the American bronze coin. As my hon. friend is interested in the subject when the Bill comes for second reading I shall obtain information as to the intrinsic value of the one-cent piece, if it is possible to estimate it, as I think it is. It is not intended to withdraw the existing coins. The Bill will provide for their continuance as legal coinage of Canada, and only as they become smooth or mutilated will they be redeemed. They will remain in circulation, for the reason I have mentioned, until they gradually disappear.

Sir HERBERT AMES: Is it the intention of the Government to introduce a two-cent piece?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That suggestion has been put forward but I have not thought it necessary. There may be a difference of view as to that but it occurs to me that if we improve our one cent piece by making it smaller, as proposed in this resolution, we shall have a very excellent coinage. It has been put forward for consideration from time to time by some that the five cent piece is too small. I think there is something to be said for that but I like the five cent piece myself. Our ten cent, twenty-five cent and fifty-cent pieces, seem to me to be beautiful silver coinage. I am not prepared to say that it cannot be improved upon but I should not like to change the five cent piece except for good reason and it has not appeared to me up to the present time that there has been any public sentiment in favour of the change.

Mr. JACOBS: It does not go far enough.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The five cent piece?

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: George Washington could not have thrown it as far as the silver dollar that he threw across the Delaware. I think the five cent piece is a pretty good coin. There is another feature here. It is undesirable, unless for good cause, to change your coinage at all. It is not well to meddle with coinage unless for reasons strongly in the public interest. My view has been that though we might improve the one cent piece, our subsidiary coinage is very good indeed. But I would

be prepared to hear the views of hon. members as to the desirability of any further change.

Mr. JACOBS: Might I suggest that if we are going to strike new coins they be made more distinctively Canadian than in the past and also that the artists who are employed on the work be Canadian if available.

Mr. FIELDING: What is wrong with them?

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does the minister say that a new issue of coins will yield a profit to the department?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: There is a certain profit called seigniorage on subsidiary silver and bronze coinage. There is a certain profit on our silver coinage because it is not worth in terms of gold its face value. That is more the case in regard to bronze coins on which there is also a certain profit. But the total circulation of our bronze coinage is so comparatively small that the amount of profit is not a serious consideration.

Resolution reported, read the second time and concurred in.

Sir Thomas White moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 25 to amend the Currency Act, 1910.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

RECLAMATION OF DOMINION LANDS BY DRAINAGE.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of Interior) moved the second reading of Bill No. 9 to authorize the reclamation of Dominion Lands by drainage.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the Bill is read a second time, perhaps the minister will explain whether he thinks it desirable in view of the large quantities of land which we are supposed to have in this country, to go to any very great expense for reclaiming land. Perhaps the minister would explain whether this is going to be an expensive process or whether it is desirable, in view of the very large tracts of land which we have, to go to any large expense in reclaiming swamp lands.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is not the purpose of the department to go into the reclaiming of swamp lands on an extensive scale; at all events, at first. I do think it desirable though that we should commence now to do some work in the way of reclaiming our reclaimable lands that are not at present in use by reason of their water content. The area of our land available for farming purposes while great is not so great as the terms in which we have been accustomed to speak of it. The amount of land found available, or immediately suitable, for Soldiers' Settlement is indeed rather disappointing. But aside from the question as to the amount of land available the country should, in so far as it is our duty, as distinguished from the duty of the provincial authorities, endeavour to reclaim and make available for cultivation any lands of this character that can be economically dealt with in this way. Very often they are situated in districts whose development is retarded simply by reason of the fact that these swamp lands are there and that the duty of reclaiming them, on whomsoever it may rest, has not been undertaken.

The United States of America has, through its Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Lane, thrown out a very large programme as being under contemplation at least by that Government. We do not contemplate a programme as extensive as that contained in the manifesto of Mr. Secretary Lane. The way this Bill comes to be introduced is this: We have constitutionally, and we have asserted it, by our Irrigation Act, passed many years ago, control of the surface water and that control we have exercised in Alberta, Saskatchewan and the added portion of Manitoba. While we had that control, the control of drainage and the whole jurisdiction as to drainage were in the hands of the provincial authorities. As a consequence of that dual control the development of the country through drainage has been held up in the districts in which the Crown lands were ours. I may say as a premise, now, that the cardinal principle that I keep before me in this discussion is that our duty in regard to drainage arises by virtue of our ownership of the Crown lands.

Under those circumstances certain conferences were held before I was Minister of the Interior, between the authorities of the three Prairie Provinces and the Dominion, with a view to arriving at a division of responsibilities with respect to the various classes of drainage projects between the provincial governments and the Dominion Government. As a result of those conferences the drainage projects were divided into four separate classes. I might denominate those classes as follows: First of all, small drainage projects involving an expenditure not exceeding $2,000—merely

the drainage of say small lakes. The second were a class covered within the scope of a drainage project by a provincial government looking to the construction of highways—such drainage work as was necessary in its highways programme—and which drainage affected Dominion lands and could not be done unless provision was made either for a charge against the Dominion lands, or for some other arrangement that would get over the difficulty. The third class were those that were on a scale that should best be taken care of under the drainage district laws of the province—not under the highway laws, but under the laws which provided for the establishment of drainage districts, in which, of course, the Dominion had certain lands. The fourth class were those in which the Dominion owned the great area of the lands, and consequently upon the Dominion would be the great body of responsibility. A division of duty was arranged between the provinces and the Dominion with regard to those four distinct classes, and certain legislation became necessary, both on the part of the provinces and on the part of the Dominion, to carry out the arrangements agreed upon as the result of the conferences. The province of Alberta responded to its duty in this respect by the passing of its Reclamation Act in April, 1917. The province of Saskatchewan took similar action in, I think, December of the same year, and also by certain amendments to its Highways Act. The province of Manitoba has not yet acted, but its Government has now appointed a drainage commission whose duty it will be to report on this as on other drainage matters. The Government of the Dominion, on its part, first of all provisionally accepted the arrangement by an Order in Council, and then last session passed legislation amending the Dominion Lands Act so as to enable sales of Dominion lands to be made to the provinces for the purpose of embracing those lands within drainage schemes, and thereafter selling such Dominion lands on certain terms. That legislation was in accordance with the arrangement arrived at as to the disposition of the second and third classes of drainage projects that I have just described. All that now remains for us to do, in order to carry out the full intent of the agreement arrived at, is to pass legislation to enable the Dominion to assume its responsibility with respect to that class of drainage projects where we initiate and carry out the enterprise—that is to say, in those cases where the great area of lands is ours, and consequently where the great benefit is ours. What is necessary is to enable us to come in, just as a private person or as a district would, and operate under the drainage laws of the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan—and Manitoba also when the requisite legislation has been enacted—and to reclaim land thereunder. That is the purpose of this Bill. I may also say that provision is made for assessments against privately owned lands that come within the purview of any scheme of reclamation we may undertake—assessments against them for their share of the cost of the undertaking—and likewise provision whereby we can take advantage of the provincial laws that look to the maintenance of the works after they are completed.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex): I should judge from the explanation of the minister that the purpose of this Act is to secure land for the purpose of settlement,—to some extent, at any rate,—by returned soldiers, and farmers as well?

Mr. MEIGHEN: That enters into the object, although I do not wish to hold it out as the immediate object, because land for settlement cannot be very quickly got by reclamation measures. It will take some time for this to become fit land for settlement.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex): That is the very point upon which I desire to get information. Some time ago I read an editorial in the Globe which gave some figures purporting to have been used by Premier Martin in connection with land settlement relating more particularly to the soldiers, and, as far as I can recall the premier's statements, there were available in the surveyed area of the Dominion only about twenty-three million acres of land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Available where?

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex): That there were only about twenty-three million acres of land available in the surveyed area of public lands. Premier Martin went on to point out that of over 200,000,000 acres of surveyed land, so much was granted to railways, 8,000,000 acres were covered by water, 5,000,000 acres were under grazing leases, and so on. I can see, as the minister says, that any reclamation scheme of drainage is going to be very slow in its operation. I would therefore ask him if any policy is to be adopted by his department whereby lands can be reclaimed more quickly. I understand that certain representations were recently made to him, as head of the department interested, under which lands would be reclaimed for the purpose of settlement by the soldiers in

a much more rapid way, by taking areas that had been burned by forest fires, or in other ways, and which settlers would not like to take up at present on account of the unclean condition in which the land was left. I understand it was pointed out to the minister that by the department adopting a scientific system, and at the proper time of the year, these areas, which are very extensive, could be very rapidly reclaimed and made available for settlement by soldiers and farmers. I presume that this Bill does not cover that sort of reclamation at all. Therefore I would like to know if any steps are being taken by the department over which he presides along the lines suggested by the Dominion land surveyors.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman is right in his view that this Bill does not contemplate that class of reclamation. That subject, however, has been under consideration. There are areas of land that have been burned over that, in the opinion of many who should be in a position to judge, can be more quickly and expeditiously made available for actual and immediate settlement by means of a system of burning. But there is a difference of opinion as to that. I may frankly say there is a difference of opinion among the officers of the department as to the wisdom of undertaking such an experiment. I know of no method that has been suggested except a re-burning, and there are scientific methods of doing that. Against those who say that it can be done at this season of the year,—because we are now approaching the season when that should be done if it is going to be undertaken,—it is argued, and argued very strenuously, that on account of the nature of the material that will be deposited on the ground,—that is now deposited there, and would be deposited in greater quantities by a system of slashing,—but heat produced by burning would consume or remove material, and so would affect the value of the soil for farming purposes.

As between the two schools of opinion I have not come to a conclusion. I do not like to launch upon an experiment of that kind unless I feel the ground very safe beneath me, and I do not feel it safe just yet. There may be differences of opinion between members of the House on this subject, and I am sure that there are other members whose views based on experience, would be more valuable than mine.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex): Does the minister propose to undertake investigations along that line immediately?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We have the land selected and the men selected to go, but authority to go has not been given, for the reason which I have stated.

Mr. GREEN: The Dominion owns a large belt of land in the Peace River district in British Columbia, as well as a railway belt. It is possible that lands in these sections of the province might come under the category intended to be controlled by this Bill. Has the minister considered the question of extending the authority of this Act to British Columbia?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The conference took place only between the Governments of the three Prairie Provinces and the Federal Government. I am disposed to think that the same principles could scarcely be made to apply to British Columbia. I do not think any progress has been made toward an arrangement with the Government of that province, nor can I speak very hopefully as to the likelihood of our being able to make such an arrangement. At all events, this Bill does not contemplate doing work in British Columbia. If an arrangement with the Government of British Columbia would be possible, we should be very glad to come to that arrangement. At present, however, I think we have quite enough in front of us. I would like to make a success of the undertakings we have in mind in Alberta and Saskatchewan before going further.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into Committee on the Bill, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is it worth while beginning at this late hour? We cannot possibly conclude now. Besides, quite a number of members may wish to take part in the discussion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I accede to my hon. friend's suggestion. Perhaps I should say further in reference to the question put by the member for West Kootenay (Mr. Green) that the Irrigation Act applies only to Alberta and Saskatchewan and to the added portion of Manitoba. We have never asserted control of the surface water of British Columbia, nor do we control the land of that province except in the Peace River block and in the railway belt. I scarcely think that any Act analogous to this could be considered with regard to British Columbia.

Mr. NESBITT: In my experience, the cost of clearing up burned-over land is greater than the cost of drainage.

Mr. ROSS (Middlesex): The Dominion Land Surveyors say that is not so.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Dominion Land Surveyors, or such of them as I have come in contact with, are in favour of the suggestion of the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross).

Progress reported.

The House adjourned at six o'clock.

Thursday, March 20, 1919.

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

THE PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE OF COMMONS.

The SPEAKER: I beg to draw the attention of the House to the following Address of the Senate, which was delivered to me during the recent recess:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid upon the table of the Senate a return of copies of all papers, letters, telegrams, memorials, petitions or other communications or documents in the possession of the Government or in that of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons, which may be available, in connection with the recent delegation from the farmers of Canada to present certain public and national questions and issues to the attention of the Cabinet and of the Parliament of Canada.

It appears to me that this Address constitutes a breach of the privileges of this House, and that if it is obeyed without protest it might be treated as a precedent that would in the future be a source of inconvenience and embarrassment. I would point out that the authorities on parliamentary procedure are all agreed that where one House of Parliament desires communication of any papers or documents belonging to the other the proper course is to send a message asking to be supplied with the papers in question (see Bourinot, 4th edition, pp. 281, 282; May, 12th edition, p. 563). This practice, too, has, as far as I can ascertain, been invariably followed in all similar communications between the Houses. I beg to submit, therefore, for the consideration of the House, whether it would not be proper to send a message to the Senate drawing attention to the Address, pointing out the uniform practice that has hitherto existed between the two Houses, and stating that the Address, being a breach of a very important privilege of the House, might, if unobjected to, form a dangerous and objectionable precedent.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

Whereas this House having been informed by the Honourable the Speaker of an Address of the Senate of the 22nd May, 1918, which was delivered by His Honour during the recent recess of Parliament and which is as follows:

That an humble Address be presented to His Excellency the Governor General, praying that His Excellency will cause to be laid upon the table of the Senate a return of copies of all papers, letters, telegrams, memorials, petitions or other communications or documents in the possession of the Government or in that of His Honour the Speaker of the House of Commons, which may be available, in connection with the recent delegation from the farmers of Canada to present certain public and national questions and issues to the attention of the Cabinet and of the Parliament of Canada.

Resolved,—That a Message be sent to the Senate drawing the attention of their Honours to the uniform practice that has hitherto existed of transmitting a request by Message to the House of Commons whenever their Honours desire communication of any papers or documents belonging to the House, and that the issuing of an Address praying that his Excellency the Governor General will cause copies of papers and documents in the possession of the Speaker of the House of Commons to be laid upon the table of the Senate is a breach of an important privilege of this House which might, if unobjected to, form a dangerous and objectionable precedent.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North): Mr. Speaker, it has been my privilege to see a copy of the decision which you have submitted to the consideration of the House, and I may say at once that I fully concur in the conclusions which you have reached in respect to the order which was passed by the honourable the Senate. It is, of course, of the highest importance that each Chamber should maintain its full and absolute autonomy, and that there should be no encroachment whatever by one body upon the rights, privileges, powers and immunities of the other. It is also equally true that nothing in the way of obstruction should exist which would prevent the members of either branch of the Parliament of Canada from obtaining the fullest possible information respecting any public matter. If that object can be attained—and I think it can—without any infringement of the rights of either, and without the creation of any friction between the two great bodies which govern the country, it is of course proper and well that the ends sought to be attained should be reached without difficulty, and that there should be no clash between the two Houses. As the practice in the past has furnished ample provisions for the obtaining of such

information, and as there is no precedent for refusing any request that has hitherto been made by the Senate upon this body, or by this body upon the Senate, there is no reason to believe that anything but the greatest possible harmony will exist in future in regard to the supplying of such information. And I know that the Government and the officials of this House and yourself, Sir, will always meet any reasonable and proper demands that shall be made for such information as may be sought by the Senate. Knowing that the machinery in existence, and the constitution and rules which have been recognized hitherto have been ample for such purpose, I think it would be well to stand by these old rules; and I am of the opinion that your decision, Sir, is proper and constitutional, fully conserving the rights and dignities of this Chamber.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (York, South): Mr. Speaker, the question raised to-day has a good deal of width and breadth to it, to my mind, and that is, that in a formal manner we are objecting to an invasion of the rights of this House by the action of the Senate. I want to take the opportunity on this occasion to say that the people of Canada think that the Senate of Canada has invaded in a very important way the rights of the people and of this Chamber, and the question may come up later on. The pretension has been put forward—and the people of Canada think—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The people think, Sir,——

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. gentleman is going far beyond the question before the House. It is not competent for him, neither is it desirable, that he should now enter into a general discussion as to our constitutional relations with the other Chamber. He will please confine his remarks to the motion before the House.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I bow to your decision in that respect, Sir. But it has been stated in the remarks to-day, and probably in the resolution, that a dangerous precedent was being created. Later on I may address myself to the House on that subject, but I take advantage of this opportunity to say that when a dangerous invasion of the rights of this House, or of the people of this country, is made by the Senate, it ought to be corrected, and I am going to vote for this motion before the House to-day.

Motion agreed to.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Copy of an Order in Council passed on the 14th of March, 1919, in reference to separation allowance in the Canadian Naval Service.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

HOUSE OF COMMONS ACT AMENDMENT.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 26, to amend the House of Commons Act.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Explain.

Mr. JACOBS: Mr. Speaker, this Bill is designed to correct an abuse which has existed for many years in this country, whereby the Government in power can keep an electoral seat vacant as long as it suits its purpose. Unfortunately, this abuse cannot be attributed entirely to the present Government because Governments that have preceded it have been equally guilty. It is proposed by this Bill that within sixty days after a seat is declared vacant a new writ shall issue for an election. The rule in England is exactly in line with this. As many hon. members know, within a remarkably short period after a seat is declared vacant, I think it is three weeks in England, the writ issues for a new election. By this Bill it is proposed that sixty days shall be allowed before the election takes place. Because of geographical conditions we cannot very well fall in line with England and prescribe a similar term; otherwise I would have moved to introduce the same law, as to the delays.

Another provision of the Bill is that no member of Parliament may sit for more than one seat. There is a standing order of the House that no member shall sit for more than one seat, but, as Bourinot remarks, it is a rule that is honoured more in the breach than in the observance. This Bill proposes to make a statutory enactment that no member may sit for more than one seat, and that if he persists in doing so, he shall incur a penalty of $200 a day. It is provided further that he is not to make election, or declare his option, until the delays for protesting his seat have expired, because, without such a provision, a member might escape an investigation into the manner in which the election was carried on. After the delays have expired for protesting the seat, the member must declare his option in order to escape the penalties mentioned in the Bill. I am sure that the Bill will appeal to the good sense of the House, and I hope to see it carried.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

EXCESS CIRCULATION CHARTERED BANKS.

PROCLAMATIONS UNDER FINANCE ACT, 1914, TO CONTINUE IN FORCE.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 27, to provide for the continuance in force of certain proclamations made under the Finance Act, 1914.

He said: The Bill is founded on the resolutions which were adopted in committee yesterday.

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks).

GOVERNMENT SHIPBUILDING PROGRAMME.

Mr. REID (Mackenzie):

1. What is the total number of ships built by the Government since 1917?
2. What is the total tonnage?
3. How many of these were steel ships?
4. What was the cost per ton?
5. How many were wooden ships?
6. What was their cost per ton?
7. Were they built by contract or day labour or on a percentage basis?
8. If by contract, what steps have the Government taken to prevent profiteering?
9. What steps have the Government taken to ascertain the total cost of labour for construction, total cost of material used, total overhead expenses, gross profit and net profit respectively?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. One vessel in commission; 6 vessels will be ready for commission by the end of May, 1919; 38 under construction in various stages.
2. 263,950 tons dead weight.
3. All.
4. The attached schedule, which is official, gives in detail the costs per ton dead weight of the various types.
5. None.
6. Answered by No. 5.
7. Steel vessels built by contract.
8. (a) By inspection in order to determine if the specifications are being adhered to.

(b) All steel materials are purchased by the Marine Department.

(c) All other sub-contracts let by builders are submitted to the department for approval, these wherever possible, being confined to the Dominion.

[Mr. Jacobs.]

9. The total cost of labour for each branch and the total cost of material entering into construction is estimated by the technical officers of the department before contracts are awarded. To the above is added overhead charges of the various firms, in some cases estimated, in others known from audited returns, to which is added approximately 10 per cent for profit. Extra allowances are made for British Columbia districts where labour and other conditions differ from conditions in Eastern Canada.

FRENCH-CANADIAN CASUALTIES.

* Mr. PREVOST:

How many soldiers of French-Canadian nationality belonging to the Canadian Expeditionary Force have been killed at the front, or died of their wounds, since the beginning of hostilities?

Major-General MEWBURN: This information is not available, as the attestation paper of a soldier does not state positively whether or not he is French-Canadian, and to judge from the spelling of the names would be very misleading.

CANADIAN TRADE COMMISSION.

Mr. ROBB:

1. Who are the members of the Canadian Trade Commission?
2. Who is the Chairman of said Commission?
3. What salary is paid per annum to the Chairman, and what salary is paid per annum to each member of the Commission?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Sir Charles Gordon, Mr. H. B. Thomson, Mr. C. B. McNaught.
2. Sir Charles Gordon.
3. The salaries have not yet been fixed.

PAYMENTS TO SOLDIERS' DEPENDENTS.

Mr. VIEN:

1. Have any separation allowances or assigned pay been wrongly paid to dependents or relatives of soldiers or other persons?
2. If so, to what amount, during each of the years: 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes. Assigned pay and separation allowance have in some cases been paid (a) improperly; (b) in error, to dependents or relatives or other persons. This may be caused through (1) incomplete records; (2) wrong or incomplete information furnished by or on behalf of applicants; (3) loss of records at sea; (4) clerical errors; (5) payments made in England and France while payments were being made in Canada. In most cases they are being recovered, and separation allowance to all dependents

other than wives is now authorized by the Pay and Allowance Board, who carefully consider each case individually.

2. It is not possible to collate this information at present, as records are in England, in Headquarters files, and in all the military districts throughout Canada. Any over-payments which the Pay and Allowance Board consider should be refunded are being recovered, but the percentage of over-payments is very small. As announced in the House last session, all these over-payments are being transferred to suspense account, and an Act will be submitted to Parliament when the work is completed.

MAPLE SYRUP AND SUGAR.

Mr. BOYER:

1. What was the total number of samples of maple syrup analysed during each of the years: 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918, respectively?

2. How many of such samples during each of the years were found (*a*) pure; (*b*) normal; (*c*) doubtful; (*d*) adulterated?

3. How many prosecutions were instituted by the Government during each year against those persons who transgressed the law?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1.

Fiscal Year.	No. of Samples.
1913-14	138
1914-15	36
1915-16	307
1916-17	231
1917-18	8
1918-19	151
Total	871

2.

Fiscal Year.	Pure.	Normal.	Doubtful.	Adulterated.	Total
1913-14	98	..	3	37	138
1914-15	26	..	..	10	36
1915-16	256	4	1	46	307
1916-17	174	6	..	51	231
1917-18	8	..	..	..	8
1918-19	123	14	..	14	151
Total					871

3.

1913-14	37
1914-15	10
1915-16	15
1916-17	51
1917-18	..
1918-19	14
	127

Mr. BOYER:

1. What was the total number of samples of maple sugar, analyzed during each of the years: 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918, respectively?

2. How many of such samples during each of the years were found (a) pure; (b) normal; (c) doubtful; (d) adulterated?

3. How many prosecutions were instituted by the Government during each year against those persons who transgressed the law?

Answers:

1.

Fiscal year	No. of samples.
1913-14	83
1914-15	31
1915-16	265
1916-17	21
1917-18	7
1918-19	160
Total	567

2.

Fiscal Year.	Pure.	Normal.	Doubtful.	Adulterated.	Total
1913-14	45	3	1	34	83
1914-15	27	..	1	3	31
1915-16	230	5	..	30	265
1916-17	21	..	..	..	21
1917-18	7	..	..	..	7
1918-19	69	6	..	85	160
Total	399	14	2	152	567

3.

1913-14	34
1914-15	4
1915-16	29
1916-17	..
1917-18	..
1918-19	66
	133

PROTECTIVE WORKS IN BATISCAN.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. Has the Government been made aware that a portion of the Parish of Batiscan, in Champlain County, is being threatened with complete destruction on account of the waters of the St. Lawrence river, which are wearing away the bank opposite the village properties?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to construct, this year, some protective works which would prevent such destruction?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. Yes.

2. This work does not come under the jurisdiction of the Federal Government.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT EXPENDITURE.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What is the total expense incurred to date in the administration and enforcement of the Military Service Act, 1917?

2. What is the total amount of claims yet unpaid in connection with the said Act?

3. Will any further expense be incurred in connection therewith?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. To January 1, 1919, $3,661,417.20.

2. Practically none.

3. The wages and expenses of the Military Service Branch and the outside Registrar's offices which have been cut down to skeleton staffs, but which have to be kept open for the present for the purpose of furnishing information required by Parliament.

CHARGES AGAINST BISHOP BUDKA.

Mr. BLAKE:

1. Is the Government aware as to whether or not Bishop Budka (Ukrainian), resident at Winnipeg, was charged with sedition at Hafford, Sask., in July, 1918?
2. Has the Government any knowledge of any accusation being made against the said Bishop?
3. If so, has the Government taken any steps to inquire into such accusations?
4. Has the Government taken any steps to prosecute the said Bishop for his said alleged utterances?
5. Has the Government any intention of deporting the said Bishop? If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes, but the charge was subsequently withdrawn.
2. He has been accused of disloyalty on several occasions.
3. Investigation has been made but no evidence to substantiate the accusations has been submitted.
4. No grounds disclosed to prosecute.

ROYAL AIR FORCE AND SOLDIERS' BUTTON.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

Are Canadians who have served in the Royal Air Force and who have also been at the front, entitled to wear the "Returned Soldiers' Button?" If not, why not?

Major-General MEWBURN:

Canadians, members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, seconded to the Royal Air Force, are awarded War Service Badges in the same manner and under the same regulations as members of the C.E.F.

Canadians who are not members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force but who joined the Royal Air Force directly are not, under the present regulations, eligible for Canadian War Service Badges. They are eligible for badges issued by the Imperial authorities.

The question of issue of Canadian War Service Badges to Canadian citizens whose service has been exclusively with the Imperial Forces has received extended consideration. There were a number of objections to issue of Canadian badges to soldiers whose services was not with the Canadian forces; the principal one being that no record of service of such soldier is available at Militia Headquarters.

These difficulties have, however, been met, and an Order in Council which provides among other things for award of Canadian badges to those Canadians who resided in Canada on August 4, 1914, and who served in the Imperial Forces and have returned to take up their residence in Canada, has been prepared and is expected to be passed shortly.

[Mr. Meighen.]

RECRUITS FOR NAVAL SERVICE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens):

1. Was any person employed in Prince Edward Island in 1917 or 1918 to secure recruits for the Naval Service?
2. If so, what is the name of such person?
3. When did such employment begin?
4. What salary or remuneration was paid for this service?
5. Is such person employed in this service now?
6. If so, what salary does said person receive?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. George H. Holbrook.
3. December 1, 1916—November 30, 1917.
4. $150 per month.
5 and 6. No.

REBATES OF CUSTOMS DUTY.

Mr. ROBB:

What was the total amount of duty refunded or rebated during the years ending December 31, 1917 and December 31, 1918?

Hon. Mr. REID: Amount paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund on account of Refunds and Drawbacks: 1917, $17,720,-925.84; 1918, $10,334,691.96.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Are all the provisions of the Military Service Act, 1917, still in force?
2. If not, how many of the said provisions have been abrogated?
3. If any of the provisions have been abrogated, how and when was the Act so amended?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Certain M.S.A. Regulations have been suspended.
2. Regulations and Orders in Council bearing on seven important provisions connected with the enforcement of the Military Service Act have been suspended.
3. P.C. 3090 December 16, 1918, suspends the Regulations and Orders in Council referred to in "2."

COMMISSIONS CREATED BY GOVERNMENT.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Order of the House issued last session, on the 25th March, 1918, for a return showing all commissions created by the Government since 1911, been complied with?
2. If not, why?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to comply with the said order at an early date this session?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: The return asked for was tabled yesterday.

ALCOHOLIC CONTENT OF MEDICINES.

*Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Is it the intention of the Government, during the present Session, to pass a measure

respecting patent medicines, repealing the Act which is now in force?

2. If not, is it the intention of the Government to efficaciously inspect the preparation and sale of medicines which contain basic properties of copious doses of alcohol and other ingredients to produce abortion?

3. If so, will the Government appoint a Committee to be composed of physicians, irrespective of politics, and not associated in the manufacture of patent medicines, except in the case relating to the preparing and revising of said proposed measure, before presenting it to Parliament?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. No.

2. Yes.

3. It is proposed to establish a board qualified to pronounce finally upon the character of patent medicines as regards the content of alcohol and their toxicity.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. What amount, if any, was paid by the Government for advertising to the Moncton Transcript, Acadian Recorder, Morning Chronicle Halifax Herald, and Evening Mail, during the year 1918?

2. What amounts, if any, were paid to the said newspapers during the same year for printing?

Mr. FONTAINE:

1. How many men of military age have been condemned to terms of imprisonment for infractions of the Military Service Act 1917, in each of the nine provinces of Canada?

2. How many of the said men have been released from prison before the expiration of their terms?

3. What are their names, where were they imprisoned and what was the length of their respective sentences?

Mr. LEMIEUX:

1. What quantity of soap was purchased by the Government from the Palm Olive Company in 1917 and 1918?

2. What was the price paid for same?

PRACTICE IN ANSWERING QUESTIONS.

Mr. SPEAKER: At the last sitting of the House the hon. member for Bonaventure (Mr. Marcil) put a question to me with respect to the practice in bringing down answers to questions. I have had the matter carefully inquired into, and I find that practically the custom for years has been only to bring down one copy of the answer, and only one copy is called for under our rules and practice. It has, however, been usual for ministers to present an additional copy, and in the past it has been the general practice where members desired immediately a copy of an answer to have it prepared by the sessional clerks. I can see that it would be a great convenience to members if a more uniform practice of having an additional copy of the answers brought down could be adopted, and I shall take the matter up with the various ministers and endeavour to see if that cannot be done in future.

STATEMENTS OF LT.-COL. PRATT, M.L.A. —THE HIGH COMMISSIONER.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: May I ask the Acting Prime Minister whether the Government has given consideration to the statements contained in an interview published in yesterday's papers alleged to have been given at Halifax by Lt.-Col. Pratt, Conservative member of the Ontario Legislature, in which certain severe strictures are passed upon members of the Government, particularly upon the High Commissioner for Canada? Is there any connection between the statements in that interview and the report in to-day's papers that the High Commissioner is about to resign? Further, is it a fact that the High Commissioner is about to resign, or has resigned?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The statement to which my hon. friend refers has not come to my attention. I can assure him that so far as I know the High Commissioner is not about to resign, nor do I know that his resignation has been suggested.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Has the Government come to any decision with regard to the re-enacting of the daylight saving legislation? As a change in time is to be effected in the United States at the end of the present month, this matter is one of much interest to the people generally.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The matter has been and still is under consideration by the Government.

DISEMBARKATION OF CANADIAN SOLDIERS AT PORTLAND.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. A. B. COPP (Westmorland): Press reports say that returned Canadian wounded soldiers are to be disembarked at Portland instead of at our own Canadian ports. Is that correct?

Major-General MEWBURN: I do not think that is quite correct. During the last month we decided to transfer to Portland two hos-

pital ships with cot cases, owing to the congestion at Halifax and Saint John, and to the fact that these cases can be moved from Portland to Montreal in twelve hours as against thirty-two hours from Halifax, and at a considerable saving. We are transferring to Portland only two hospital ships a month, as a temporary measure.

INQUIRIES RE ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. POWER: I wish to call the attention of the House to an answer given to a question which appeared on the Order Paper yesterday. The question is as follows:

1. Has the Government taken possession of the property situated on St. Louis Road, bequeathed by the late Gustave Stuart, K.C., of Quebec?
2. For what purpose was this property bequeathed?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to make any use of it? If so, what?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is not in order for the hon. gentleman, on the Orders of the Day, to enter into what would in effect be a discussion of an answer to a question. He will have opportunity of doing that in due course, when the Estimates of the department concerned are before the House.

Mr. POWER: It is a question of privilege. The Government has given me two answers to the same question; one, "Yes," and one "No."

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. It is not competent for the hon. gentleman to enter into this question on the Orders of the Day.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): Will the leader of the Government define the principles on which questions are answered? A good deal of doubt exists in the minds of the members whether they should, in particular cases, move for returns, or ask questions. A return is a very slow process; the minister has presented returns to-day that were moved for a year ago. On what principle do the ministers decide whether the information sought should be given in the form of a return or in the form of an answer?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It would take quite a year for the Government to obtain the necessary information to enable them to answer properly some of the questions on the Order Paper. It is the desire of the Government to answer all questions, if it is possible to obtain the information. If some inquiry is necessary, involving considerable delay, the Government, in its discretion, is entitled to ask that the questions stand as orders for returns. I do not think it is possible to lay down any hard and fast rule. The desire of the Government is to answer the questions, if it is possible to do so properly, within a reasonable time, and without extended inquiry.

INTERVIEW WITH LORD SHAUGHNESSY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. Mr. MURPHY: May I avail myself of the desire just expressed by the Acting Prime Minister to ask whether his attention has been drawn to an interview with Lord Shaughnessy at Montreal with reference to the presence of his colleagues overseas, and, if so, whether the Government has any statement to make with regard to Lord Shaughnessy's criticism?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am sorry that Lord Shaughnessy's statement has not come to my attention; therefore I cannot make any comment on it.

Mr. MURPHY: I will send it to my hon. friend.

ENTERTAINMENT AND OCCUPATION OF TROOPS AWAITING EMBARKATION.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I desire to read the following message from the Overseas Minister of Militia (Sir Edward Kemp):

Following are some of the things provided for entertainment and occupation of troops whilst awaiting embarkation.

General training. Upon cessation of hostilities it was immediately decided to eliminate the more particularly offensive training from the syllabus. Maintenance of health of troops and their preparation for demobilization became paramount thought. Syllabus has been laid down for daily physical training, discipline, ceremonial parades and route marches to limited extent. Remainder of time has been taken up in instruction by Khaki University of Canada in all areas and sports and athletics with object of maintaining health and contentment of troops as far as possible and fitting them for their civil duties.

Education. A concentration camp in connection with the work of Khaki University has been opened at Ripon for the purpose of assembling and giving instruction in more advanced educational work to suitable students. Establishment of this camp has proved very popular, and keen competition has been apparent to gain admittance. At present there are in session between 750 and 800 students. Approval has been given for attachment of officers and other ranks who have studied for at least two years at a University in Canada prior to enlistment, to enable them to continue

their studies. This privilege has been extended to some 300 students with creditable service overseas. Total attachment to date 307. Battalion schools organized for men seeking elementary education comprise elementary agriculture and commercial arithmetic, etc., area colleges in each area for men to study who have studied higher matriculation, etc. At concentration camp, Ripon, matriculation first and second years arts, applied science and first year pre-medical studies is given. Men attached to British Universities who require third and fourth year work in graduated studies.

Literature is distributed amongst Canadian troops, such as Booklet number 2, information regarding land settlement and agriculture. Copies Canadian Government pamphlet entitled "Canada and her soldiers," have been despatched to France for distribution to Canadian troops.

Athletics. Teams selected from Canadian personnel in England and France will compete in International events in England during spring and summer of this year, embracing boxing, pushball, baseball, soccer, football, lawn-tennis, and athletics; field and track events. Sub-committees have been formed for each sport comprising officers and other ranks. Canadian boxing championship, O.M. F.C. in British Isles was held at Witley on February 27, before a very enthusiastic audience. Sum of five thousand dollars has been authorized from a special fund in connection with expenses incurred in training of Canadian teams buying surplus sporting equipment, extra messing where necessary. Sunday travelling expenses, etc.

Activities of Canadian Y.M.C.A. An officer has been placed in charge of athletic work in interests of Y.M.C.A. and prepared to co-operate fully in matters of athletic programmes. Distribution of boxing gloves and footballs, etc., has been made to all Canadian areas. Complete list of sport equipment it is expected will be required to carry out extensive athletic programme contemplated during coming summer; has been prepared to cover wants of Canadian troops in British Isles. In each area there are from four to six Y.M.C.A. huts which are supplied with concert parties, luxuries, cinemas, table games and free stationery. There are also canteens in each area selling various goods such as cleaning kits, etc., etc., at cheapest rates. Pamphlets on citizenship have been distributed among troops numbering approximately fifty thousand copies. During the year 1918 the sum of sixty-eight thousand dollars was expended out of Y.M.C.A. fund in purchasing equipment for troops in England, total comprising England and France amounted to one hundred and sixty-four thousand dollars.

In London a Leave Bureau has been established to take care of Canadian soldiers in England on leave who have no homes on this side. Man is put up for six days in London, including bed, meals, tour every day of city, four theatres and comforts of private home twice during this period for two pounds, five shillings or eleven dollars. About twenty thousand men per month pass through Leave Bureau. Free coffee bars are established in England at points at which troops arrive from France, where they are supplied with free coffee and food. On board ships a Y.M.C.A. officer is supplied to each conducting staff. He has with him magic lanterns and slides for entertainment purposes, gramophones, tables, games, athletic material, writing paper, etc., and organized entertainment on board.

YUKON PLACER MINING ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. Arthur Meighen (Minister of the Interior), Bill No. 7, to amend the Yukon Placer Mining Act, was read the third time and passed.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY COMPANY.

RESOLUTION TO APPOINT A RECEIVER.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved: That the House do go into Committee to consider the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to bring in a measure to ratify and confirm,—

(1) The Order in Council of the seventh day of March, 1919, which provides as follows:—

"Whereas under the authority of "The Appropriation Act No. 2, 1918," the Governor in Council advanced the sum of $7,471,399.93 or thereabouts to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for certain purposes in said Act defined, including the meeting of "deficit in operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System," such sum being in addition to other large sums previously advanced under previous authority for similar purposes.

"And whereas a letter dated 4th March, 1919, from the Vice President of said Company was received by the Minister of Finance, as follows:—

"I am instructed to inform the Government that in view of the fact that the increased rates applicable to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway have not been sufficient to meet the increased operating expenses, it will not be possible for that Company to continue its operations when the present funds have been exhausted, which will be about 10th instant. May I ask you to be so good as to acknowledge receipt of this letter."

"And whereas should the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System be discontinued, great detriment to the public interests would ensue, and the intention of Parliament in authorizing the said advances would be defeated.

"And whereas the continued operation of said system is essential in the present position of Canada resulting from the war, which has not yet been terminated by Peace, especially in connection with the transport of returning Canadian Troops and of supplies and equipment and freight, and other services made necessary by the war.

"And whereas for the protection of the public interests and for the purposes aforesaid, it is essential that the operation of said system should be continued without interruption.

"And whereas the duty of continuing such operation is thrown upon the Government of Canada inasmuch as there are no effective provisions in existing laws whereby such continued operation could be otherwise secured.

"And whereas immediate action by the Government is imperative.

"Therefore, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, under the authority of the War Measures Act, 1914, and of all other authority in that behalf, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered as follows:—

"1. In this Order, unless the context otherwise requires:—

"(a) 'Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System' means and includes (1) the lines of railway and their appurtenances and the undertaking and works of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, of the Grand Trunk Pacific Branch Lines Company and of the Grand Trunk Pacific Saskatchewan Railway Company, (2) the lines of telegraph and their appurtenances and the undertaking and works of the Grand Trunk Pacific Telegraph Company, (3) the steamships, vessels and their appurtenances and the undertaking and works of the Grand Trunk Pacific Steamships Company, (4) the properties, hotels, and appurtenances and the undertaking and works of the Grand Trunk Pacific Development Company.

"(b) 'Officers' means and includes Directors, President, Vice-Presidents, Managers, Secretary, Treasurer, Clerks, Servants and employees.

"(c) 'Books and papers' means and includes books of accounts or of entries relating to the business or operation or maintenance of the said lines of railway or telegraph or steamships, vessels, hotels, properties or works, or any of them, or any part thereof, also records, statements and documents relating to such business, operation, or maintenance or any part thereof.

"(d) 'Exchequer Court' means the Exchequer Court of Canada.

"(e) The singular number includes the plural and the plural the singular, the male gender includes the female, and the female the male.

"(f) 'Person' includes corporation.

"(g) 'Government Receiver' means the Receiver appointed by this Order.

"2. The Minister of Railways and Canals is hereby appointed Receiver of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System, and such Receiver shall have and exercise with respect to the said system and every part thereof and to the companies included therein, powers and duties similar to those of a receiver under section 26 of the Exchequer Court Act.

"3. On the application of the Government Receiver the Exchequer Court of Canada may make such orders respecting such Receiver and his powers and duties and the carrying out thereof including the issue of Receiver's Certificates, as the Court may deem necessary or expedient in the public interest.

"4. Subsections 5 and 6 of section 26 of the said Act shall apply to the Government Receiver and to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System and every part thereof and to the companies included therein—except that no remuneration of the Receiver shall be fixed by the Court.

"5. The Government Receiver may, on or after the 10th day of March, 1919, or on such earlier day as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, or any Company included in the Grand Trunk Pacific System, may cease to operate efficiently its undertaking and works, or any portion thereof, take possession of such undertaking and works, and the Exchequer Court may from time to time make and enforce such orders in aid of the Government Receiver with respect to taking of such possession or otherwise as the Court may deem expedient for carrying out of the provisions of this Order according to their true spirit and meaning.

"6. Each Company included in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System and its officers shall facilitate the carrying out of the powers and duties of the Government Receiver, and all books and papers, real or personal property

of each of the said Companies, in its possession or under its control or the control of its officers or any of them, shall without delay be handed over to the said Receiver or his nominees or placed under his control in such manner as he may direct.

"7. Any officer of the Company included in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System, who obstructs the Government Receiver in carrying out his powers and duties, or fails to hand over to him or his nominees, or to place under his control, any book or paper, real or personal property in accordance with the foregoing provisions, shall incur a penalty for each breach of said provisions of the amount hereinafter stated, viz., in the case of a President, a Vice-President or a Director, the sum of Ten Thousand Dollars ($10,000); in the case of a Manager, with the authority of or similar to that of a General Manager or of one acting for or assisting a General Manager, the sum of Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000); in the case of a Secretary or of a Treasurer, or of one acting for or assisting a Secretary or Treasurer, the sum of Two Thousand Five Hundred Dollars ($2,500); in the case of any clerks, servant or employee, the sum of One Thousand Dollars ($1,000).

"8. Any penalty incurred under the foregoing provisions may be sued for and recovered, with costs, in the Exchequer Court, by suit or proceeding in such Court instituted by the Attorney General of Canada.

"9. Nothing in this Order contained, and nothing done or to be done under the authority hereof, shall render the Government of Canada or the Government Receiver, or any one acting under the authority of the Government Receiver, or of the Exchequer Court, liable to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, or to any Company included in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System, or to any creditor, or holder of any bonds, debentures, debenture stock or other securities of the said Companies or any of them, for any claim by reason of the making of this Order, or of anything done or to be done under the authority hereof, or under the authority of the Government Receiver or of the Exchequer Court, nor shall afford any defence to, nor shall prejudice any claim, action, or proceeding of the Government of Canada which the Government might lawfully make or take had this Order not been made.

"10. All Officers except the Board of Directors of any Company included in The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System shall continue to discharge for the Government Receiver, till further orders or directions by him, duties in connection with the operation and management of the undertakings and works of any Company included in The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System, similar to their present duties, so that no interruption in the operation and management thereof may occur.

"11. Nothing herein contained or done, or to be done hereunder shall prejudice the exercise by the Exchequer Court or by any Court of any Province of Canada of its present jurisdiction under the Exchequer Court Act, or under any other law of jurisdiction to appoint a receiver or to order or decree a sale or foreclosure of any railway, or section thereof, or other property affected by this Order; provided that before any such sale or foreclosure is ordered or decreed or any Receiver is appointed by any such Court, notice of the application shall be given to the Minister of Railways and

Canals of Canada, and he, or counsel for him, shall be heard upon the application; and the Court in granting, or refusing or postponing the application, shall take into consideration the public interests involved, and shall make such order as shall in the opinion of the Court protect the public interests.

"12. The Minister of Railways and Canals mentioned in this Order means the Minister for the time being, and upon a vacancy occurring his successor shall become the Government Receiver. The powers and duties of the Government Receiver may be exercised by such member of the Government as may from time to time be the Acting Minister of Railways and Canals.

"13. Should it be made to appear to the Government Receiver that any book or paper is or has been used for the purposes of the operations of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, as well as the operations of any company included in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system, and that for such reason the same should not be handed over to the Receiver or placed under his exclusive control, the Government Receiver may, on such terms and condition as he may deem necessary, allow the joint use of same to be continued. The Government Receiver may open such books and accounts as in his opinion may be necessary, to separate and transfer from any such book or paper, jointly used, accounts and entries relating to any of the companies included in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System, and may so separate and transfer the same; and the said Receiver shall keep the accounts of his receipts, expenses and disbursements in connection with each of the companies included in the said System and their works, undertakings and properties, or parts thereof, in such manner that one may be distinguished from another, and that the interests of the various parties interested therein may be ascertained.

"14. The Governor in Council may, from time to time, under the Order of the Exchequer Court, and upon the security of Receiver's Certificates, or otherwise, advance to the Government Receiver such sums as may be required to enable him to exercise his powers, and to perform his duties as Receiver; the sums so advanced shall be paid out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

"15. No transfer of any shares in the Capital Stock of any company included in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System shall, after the appointment of the Government Receiver, be made, and no such transfer shall be entered on any register or transfer book. Any transfer contrary to this provision shall be null and void; provided that the Government Receiver may, on the application of any person interested, or of his own motion, permit any transfer to be made or completed."

(2) And also the Order in Council of the thirteenth day of March, 1919, which provides as follows:—

"WHEREAS through inadvertence, there were omitted from the definition of 'Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System,' in Section 1 of the Order passed by His Excellency in Council on the 7th of March, 1919, providing for the appointment of a Government Receiver for the said System, the necessary words relating to Grand Trunk Pacific Terminal Elevator Company Limited;

"THEREFORE, His Excellency the Governor General in Council, is pleased to order and it is hereby ordered that the said Order in Council of the 7th March, 1919, shall be and the same is hereby amended by inserting at the end of the definition of 'Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System' in Section 1 thereof, the following:—

'(5) The properties, elevators, terminals and appurtenances, and the undertaking and works of Grand Trunk Pacific Terminal Elevator Company, Limited.'

"AND His Excellency the Governor General in Council is further pleased to declare and doth hereby declare that the said Order in Council of the 7th March, take effect from the passing of the said Order of the 7th March, 1919."—The Minister of Finance.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): As this resolution is a very important one, I think it is proper for me to point out that, while we may agree to this resolution going through, before the Bill is introduced, there should be furnished to hon. members of this House certain information in connection with the very important transaction with which this resolution undertakes to deal. The railroad referred to in the resolution is an enterprise in which the Canadian people have taken a great interest, ever since the first steps for the building of the Grand Trunk Pacific took place in 1903 during the various years down to the present time. Now that this railway is getting into these financial and other entanglements, it is proper that the Canadian people, whose money has, to a very large extent, entered into this enterprise, should have from the Government the fullest possible information as to its exact condition. Therefore, as this is a new Parliament, I think, before the Bill is introduced, every member of this House should be furnished with a copy of the original agreement, which is not a very long one, between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Government; that is the agreement under which the company started in 1903, and the Government of the day undertook to furnish certain moneys and to comply with certain conditions in respect thereto. This agreement was, if I remember correctly, further amended in 1904, and a statute was passed confirming that agreement. I presume the agreement as finally confirmed and ratified in 1904 is the agreement that hon. members should have an opportunity of perusing. We should also be put in possession of the correspondence which passed between the former Government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier and that company, or at least any such correspondence as has a bearing upon the reso-

lution now before the House, and also all the correspondence which passed between the Administration of the Right Hon. Sir Robert Borden and that company, in particular in reference to the section of the road that is now concerned, and also the section of the road between Winnipeg and Moncton. It is alleged that the Government of the day have not complied with the agreement entered into in 1904, and that they have made it impossible for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to carry on the enterprise. For those reasons, I think that before we deal with the question, the particulars I have enumerated should be put at the disposal of hon. members. We should also have a statement of all the financial aid, by endorsation, or guarantees of bonds, or otherwise, given by this Government or the former Government to this company, also a statement of the cash subsidies or aids granted by the different governments, from 1903 to date, to this company. The Government should give the House as clear a statement as possible as to the financial standing of the company on the 10th day of March, 1919, the date on which the Government, as I understand it, took charge.

I do not at all agree with the steps taken by the Government in regard to taking charge of this company. The War Measures Act was never intended to be used for purposes of this kind. That Act was intended only to be a ready instrument in the hands of the Government to carry out any purpose for which there was no legislative provision on the Statute Books of this country. That was a proper and necessary thing to have. But now that the war is over and there is no urgency in connection with the measure; when we have a statute of our own solemnly passed by the Parliament of this country and acted on practically since Confederation in connection with cases of this kind; when the courts of this country have a well established practice and procedure in connection with putting bodies of this kind into liquidation, it is an innovation of a most undesirable character to start a proceeding of this kind, which is bound to create entanglements and difficulties which are far-reaching and which the Government may, later on, find it very hard to remedy.

The only section in the War Measures Act that could possibly be used for an action of this kind is section 6. This section of the War Measures Act, which is Chapter II of the Statutes of Canada, 1914, reads:

> The Governor in Council shall have power to do and authorize such acts and things, and to make from time to time such orders and regulations as he may by reason of the existence of real or apprehended war, invasion or insurrection deem it necessary or advisable for the security, defence, peace, order and welfare of Canada; and for greater certainty, but not so as to restrict the generality of the foregoing terms, it is hereby declared that the powers of the Governor in Council shall extend to all matters coming within the classes of subjects hereinafter enumerated, that is to say:—
>
> (a) Censorship and the control and suppression of publications, writings, maps, plans, photographs, communications and means of communications;
>
> (b) Arrest, detention, exclusion and deportation;
>
> (c) Control of the harbours, ports and territorial waters of Canada, and the movement of vessels;
>
> (d) Transportation by land, air or water, and the control of the transport of persons and things;
>
> (e) Trading, exportation, importation, production and manufacture;
>
> (f) Appropriation, control, forfeiture and disposition of property and of the use thereof.
>
> 2. All orders and regulations made under this section shall have the force of law, and shall be enforced in such manner and by such courts, officers and authorities as the Governor in Council may prescribe, and may be varied, extended or revoked by any subsequent order or regulation; but if any order or regulation is varied, extended or revoked, neither the previous operation thereof nor anything duly done thereunder, shall be affected thereby, nor shall any right, privilege, obligation or liability acquired, accrued, accruing or incurred thereunder be affected by such variation, extension or revocation.

All these powers could be exercised by the Government in view of the immediate danger of war. Fortunately, Sir, the danger of war is over, but the machinery was at hand whereby the Government, upon a motion before the judge, could have had a receiver appointed by the Exchequer Court instanter. That was the proper way to deal with a matter of this kind, for I submit, with all due respect to the body of men who are here to govern the affairs of this country, that this Parliament should not usurp the functions of a judge or court. I repeat, an order could have been made by a judge of the Exchequer Court and a receiver appointed in a twinkling, and when that course is followed, both the party moving for the order and the party going into liquidation has an opportunity to be heard. But in this case the company has not had an opportunity of being heard. The company was thrown into a receivership whether it liked it or not. For these reasons it is a very grave question for the members of this House to consider whether they will sanction this method of procedure, which is drifting away from the well-established rules that have been observed in this country at least for the last fifty years. I trust that before the Bill is introduced and we

are called upon to decide whether the Government has taken the proper course in connection with this company, full information will be given to the House and ample opportunity provided for digesting its various phrases.

Motion agreed to, and the House went into committee on the resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The request of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition for correspondence or other information relating to this resolution, and the Bill to be founded upon it, is reasonable, and before the Bill is introduced we shall be glad to produce such correspondence as we may find which is relevant to the proper consideration of this question.

With regard to the agreement to which he has referred, namely, that which was entered into in 1903 between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Government of Canada, hon. members will find that agreement in the statutes of 1903, chapter 71, an Act respecting the construction of a National Transcontinental Railway. The agreement which had been entered into is found in a schedule to that Act. In 1904, further legislation was introduced into Parliament validating an amended agreement, and making further provisions with reference to the transaction. Therefore, such members of the House as may desire to familiarize themselves with the legislation, and with the agreements between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government of Canada, will find all necessary information in the statutes of those years.

It had been my intention, on consideration of this resolution to give a brief résumé of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway transaction, and to furnish to the committee a considerable part of the information for which my hon. friend has properly asked.

In 1903 an agreement was entered into between the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Government of Canada for the building of what is known as the National Transcontinental Railway. That National Transcontinental Railway embraced two divisions: the Eastern division from Moncton to Winnipeg, and the Western division from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert. The Eastern division was built by the Government of Canada upon plans and specifications agreeable to the Grand Trunk Pacific, and was built through a commission. The intention was that when that Eastern division from Moncton to Winnipeg was completed, it should be leased by the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which was to construct, own and operate the Western division, that is to say, the main line from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert and the subsidiary undertakings. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was to lease the Eastern division from Moncton to Winnipeg for seven years, and was to pay no rent, but only the operating expenses. After a period of seven years it was to pay three per cent on the cost of construction of the Eastern division of the National Transcontinental Railway, the lease being for a period of fifty years altogether.

With respect to the Western division of the National Transcontinental railway, the construction of the line was to be financed by the sale of bonds guaranteed by the Government of Canada and by the sale of bonds guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company; and here I may say that the proprietary interest of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, which was to own and operate the Eastern division, and lease that division, was in the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada was to own all the stock, and does as a matter of fact own all the stock, of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. So that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and indeed the entire National Transcontinental railway, became a part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company's system. The Western division was, as I have said, to be financed by the sale of securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, guaranteed by the Dominion Government, and guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The Dominion Government was to guarantee bonds of the Prairie Section (which, roughly speaking, extended from Winnipeg to Edmonton) to an amount not exceeding $13,000 per mile.

The Dominion Government was to guarantee the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company required to construct the Mountain Section, extending roughly, from Edmonton or thereabouts to Prince Rupert, to an extent of three-quarters of the entire cost of that Mountain Section. The Dominion Government was given first charge upon the undertaking from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert, the bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company which I have referred to, guaranteed by the Dominion, being secured by trust mortgage covering the enterprise. Next after that charge came the securities of the

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, to an amount of about $20,000,000. The House will, therefore, readily grasp the plan of finance which was to ensure the construction of the National Transcontinental railway. Just let me summarize.

The Dominion Government was to build the Eastern division from Moncton to Winnipeg. With respect to the Western division, the Dominion Government was to guarantee bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific secured by first mortgage. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada was to guarantee second mortgage bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and it was thought at the time that the proceeds of bonds so guaranteed would be adequate to construct the Western division. As it transpired, the proceeds of the bonds mentioned were not sufficient, and in 1909 legislation was introduced into Parliament whereby the Dominion Government made an advance of $10,000,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company upon the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The proceeds of that loan were found not sufficient, and in 1913 a further loan of $15,000,000 was made by the Government of Canada to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company upon the guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The proceeds of that loan were found not sufficient to complete the enterprise and here a departure took place. The Grand Trunk Railway Company, which, as I have stated to the House, has a proprietary interest in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, declined to guarantee any further loans made by the Government to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for the purpose of its completion. It was put forward that the finances of the Grand Trunk Railway Company would not permit the Grand Trunk Railway Company to increase its guarantees of loans made by the Government to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. It was considered desirable in the national interest, and having regard to the fact that the enterprise had been carried on so far, that the undertaking should be finished, and a further loan made by the Government. And in 1914 a loan of $16,000,000 was made by the Government of Canada to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, such loan not being guaranteed, as had been the case with the two previous loans, by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The proceeds of that last loan were adequate to complete the line, which was finished at the end of 1915.

The position then was that the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company had completed its enterprise by the financing which I have mentioned. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada owned, and still owns, all the stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The Grand Trunk Railway Company then, through its president, notified the Prime Minister that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, to use his own terms, had "come to the end of its tether," as far as the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company was concerned. In 1916, in order to provide for the payment of interest upon securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and to provide for deficit in operating expenses—because there has been, with the exception of one year, a continuous deficit in operating expenses on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company,—the Government voted in the Estimates the sum of $8,000,000. That was in 1916.

Now, I desire to point out to the House that the Dominion Government, since the original agreement was entered into, and without being obliged to do so under the terms of the original agreement, in 1909 made a loan of $10,000,000, guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company; in 1913 made a loan of $15,000,000 guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company; in 1914 made a loan of $16,000,000 direct to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company; and in 1916 Parliament voted $8,000,000 for the purpose of providing for the interest upon the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company,—guaranteed not only by the Dominion Government but by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada,—and, further, to meet deficit in operation expenses, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada taking the view that they should not be called upon to furnish any money for the operation of that railway company. In 1917, the situation continuing as it was, Parliament again voted the sum of $7,500,000 for the same purposes. Of that sum about $5,000,000 was expended. Last year Parliament again, at the instance of the Government, voted the sum of $7,500,000 for the same purposes.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Were these loans or gifts?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: These three I have last mentioned were loans—$8,000,000 in 1916; $7,500,000 in 1917, of which $5,000,000 was paid out, and $7,500,000 voted last year.

These were loans to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company secured by blanket mortgage upon their enterprise.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Were these advances also made on the expectation of the Grand Trunk being able to carry out its original agreement with Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government has never expected any thing else than that the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada would carry out the bargain which it entered into with the Government of Canada. At the same time, the present Government of Canada, like the Government which preceded it, has been desirous of assisting in the completion of the enterprise and adopting a generous attitude not only towards the Grand Trunk Pacific undertaking but towards the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada itself; the Grand Trunk being a pioneer company whose operations have meant much to this country.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was the interest always paid?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The interest was always paid but it was paid from the money which Parliament voted. Parliament voted the money which paid interest upon the Grand Trunk Pacific securities, guaranteed by the Dominion Government and guaranteed by the Grand Trunk, and paid also the deficit in the operating expenses. The interest has been paid only because the Dominion Government, over and above any obligation which they had under the agreement, have provided all the money for the purpose.

Mr. CAHILL: Was this $8,000,000, $7,500,000 and $7,500,000 guaranteed by the Grand Trunk?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, it was a direct loan to the Grand Trunk Pacific, not guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but secured by a blanket mortgage on the entire enterprise. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company has not been able to pay its fixed charges with the exception of one year, and then only to a small extent. There has also been a deficit in operating expenses, which is to-day and will be for the coming year a larger amount than it was last year.

In order that the committee may understand the attitude of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada towards its obligations with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific, I desire to refer to what is known as the Drayton-Acworth report. The Government saw the railway situation developing in a way that required attention and action, and in 1916 they appointed a commission to look into the entire railway situation of Canada and make such recommendations as they thought proper respecting the transcontinental railway systems. That commission consisted of Sir Henry Drayton, chairman of the Board of Railway Commissioners, Mr. Acworth, an eminent London financier and railway authority and Mr. Smith, President of the New York Central Railway System. They made a report, Mr. Smith dissenting from the conclusions of his colleagues.

The Drayton-Acworth report has been before the House and is available to any member who may desire to read it. To those who take an interest in the railway situation in Canada and especially those who want to know something about the problem before us, I cannot too earnestly commend this report of Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. Acworth in respect to the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway situation. The report deals, amongst other things, with the question of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and with that of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, which, as I have stated, is a subsidiary of the Grand Trunk Railway Company. At page 26 the report calls attention to the fact that the chairman of the Grand Trunk Railway, writing to the Prime Minister, states "they are at the end of their tether," and that "it is quite impossible for them to meet the extra liabilities arising from the Grand Trunk Pacific Company." That is to say that Mr. Smithers, who is the chairman of the Board of Directors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, wrote to the Prime Minister, as I stated a little while ago, to the effect that they were at the end of their tether and that it would be impossible for them to meet the extra liabilities arising from the Grand Trunk Pacific Company. What these liabilities are, I shall explain to the House in a moment. At page 26 of the report I find a statement expressing the opinion of the commissioners upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada towards their liability with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company. The commissioners say:

"We cannot think that this is a reasonable proposition, or one that we could advise the Government to accept——We think the Grand Trunk Company cannot thus escape the consequence of its own action. We quite agree that the Grand Trunk Company cannot meet its Grand Trunk Pacific liabilities. But, if the Government is to relieve the Grand Trunk Company of liabilities which it voluntarily incurred,

but which it now finds impossible to meet, it is for the Government, not for the Company, to fix the terms."

To show further the attitude of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, I read from the report an extract from the examination of Mr. Chamberlin, who was president of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and also of the Grand Trunk Railway Company:

Sir Henry Drayton—Doesn't it really come down to this that the statements in your letter mean that in your view, in order to protect the finances of the Grand Trunk, and as a corollary to protect the finances of the country the Government ought to relieve the Grand Trunk in regard to its investment; isn't that the whole thing?

Mr. Chamberlain—That is the whole thing.

Sir Henry Drayton—There is nothing else to it?

Mr. Chamberlain—Nothing else.

That clearly shows that the Grand Trunk Railway Company, proprietors of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway System, had come to the conclusion that they would not continue to be responsible for the payment of the interest upon the securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific; that they would not be responsible for the deficit in its operations but would cast the entire burden of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company upon the Government of Canada; in other words, wash their hands of the entire transaction.

Mr. McKENZIE: Does the minister think that the Grand Trunk Railway could by any ipse dixit, or action of their own, relieve themselves of their responsibility under the original agreement?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Legally they could not and I shall come to that a little later on. But if the Government of Canada continued, as they requested them to continue, to vote $7,500,000 a year, that question would not arise because the $7,500,000 that we would vote would relieve the Grand Trunk for the year in which it was voted from the necessity of finding any money to pay the interest upon the securities which it had guaranteed, and which the Dominion Government had guaranteed, and any deficit in operating expenses. So long as the Dominion Government will introduce measures into this House providing for an annual payment of $7,500,000, or $8,000,000, a year the Grand Trunk would not be obliged to find any money in respect to its subsidiary undertaking. But the point I am making now is that the Grand Trunk Railway directorate have fairly put themselves upon record as having washed their hands of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and intend, if they can, to pass the burden of its operation and financing upon the Government of Canada. That is to say, the real proprietors of the system, the company owning the stock in the subsidiary, intended to cast upon the Government of Canada the entire burden of its financing although the company was not only not paying its fixed charges but had, as it has to-day, a deficit on its operating account. Now the commissioners, referring to this attitude of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and to the condition—the precarious condition—of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company by reason of its financial position, made certain recommendations. They say:

The Grand Trunk Company's Board of Directors is 3,000 miles away. We cannot think that the state of affairs which our investigation has disclosed could have arisen had the board been on the spot.

They referred there to certain defects in the management of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada itself. They continue:—

We are forced to the conclusion that the control of an important Canadian company should be in Canada. But this cannot be secured as long as the Grand Trunk Railway is owned by shareholders in England. We have come to the conclusion, therefore, that the control, not only of the Grand Trunk Pacific Company, but also of the Grand Trunk Company of Canada, should be surrendered into the hands of the people of Canada. We recommend that the chairman of the Grand Trunk Company be informed, that it is only on this condition that the Government is prepared to relieve his company of the obligations which it has incurred in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

Therefore the Drayton-Acworth Report recommended to the Government of Canada that before it considered the question of relieving the Grand Trunk Railway Company of its obligations in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific, that the Grand Trunk Railway should be surrendered into the hands of the people of Canada. Now the Drayton-Acworth Report has taken, as I think it properly should have taken, a generous view with regard to the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The commissioners were not in favour of exacting the pound of flesh, as the saying is, nor has the Government been desirous of doing so. Let me read what Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. Acworth say respecting that. They refer to the average amount paid in dividends yearly for a period of ten years by the Grand Trunk Company; they are stating the position of the Grand Trunk Company with respect to

net earnings. They say that the average amount paid in dividends has been $3,600,000 per annum. Then, after referring to the fact that the company has to face immediate liabilities of over $5,000,000 per annum in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, and that, on the statement of its own officers, a capital expenditure of $30,000,000 is immediately required on its own line to put it into proper condition to do existing business, the Report says:—

It can still less be contended that the dividends are maintainable.

Then the Report goes on further:—

Even if the Government were to relieve them entirely, as suggested by their president, of their unfortunate Grand Trunk Pacific venture, and as we have already said, we cannot think that this request can be reasonably justified,—it is evident that the Grand Trunk Company is not, and will not be for some time to come, in a position entitling it to pay out any money at all in dividends. We regard the entire share capital of the company as being intrinsically of but small value at the present time. On the basis of present value of maintainable income the fair compensation would be very small.

Now let us consider what the commissioners had in mind when they made that statement. They considered the net earning power of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada over a period of ten years averaged $3,600,000 a year, although the commissioners questioned the propriety of the payment out of dividends to that amount on account of the requirements of the road for maintenance and other purposes. But they pointed out that the liability of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific was about $4,000,000 a year. That liability the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada desires to place upon the Dominion and continue paying dividends from net earnings to their shareholders. The two commissioners, Sir Henry Drayton and Mr. Acworth, took the view that if the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific, were taken into account, to use their own language, "the intrinsic value of the share capital is small at the present time," and they go on to say, as I have stated, that on the basis of the present value the maintainable income would be very small.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The Grand Trunk Pacific?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Grand Trunk Railway. That is to say if the Dominion Government took over the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, and strict regard was had to its legal liabilities in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the amount which should be paid by the Government in compensation to the shareholders would, in the language of the report, be very small.

Mr. McKENZIE: Not paid by the Government, paid by the company.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Commissioners are discussing here the question of the Dominion Government taking over the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, and they say that if regard should be had to the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific, the amount which the Government of Canada should be called upon to pay for that stock would be very small. But the Board of Commissioners took a rather generous view of the situation, as the Government of Canada has taken and is prepared to take of the situation. Neither the Commission nor the Government has ever had it in mind to deal harshly, to exact the pound of flesh, as the saying is, from the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada. Now let me read to the House what the Commissioners said on that point:

But we do not think this is the only basis on which the people of Canada should proceed. We think this is a case for generosity rather than strict justice. Canada is under obligations to the Grand Trunk shareholders, who, in the early days, with but small Government assistance, and in competition with the railways of the United States, with their vastly greater resources, built up the first Canadian railway system. In later times the Company has had further to meet the competition of heavily subsidized Canadian rivals, and it cannot be said that at any stage of its history the shareholders have obtained excessive profits on their enterprise. On the whole we recommend that on condition of the surrender, by the Grand Trunk Company of their entire share capital, guaranteed, preferred and ordinary, the trustees grant a certain annuity, charged as a working expense on the whole undertaking of the Dominion Railway Company, for the first seven years, increasing at the termination of that period by something like 40 or 50 per cent. We have left the figures blank, as there will be questions of cash in hand, value of stores, etc., which must make the precise figures subject to negotiation. But our meaning is that the first figure shauld be a moderate but substantial percentage of $3,600,000 (the average dividend payment for the last ten years).

The Commission say, from a strictly legal point the share capital, by reason of the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Railway Company toward the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, has but very small value, but dealing with them generously they recommend that for the period of seven years there should be a moderate but substantial percentage of $3,600,000, in-

creasing at the termination of that period by something like 40 or 50 per cent.

In order that the Committee may realize the financial interest which the people of Canada and the Grand Trunk had in that Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise, let me make a statement with respect to its financial position.

Mr. CAHILL: In any action which it is taking with regard to the railroads of this country, is the Government being guided by the Drayton-Acworth report?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I stated at the time the Commission was created, when the same question was put by the former Minister of Railways (Hon. Mr. Graham), that it would be for the Government of Canada to exercise its discretion and judgment as to what policy would be followed. We appointed a Commission, but we did not give them plenary power to determine the policy of the Government. Nevertheless, the report is an exceedingly valuable one. In the three years which have passed since that Commission was created and in the two years since the report was made, I have come more and more to the conclusion that the Drayton-Acworth report is one of the most valuable reports that has ever been made upon railway matters in this country. I am perfectly satisfied, speaking for myself, that in the administration of railway enterprises which come under the control of the Dominion Government, the machinery recommended by the Drayton-Acworth report will be utilized. In my opinion, it is the best for the purpose.

Now, I was going to show the financial position of the Grand Trunk Pacific. The figures are staggering. The members of the House are generally familiar with the situation, but the public do not understand it, and I am satisfied that the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company do not understand it. I do not believe that the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway Company have been made fully aware of the extent of the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Railway Company towards the Grand Trunk Pacific enterprise. I will give the figures slowly so that hon. gentlemen can dwell upon them, because they are very large indeed.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company—which has about 1,700 miles from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert and about 1,000 miles in the Grand Trunk branch lines system; and which has also its subsidiary Development company, owning lands, hotels, steamships and other assets—has outstanding securities guaranteed by the Dominion Government to the extent of $84,000,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who are the holders of those securities?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That $84,000,000 includes the securities, to which I made reference earlier in the course of my remarks, guaranteed by the Dominion Government and secured by a first mortgage upon the line from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert. It includes also a portion—I think, speaking from recollection, about $7,500,000—of the $16,000,000 issue of 1914 guaranteed by the Dominion Government. But the $84,000,000 are bonds of the Grand Trunk Pacific bearing the guarantee of the Dominion of Canada.

My hon. friend asks who holds these securities. The Dominion of Canada holds $33,000,000 of them; they are in our vaults. We took them under what is known as the implementing agreement, which the Committee may recall; and instead of having them sold on the market at a low price, the Dominion Government took them at par. It is a good thing we did, because of the $84,000,000 outstanding we hold $33,000,000 ourselves. Nevertheless, they are outstanding; the money was advanced; the interest is payable; the legal liability on the part of the Grand Trunk Pacific exists precisely as if these securities were in the hands of holders in England, United States or Canada. The remainder of the securities are in the hands of bondholders in Great Britain principally; I think comparatively few of them are held in this country.

In addition to that $84,000,000 the Dominion Government made a loan of $10,000,000 in 1909 and another loan of $15,000,000 in 1913, a total of $25,000,000 guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. One would think that that guarantee of the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada would be sufficient to relieve the Dominion Government from any anxiety with regard to the $25,000,000. But the Dominion is concerned in that $25,000,000, because it loaned the money, notwithstanding the fact it is guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. I have mentioned the votes which were loans secured by mortgage—$8,000,000 in 1916, $7,500,000 in 1917, of which $5,000,000 were paid; and $7,500,000 in 1918, a total of about $20,000,000. So that the Dominion Government, on top of the figures I have mentioned, is interested to the extent of $20,000,000 further by reason of votes made by Parliament during the last three years.

In addition, the Grand Trunk Pacific lines in Alberta and Saskatchewan have issued bonds to the extent of $13,000,000 guaranteed by Alberta and Saskatchewan. Just consider the amount of public credit that is involved there. $84,000,000, $25,000,000, $20,000,000—$130,000,000 represents the extent to which the Dominion Government is, by its guarantees or by the obligation of the Grand Trunk Pacific or the Grand Trunk Railway Company as guarantor, interested in the finance of this system.

Mr. NICKLE: Has the Minister not omitted to mention the $16,000,000 issue in 1914?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend is right; I have inadvertently omitted to mention that. If you add the $16,000,000 to the amount which I have mentioned, you get a total of $145,000,000 of interest which the Dominion Government has in the Grand Trunk Pacific Company and in the guarantees which I have mentioned of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Mr. ROBB: Is it the intention of the Government to take over the branch lines and pay the provinces for the amounts guaranteed by them?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I will come to that a little later.

Mr. McKENZIE: Suppose the guarantee or endorsement of the Grand Trunk Railway Company is good; what is still our direct liability in respect of our own guarantees?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That can easily be calculated. The Dominion Government would be liable as guarantors in respect of $84,000,000, upon which the interest charged per annum would be about $2,400,000.

Those are, I think, the figures shown in the Drayton-Acworth report, but there must be added the interest on the loans made during the last three years for the purpose which I have mentioned, and the rate of interest being high, there would be a substantial increase—in round figures, I should say a total of $3,000,000 at least. In addition to the Dominion Guarantees in respect to this enterprise, I desire to place the committee in possession of information respecting the guarantees of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada has guaranteed securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to a total amount of $97,000,000.

Mr. STEVENS: That does not overlap the Dominion guarantees?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, it overlaps only the $25,000,000 I have mentioned. I will tell my hon. friend how this is made up. There is $20,000,000 of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company secured by second mortgages on the western division, guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and $25,000,000 representing two loans made, one in 1909 and the other in 1913 by the Dominion of Canada, guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. That makes $45,000,000. In addition to that there is $48,000,000, representing debenture stock of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada. In addition to that, there is some further liability which makes a total of about $97,000,000. That $97,000,000 means an interest liability of about $4,000,000 per annum on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada in respect of its guarantee. There is some overlapping, and in order that the House may not be confused by the overlapping, I should say that the total securities outstanding of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company guaranteed by both the Dominion Government and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, aggregate something over $200,000,000.

I think I mentioned the fact that there were guarantees on the branch lines by the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan. That brings us down to the present year. We had the Drayton-Acworth report, recommending that in order to meet the difficulties of the railway situation, the Government of Canada should take over the Canadian Northern, as we did, and should also take over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Early in 1918, there were some negotiations with respect to the matter, but they came to nothing. Last year when the Prime Minister and certain of his colleagues were overseas, the question was taken up with the Grand Trunk Railway Company which, I may say, desired some assistance from the Government about July of last year. It transpired afterwards that they were able to arrange otherwise; but the matter was taken up with Mr. Smithers and the Board of Directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, by the Prime Minister and his colleagues overseas.

I desire to inform the House as to the offer which was then made by the Government of Canada and as to the counter-offer which was made by the Grand Trunk Rail-

way Company of Canada. The House will then understand the situation practically down to the present time. As I said to the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) if, when I have concluded my remarks in the course of this discussion upon the resolution, there is further information that he requires and I can get it, it, of course, goes without saying that I shall be only too glad to give it to the House. I do not know what correspondence there was in the time of the Government which held power up to 1911, and personally I cannot see that it has much bearing on the question before us to-day, because agreements were entered into which were validated by legislation. It, therefore, appears to me that the legislation discloses the situation, and the correspondence would not be helpful. If, however, my hon. friend has in mind any particular correspondence, I shall be glad to endeavour to get it. This is the offer made on behalf of the Government of Canada last July by the Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen). It is a little long, but I hope the House will have patience:

Dear Mr. Smithers:—Some time ago the Government of Canada was informed on behalf of the Board of Directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that this company would not be able, without Government assistance, to meet certain maturities falling due on the 1st and 15th of the present month.

It was thought of advantage that representatives of the Government should, on the occasion of their visit to England, to attend the Imperial War Conference, take the opportunity of conferring with yourself and your directorate on the general subject of Grand Trunk obligations and finance. Accordingly, the Hon. Mr. Calder and myself have had four conferences with you, at two of which you were accompanied by certain associates on the Board.

At the last conference you suggested that I should lay before you in writing the position taken by the Government and, in as definite a form as possible, its concrete proposals.

It may be assumed that the difficulties in which the company now finds itself arise from two main causes:—

(1) The obligations into which the company entered in 1903 and 1904 with respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company;

(2) War conditions as to operation and finance.

As to the latter cause it is not unfair to say that its incidence has fallen chiefly, if not wholly, in the years 1917 and 1918. On the contrary, the difficulties of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, which are the direct outcome of its Grand Trunk Pacific obligations, are of much longer date. This latter company is in every sense subsidiary to, and its stock is wholly owned by the Grand Trunk Company. To this subsidiary company the Government of Canada came, by way of assistance, as far back as 1909, with a loan of $10,000,000. Another loan of $15,000,000 was made in 1913. A further loan of $6,000,000 was made in 1914 on a pledge of bonds. Its securities were further guaranteed by legislation of that year to the extent of $16,000,000. In 1916 a loan of $8,000,000 was made. In 1917, a loan of $7,500,000 was authorized and advanced, and in the spring of this year a further loan of $7,500,000 was authorized by Parliament. Meantime, the ever-increasing interest obligation binding on the Grand Trunk Railway Company towards its subsidiary company were not paid by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, but were taken care of out of the proceeds of loans thus made by the Government of Canada. These obligations at the present time amount to very considerably over $5,000,000 per annum and in January 1923 increase to over $7,000,000 per annum.

Those are the figures given in the Drayton-Acworth report.

In the same conjunction it must also be remembered that the Grand Trunk Pacific Company has not assumed or attempted to discharge its rental obligations to the Government of Canada with respect to the National Transcontinental Railway, which obligations while not formally assumed by the Government, have in practice been shouldered by the Dominion. This extra burden is a matter of very considerable magnitude.

I refer to the outstanding facts related in the preceding paragraph for the purpose of indicating what has through recent years been the attitude of the Canadian Government and people toward Grand Trunk enterprises.

It is at this point that the Canadian Government is invited to enter upon a still wider field of assistance by assuming the liabilities in respect of Grand Trunk securities themselves.

We had been asked to render some assistance in July.

Through the course of the various steps recalled above, public opinion in our country has become more and more opposed to a continuance of the practice of assisting financially railways that were in private hands. Consequently, at the opening of our negotiations we stated to you that we did not believe that continued further assistance under present conditions could be justified.

In order, however, that there might be reasonable opportunity for negotiations, we recommended to the Minister of Finance that funds be provided to enable the company to meet maturities falling due in July. This has been and is being arranged.

I may say that it was not necessary to go on with it.

Throughout the negotiations and indeed prior thereto, it has been made clear to your Company that the obligations of the Grand Trunk Company to the Grand Trunk Pacific Company could not be ignored and that the Government could not undertake to assume the indebtedness of and to operate the Grand Trunk Pacific and branch lines thereof, and to relieve the Grand Trunk of responsibility therefor, while the Grand Trunk Railway itself, as a subsidiary of which and indeed as an extension of which the Grand Trunk Pacific was built, remained in independent hands. Accordingly, in the month of February last, after careful consideration and in pursuance of the recommendation of what is commonly known as the Drayton-Acworth Report, there were made to your Company the following proposals:

(1) The Government to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway and branch lines and the Grand Trunk Railway Company; to acquire all assets, and to assume all obligations of both Companies.

(2) The Government to make annual payment of $2,500,000 for the first three years, $3,000,000 for the succeeding five years, and $3,600,000 annually thereafter; such sums to be distributed by the Grand Trunk management, as they might determine, among holders of 4 per cent Guaranteed and other stocks.

It was intended that the taking over should be by rental over a long period of years, as might be agreed, with a provision for purchase.

Should such terms not be accepted, it was suggested that the amounts in question might be submitted to arbitration. These proposals met with no acceptance.

Our present conference, extending over the past months have resulted in little progress—the only practical step being indeed the assistance referred to above as advanced by the Government. As intimated above, such assistance cannot under present conditions be continued.

We are now prepared to abide by the proposals submitted to you in February last as to acquisition or we are prepared on behalf of the Government to submit the entire question of remuneration to a Board of Arbitration on the following general terms:—

(1) The Board to consist of three persons; one to be appointed by the Grand Trunk Company, one by the Government of Canada, and the two so appointed to select a third, or, if they fail to agree, the third to be selected by a majority of the following: the Judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada, the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada, the Chief Justice of the Province of Ontario.

(2) The Board to have full power as to the procuring and acceptance of evidence

(3) The award to be by way of annual rental for a term of 999 years; the Board to have power to vary the rental for two or more periods of years. The Government to have the option of purchase on the basis of and during the term of the final rental at the end of any year and on one-year's notice at twenty-five times the annual final rental.

(4) Conditions arising or that have arisen out of the war not to be taken into account in determining the rental value.

Should the Company desire, the Guaranteed Stock may be treated as an obligation in the same way as the Company's Bonds.

I would be glad to be advised whether the above specific proposal is acceptable or if not, whether the general terms of arbitration outlined above are satisfactory. Should either alternative be favourably received we may then enter upon discussion and negotiation as to further necessary details.

Yours very truly,

(Sgd.) Arthur Meighen.

Alfred W. Smithers, Esq.,
Chairman of the Board of Directors,
Grand Trunk Railway Company,
9 New Broad Street,
W.C.

That was the offer of the Government of Canada—an offer along the lines suggested in the Drayton-Acworth report. But in addition to that, in case that offer was not acceptable to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the Government of Canada offered to leave to arbitration the question of the rental to be paid. I have seen some reports emanating from London to the effect that the Government was not dealing as fairly with the Grand Trunk as with the Canadian Northern. Well, the Government had the question of what it should pay for the stock of the Canadian Northern determined by arbitration, a maximum being fixed as a safeguard against an unduly high award. But here we are not setting any maximum amount; we offered to arbitrate as to the price we should pay.

On August 8, 1918, the counter offer of the Grand Trunk Railway Company was received. Mr. Smithers writes:

Rt. Hon. Sir R. L. Borden,
Savoy Hotel,
Strand, W.C.

Dear Sir Robert Borden,—At the meeting yesterday between you and Mr. Ballantyne and General Mewburn and a Committee of my Board and myself, I made a proposition which, after a long discussion, you asked should be put in writing.

I think in order to put it in its true perspective, I should just put down the propositions that have passed between the Government and the Company. You have all the particulars of those propositions, and therefore I only shortly put down the bare figures.

At your request on the 25th January, conveyed through the High Commissioner, asking the Board to say on what terms they would recommend the sale of the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific to the Government, I replied with a statement of terms which at the end of 1930 would have resulted in an annual payment by the Government of 1,609,000 pounds.

About $8,000,000.

On the 7th March you replied on the part of the Government, with an offer which at the end of eight years would have involved an annual payment by the Government of 739,000 pounds—

About $3,500,000.

—or you were prepared to leave the whole question of the amount to be paid to arbitration. At our meeting yesterday I proposed that the Government should pay a net annual sum of 977,000 pounds—

About $4,500,000.

—being the amount of net earnings for the year 1913, the last normal year before the war, and thus following the course pursued by the British Government towards the British Railways, and leave to arbitration what further sum if any, the shareholders are entitled to in respect of the prospective value of the undertaking that must arise from the development of the Dominion. This offer I now repeat. But, it was also suggested that an alternative offer should be made of a definite sum without arbitration, and I am authorized to say, the Board would recommend to the shareholders the payment of an annual sum of 1,163,000 pounds.

Or over five million dollars.

Let me summarize those two offers. The Government say: "We will offer you $2,500,000 for the first three years, $3,000,000 for the succeeding five years, and $3,600,000 annually thereafter. We will assume all the liabilities of the Grand Trunk and all the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific." What does Mr. Smithers say in reply? You will observe there is not a word in his reply with regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company or the obligations of the Grand Trunk in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific. He takes the net earnings for 1913. He does not say whether they should be applied toward making good the obligations of the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific, but he wants the Government to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific and assume all its liabilities, and he wants the Government to pay an annual rental of £1,163,000 or over $5,000,000 a year.

What would be the position of Canada with regard to Government ownership of roads supposing we had accepted that offer? Deficits on the Canadian Northern; all the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific, amounting to at least $8,000,000 a year; $5,000,000 a year in respect of the Grand Trunk Railway, although that road is not earning more, or very little more, than its fixed charges to-day. The Government would then have the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Grand Trunk, and the Canadian Northern, with deficits on the Canadian Northern and deficits on the Grand Trunk Pacific, and it would be paying the Grand Trunk shareholders $5,000,000 a year, without getting any net earnings from the Grand Trunk, or at all events, very small net earnings at the present time, to reimburse the country for any part of that rental paid out.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Was the offer made by the Government intended to relieve the Grand Trunk of their obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was so stated. The Government said: "We realize the Grand Trunk Railway Company cannot meet its obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific." Everybody realizes that. The Drayton-Acworth report says so; it says: "Deal generously with them." We say so too. The Government said: "We will assume all the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company (and, remember, we have been carrying them), assume all the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, take a lease for 999 years and pay you the amount mentioned in Mr. Meighen's letter by way of rental; or, if you are not satisfied with that, we will arbitrate."

The Grand Trunk said, " No, we will not do that, but we make you a counter offer in which we ignore altogether our liabilities in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific; we want the Government to take care of that, and, in addition, to pay us on the basis of what we regard as the value of Grand Trunk shares, without the slightest regard to our liability towards the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway." Now, the negotiations ended. I read to the House the other day the correspondence which had taken place with the Grand Trunk Pacific Company with respect to two matters: First, default which was apprehended on March 1, and second, the discontinuance of the operation of the Grand Trunk Railway system.

Mr. CAHILL: That is default in payment of interest?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: It was apprehended. Now, let me say with regard to the last vote of $7,500,000 made last year by Parliament, that the Government, after Sir Robert Borden and his colleagues had returned, and after we were aware that an impasse had been reached, felt they must continue to pay that $7,500,000 to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, because it had been voted by Parliament. It would have been legal on the part of the Government to have discontinued payment under that vote last fall, because all votes made by Parliament are really subject to the Government paying them out. But when Parliament votes a certain sum the view that governments take—at least, the view that I have always understood they should take—is that Parliament intended that the money voted should be devoted to the purposes for which the vote was made. Therefore, the Government has paid out to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company the $7,500,000 which was voted last year, tthe proceeds of which have not been entirely used.

Mr. ANDREWS: May I ask if you deduct from the $7,500,000 the interest charges for which the Grand Trunk was liable for the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No, the $7,500,000 paid the fixed charges on the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company; that is to say, the interest upon the securities guaranteed by the Dominion Government and guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, and also the deficit up to the time the vote was exhausted. The $7,500,000 was not sufficient for the

past year. In February the vote was exhausted and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company notified the Government that they apprehended they would have to make default on March 1 in respect to interest upon securities maturing due in London, and called the attention of the Government to the serious situation which would arise if funds were not provided for that purpose. The reply which I made to them is contained in a letter which is on Hansard. We stated that the last of the money, about $1,000,000, had been paid over to meet deficit on operating expenses in accordance with the certificate of the Grand Trunk Railway officials themselves, approved by the Deputy Minister of Railways, and that no question could arise as to that money being properly applied to meet deficit on operation before application was made of any part of it to meet interest upon securities; and I said further that it would be for the directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company to consider what were their responsibilities towards that interest which was falling due in London upon securities of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company which they had guaranteed. Now, the Government was prepared for default, if it had occurred, because we had made up our minds that as long as negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada —to use the language which I employed— "remained in their present unsatisfactory condition," the Dominion Government would not ask Parliament to vote any further sums.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We had taken that view, not hastily. The matter had been under deliberation for weeks and months and the Government had come to the conclusion, and had notified that conclusion to the responsible officers of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, that when that money became exhausted the Dominion Government would not bring down a further vote, as had been done during the last three years, by way of loans to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company for the purpose of meeting fixed charges and deficit on operating expenses.

Mr. ROBB: The inference from the letter of Mr. Smithers, in January, 1918, is that the Government at that time, in January, 1918, had opened negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway to purchase the Grand Trunk Railway and all their system. Was that the unanimous policy of the Government in January, 1918, to purchase all those roads?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Having regard to the Grand Trunk Pacific situation and the liability which it involved, and the fact also that we had been asked for assistance by the Grand Trunk Railway Company, in July negotiations were taken up. But at an earlier date, in January, 1918, the Prime Minister had made an offer to the Grand Trunk Railway Company practically in pursuance of the Drayton-Acworth report.

Mr. ROBB: Negotiations were opened by the Government?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes. The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and the Grand Trunk Railway Company were coming every year to the Government and saying, "Vote us $7,500,000 or $8,000,000 to keep the Grand Trunk Pacific going, but don't call upon the Grand Trunk Railway Company for anything." Now, that could not go on, and the Government therefore opened negotiations with a view to clearing up the entire situation. The Government had been bearing all the responsibility of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada expected it to continue bearing all the responsibility. The situation had to be cleaned up. The hon. Minister of the Interior (Mr. Meighen) says he thinks there was a communication from the Grand Trunk Railway Company prior to our offer. I shall inquire as to that; but at all events, I do not know that it is indispensable to the discussion of the matter because the situation speaks for itself.

Mr. CAHILL: Before you get away from the responsibility of the Grand Trunk, may I ask, how did they get relieved of responsibility with regard to the Transcontinental?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am coming to that. I will summarize later. That interest was paid on March 1st, I believe—I did not hear anything to the contrary, and I should have heard if it had not been paid. Now, that difficulty was overcome, and the next thing that happened was, without any previous intimation or discussion at all, a notice—which I described in a cable to Mr. Smithers as peremptory—a notice on Thursday, I think, that on the following Monday, by reason of the fact that the freight rates in the West were not high enough to enable the Grand Trunk Pacific to operate without a loss, they would have to close that system. Without any discussion, without any previous intimation, the ultimatum was served

upon the Government. "We are going to close down the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system unless—" it was not so stated, but the inference is irresistible— "—unless the Government does what the Government said it would not do, namely, give us a further vote to enable us to carry on." Now, it is a pretty serious thing to close down a transcontinental railway system of 2,700 miles of main line and branches. The notification was in explicit terms: "We cannot go on." They knew that the Government had taken the view that it would not recommend to Parliament to vote any further money. What was the Government to do? I am frank to say that I do not believe the Grand Trunk Railway Company officials, or the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway officials believed that the Government had power to deal with the situation.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not like to impute motives, but it is my opinion that they did not realize that the Government had power to deal with the question, notwithstanding that Parliament was in session. Why do I say that? In adverting to that, I reply to the remarks of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition about the courts affording an adequate remedy. We did not overlook the courts, but the courts afford no adequate remedy to the cessation of operations on a system such as the Grand Trunk Pacific railway. If my hon. friend, who is a good lawyer and who has been a judge, will take the trouble to look at the legislation upon the subject, and upon the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court, he will find that what I have stated is absolutely correct. He will find further, that even as to the jurisdiction, if it does not exist in the Exchequer Court as to the appointment of a receiver, it must be on an application for foreclosure and sale. Before application can be made for foreclosure and sale of a railway company, default must exist, and a certain time elapse under the provisions of whatever mortgage or other instrument has been taken as security. The Dominion Government was not in a position to make application to the Exchequer Court for a receiver, because it could not prove default. The position was then that the Government could not resort to the Exchequer Court. The Exchequer Court would have no jurisdiction to make an order.

We had to consider what we would do to prevent a great railway system from closing down with inconvenience not only to the people of the West but to the people of Canada generally. We did not hesitate to make a clean-cut case of it, and the Dominion Government fell back upon the War Measures Act, which gives jurisdiction in the matter of railways, and appointed my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) a receiver.

Why did we appoint him a receiver? To ensure the continued operation of a system so essential to the convenience and welfare of the great communities which it serves. Let me say further to the leader of the Opposition that the Exchequer Court has no jurisdiction to appoint a receiver of a telegraph company. Embraced in a system such as the Grand Trunk Pacific there is not only the railway system itself but the telegraph system, the development company with the assets I mentioned previously, the steamship company, and all those other auxiliary or subsidiary enterprises.

There is a great lack in the railway legislation of Canada which some day will have to be remedied by this House in regard to the jurisdiction of the court to deal with a system as compared with an individual railway. Some day that will have to receive attention.

Now, the Government appointed a receiver. Lest it should be thought that further negotiations would have resulted in bringing about an understanding——

Mr. McKENZIE: How does the minister understand this section 6 of the Winding-up Act, which says:

"This Act applies to all corporations incorporated under the authority of an Act of the Parliament of Canada."

I would suppose that would be sufficiently comprehensive to include a telegraph company, or any company incorporated by this Parliament, or under the authority of this Parliament, and that this company would come within a section of that kind.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am informed on the highest legal authority that there is no jurisdiction in the Exchequer Court to deal with the question of a receivership for the system. There is this further consideration: Supposing that in several of the provinces of Canada applications were made to the courts for the appointment of not a receiver, but many receivers, for a railway system of this character and for all its subsidiaries, what a situation you would have! It would paralyse the operation of the system. There is not to-day any existing legislation providing for any effectual remedy through a receivership for a railway system such as the Grand Trunk Pacific and its subsidiaries.

In order that there may not be any doubt in the minds of any of the members of the committee that the Grand Trunk intended that notice to mean that they would close down by reason of lack of funds, I may state that I received a further cable from Mr. Smithers, in which he stated—I am afraid I cannot lay my hands on it just at the moment—that the fact that they had no funds made it necessary that they should notify the Government as they did. There is no question about it; the issue is clear-cut—the Dominion Government to furnish the money or the Grand Trunk to cease operations.

That brings us down to the present time and to this resolution that is before the House. Although the Government has plenary jurisdiction under the War Measures Act, action having been taken when Parliament is in session, it is of course proper that Parliament should deal with this Order in Council, validate it, approve it, and translate it into an Act of Parliament, in order that no question can arise whatever with regard to its validity.

Let me summarize the National Transcontinental railway situation including the Grand Trunk Pacific railway which is embraced in it:

An agreement made in 1903 to build a line from Moncton to the tide-waters of the Pacific—a great enterprise.

The Government of Canada to build the line from Moncton to Winnipeg, which cost in the neighbourhood of $170,000,000 without interest.

The Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company to construct the lines and its subsidiaries from Winnipeg to Prince Rupert.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company to lease the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway for a period of 50 years after seven of which they were to pay an annual rental and also any deficit on operating account. That was to be 3 per cent upon the cost which would amount to about $5,000,000 or 3 per cent on $170,000,000. Let us say $4,000,000 to be conservative, because it may be said that I have overstated the amount. I do not think I have but I do not desire to raise any controversy as to that.

The Grand Trunk Railway Company would be the proprietor of the entire system by holding all the stock in the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company.

What happens? The Grand Trunk Pacific, and the Grand Trunk Railway Company as a party in the matter, say: We cannot lease the National Transcontinental railway. They put it on various grounds but the ground is perfectly obvious; they could not lease the National Transcontinental railway and pay the rental of $4,000,000 or $5,000,000. They simply could not do it. The Dominion Government gives its guarantees, the Grand Trunk gives its guarantees, the western division is built at a cost of something all together, if you include deficits and fixed charges for the past three years, over $200,000,000. The Dominion Government is interested in this to the extent of $100,000,000 and the Grand Trunk's interest almost a like sum. The Grand Trunk Pacific had said to the Dominion Government: We cannot lease the eastern division of the National Transcontinental railway. The Grand Trunk Railway Company say to the Dominion: We want to assume no responsibility for the Grand Trunk Pacific; take the whole thing off our hands from Moncton to Prince Rupert That is the statement. Now I do not believe that this is a position which the Grand Trunk Railway Company can hold.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: It should not be allowed to.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not believe that is a position the Grand Trunk Railway Company should hold. The Government and the people of this country are very friendly to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, as they are to all British enterprises in this country so far as I know. But the people of Canada, I believe, will not support the Government in continuing the generous policy which it has pursued during the last three years of loaning seven and a half or eight million dollars yearly to pay off the liabilities in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific, including the interest upon the securities guaranteed by the Grand Trunk Railway Company—I do not believe it. That is the position to-day. The Government is in possession as receiver. The resolution indicates the powers and duties of the receiver, and enlarges the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court to deal with whatever situations may arise. It is not the intention of the Government to bring down a further vote while, as I stated in my communication to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, the negotiations between that company and the Dominion remain in their present unsatisfactory condition. It seems to me that the next move is on the part of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the hon. gentleman closes his very clear and excellent speech, would he be good enough to tell

the committee what the Government proposes to do? The Government has taken the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway—the hon. gentleman has dealt with that fully in his speech—but what does the Government propose to do now that it has the line in its hands, or what is it thinking of doing?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What we are doing now is passing this resolution, but my hon. friend wishes to know what will be the policy of the Government?

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The policy of the Government, speaking frankly to my hon. friend, will be what it has been in the past. There have been negotiations between the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada and the Dominion, and in our view the attitude of the Board of Directors of the Grand Trunk Company has not been a reasonable one, because they have steadfastly refused to recognize the liabilities in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway; and I say that negotiations with the Grand Trunk Company are not possible until that company's liabilities in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway are regarded as a factor, an important factor, in those negotiations. I do not go the distance of saying—I have never gone so far as to say so—that this matter should be looked upon in a hard and fast business way; that is to say that we should set off against any net earnings of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada, actual or prospective so far as we can estimate, the full amount of the deficit for fixed charges and operating expenses of the Grand Trunk Pacific, because if we did, it would wipe out absolutely all equity in Grand Trunk Railway shares. We have never taken that view.

Mr. McKENZIE: The minister did not answer my question. What I meant is what is the Government going to do now that it has the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway in its hands?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We are going to carry on.

Mr. McKENZIE: What are you going to do?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I repeat that we are going to carry on.

Mr. McKENZIE: Are you going to own the railway?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: We are carrying on as receiver at the present time. We are maintaining the service upon which great

[Mr. McKenzie.]

communities of this country depend from day to day. That is the immediate reason for the appointment of a receiver. What we shall do later on will be as we may determine, but I may say to my hon. friend that unless a satisfactory situation ensues the Dominion Government will be obliged to have recourse to whatever legal remedies it may have, and it has many.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: And it may be a receivership for the Grand Trunk?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I pass no opinion as to that. I have endeavoured to expound to the House as clearly as I could, and I am afraid at too great length, the situation, because this is an important transaction. Do not let me give the House or the country the impression that the Government desires to deal harshly with, or to exact the pound of flesh from, the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada; we have not done so, and we do not intend to do so; but we do not intend to negotiate upon a basis in which all the prospective earnings are to be capitalized, for the Grand Trunk, and all the liabilities of that company, in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific, are to be ignored. As I said the next move is from the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada.

Mr. EULER: The hon. gentleman has stated that the next move should be on the part of the Grand Trunk. It seems to me that the Government should hold the Grand Trunk Company liable for the obligations which it has not met in the past, and therefore the next move should be on the part of the Government, in order to hold the company to its obligations which the hon. gentleman states it has absolutely ignored.

Mr. CAHILL: The action taken by the Government so far, does not seem to be very consistent. It passed an Order in Council and took possession of the railway before it had actually made default.

An hon. MEMBER: Done deliberately.

Mr. CAHILL: The receiver stated that he had taken possession on the morning of Monday, March 10, at one o'clock, and the company had notified the Government that it might default on and after the 10th of March.

Mr. REID: The hon. gentleman is wrong. The company notified the Government that it would default on or before the 10th of March.

Mr. CAHILL: Was it not on or after the 10th?

Mr. REID: No, on or before the 10th.

Mr. CAHILL: But the Government did not give the company any opportunity of ceasing on the 10th. It took possession before, and this makes it appear to the overseas investors that the Government is adopting summary action and trying to force the company's hand. It looks very much like a horse trading operation, where one side is trying to take advantage of the other.

Some hon. MEMBERS: No.

Mr. CAHILL: It looks very much like it. The Acting Prime Minister referred quite frequently to the Drayton-Acworth Report and advised all hon. members to read it, and I think it is very good advice. I think that Report should be read by all of us; there are very many passages in it that are well worthy of careful perusal. The Acting Prime Minister said the commissioners recommended that the Government should take this road over, but he omitted to read one further paragraph. I will supply the omission:

1. That the Government do not acquire or undertake to operate any further railways; but

2. That these three railways, Canadian Northern, Grand Trunk, and Grand Trunk Pacific, be transferred by Act of Parliament to an independent Board of Trustees (incorporated as a company), constituted as we shall hereafter describe.

These recommendations, from our point of view, hang together and must be regarded as inseparable. We do not recommend the transfer of the three companies at all, unless our recommendations as to the method to be followed are also substantially accepted. That the Government should itself take over the railways, and they should then be operated under the control of a Parliamentary Minister of Railways, is a policy which in our judgment would not be in the best interest of Canada.

The commissioners pointed out in various places through the report that they would not under any consideration recommend the Government taking over the road and operating it. I think the Prime Minister is somewhat in error in saying that the Government railways are being operated as recommended by the Drayton-Acworth report, because they are actually being operated by a board of about fifteen directors, whereas the recommendation of the Drayton-Acworth report was that the directorate should consist of five members. The operation is carried on as a political proposition. The directors are appointed by the Minister of Railways, and I think I am safe in saying that one qualification all possess is that they supported the Union Government at the last election. There is not a known railway man in the whole aggregation of directors, outside of Mr. Hanna, Mackenzie and Mann's appointee, who was associated with Mackenzie and Mann in practically all their undertakings in this country during the last twenty years. Mr. C. M. Hamilton, of McTaggart, another of the directors, is a farmer, and I believe, a very good man; but I understand also that he made way for his Conservative opponent in the last election and was a supporter of the Union Government. Apparently this is his reward. Mr. Thomas Cantley, of New Glasgow, and Mr. Barnhill, of St. John, N.B., are presidents of steel companies. Sir H. Laporte, of Montreal, who is on practically all the Government commissions, is a wholesale grocer. Mr. Jones, of Montreal, is in the cement and steel business. Then there are Mr. Bell, of Ottawa, Mr. Riley, of Winnipeg, a broker; Mr. Hobson, of Hamilton, president of a steel company there. The others were the former directors of the Canadian Northern.

The grabbing, as it were, of these railways does not solve the railway problem of Canada. The great difficulty is that we have not sufficient traffic to make the railroads pay, and the reason why we have not sufficient traffic is that we have not sufficient population.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Why did we build them?

Mr. CAHILL: That is a question I would like the Government to answer.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CAHILL: The Drayton-Acworth report says:

We may put the same thing in another way. The growth of the mileage has far outstripped the growth of the population. In 1901, with a population of 5,371,315, Canada had 18,140 miles of railway in operation; roughly, a mile of railway for every 300 inhabitants. In 1911, the population had increased 34 per cent to 7,206,643, while the mileage had increased by 40 per cent to 25,400 miles; a mile of railway to every 284 inhabitants.

Mark you, in 1911 we had a mile of railway to every 284 people. There was an election in that year. The report goes on to say:

Since 1911, the population has, it is understood, not much increased, but the railway mileage open and under construction has grown to 40,584 miles. In other words, Canada has today, taking the present population as 7,500,000, only 185 inhabitants to support each mile of railway. Taking the four western provinces by themselves, there are only two-thirds of this number for each mile of railway.

That refers to the period between 1911 and 1916, in respect of which hon. gentle-

men will not attempt to put the responsibility for railway conditions upon members on this side. It may be said that before 1911 a railway policy had been inaugurated, and so on. That is quite true as applied to the period from 1896; but at the same time a policy of immigration and colonization was carried out by the Government which went out of power in 1911. That policy, which caused the country to be settled as railways were built, continued from 1896 to 1911. The railways did not get ahead of the population, nor was the population much behind the railways; the ratio was properly preserved. But between 1911 and 1917, hon. gentlemen opposite seemed to forget all about the immigration and colonization policy, and they constructed railroads all over the country. The friends of railway operators and contractors were in power at that time.

It does not make much difference whether you hand this money over to the Grand Trunk Pacific and let them pay it out to cover operating deficits, or pay it out yourself. The difficulty is that you may pay a great deal more to operate the road as a Government undertaking. The question for us to solve is: How are we to handle those railroads? The first consideration should be: What management do you propose? How do you hope to manage these roads? The Drayton-Acworth report goes very fully into that; in no sense does it recommend that the roads be taken over by Canada if they are to be operated by the Government. The report recommends that they be operated by a commission, and points out how the commission should be formed. I do not say that I agree with everything in the Drayton-Acworth report, but apparently the only things in that report that the Government agree with are the things that suit them and their friends. There is no mention in the report of paying the Canadian Northern people $10,800,000 for a portion of their stock; on the contrary, that stock was condemned as of no value. We have the farce of an arbitration proceeding in Toronto which decides that we shall pay out this $10,800,000; yet we have not acquired all the stock; we do not know who are the owners of ten per cent of that stock. It is understood, however, that this stock is owned by some of the friends of the Mackenzie and Mann interests.

Last year the Prime Minister announced that negotiations were to be started for the taking over of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Various members of the Government carpet-bagged back and forth across the ocean last year; our esteemed friend Clifford Sifton also was on these tours. If that speaking tube that he uses so well could tell a tale, it could inform us very much better about this railway situation than we have been informed this afternoon.

The chief trouble in connection with our railway situation is the land question. The Canadian Northern runs through millions of acres of vacant lands held by speculators throughout Western Canada and by competing railway companies. If our railroads run through vacant lands and produce no traffic, necessarily we must lose money on the operation. Until this land question is satisfactorily settled, the roads which run through these unoccupied areas cannot possibly make money. Even the tariff enters into railroad operation. If you sweep the tariff wall away in Western Canada and inaugurate a sane land policy, causing the land held by speculators in the West to be put into use and to create traffic for the roads which we own, we would have very little trouble with the railway situation. If you have people on the lines of the railways, the railways will take care of themselves. We have one prosperous railway system; the Canadian Pacific is making money. In fact, we are forcing money on them that they do not require. They are earning so much that we expect to get part of it back, because they are earning more than the country is supposed to allow them. But that line runs through territory that is developed. We have not too much railway mileage; we have too little population, and no policy which would have the effect of increasing it.

If the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) would spend more time in looking after the colonization of the country and less in convincing himself that he is a Liberal, it would be much better for the railways of this country. On the Transcontinental east of here, from Cochrane east, all through the province of Quebec, there is the poorest kind of service, a service that is heart-breaking to settlers going into that country. The pioneers going into that country cannot get cars to handle their wood. Here is an undertaking that cost from $50,000 to $60,000 a mile to build, and sufficient rolling stock is not provided. The road is well built; the country is fairly well settled; but how can the road ever hope to pay if you do not handle the traffic on it and do not encourage the traffic there. If the Minister of Immigration and Colonization would take a trip through that country if he would look after the traffic of that country and see that the railroad gave pro-

per facilities for handling the wood and other products of that country, instead of losing thousands of people from Quebec and Northern Ontario. If that were done, that road, instead of losing a great deal of money would, in a few years, prove a profitable enterprise. But if you start out with the avowed intention of killing the settlement, of course, the road cannot pay. That is bound to be the result if you will not give a proper service, and people are, therefore, afraid to go in. I know of instances on the Transcontinental last year where people drew out wood, having been promised that they would get cars. The wood was worth $5 a cord. They took out the wood, but they could not sell it, because there were no cars to take the wood away. In the spring of the year, the brokers and lawyers came along and bought that wood at from $2.50 to $3 a cord, and a few weeks afterwards they were able to secure cars. Such occurrences will kill settlement in any country. There has been no attempt to give service on the Transcontinental since it has been built, and unless you give service——

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: The Grand Trunk undertook to do that.

Mr. CAHILL: The Grand Trunk undertook to do that, and the Dominion Government, of which my hon. friends are members, relieved the Grand Trunk of their responsibility, and when they relieved them of that responsibility, I think the Grand Trunk was quite justified in believing that they would also be relieved of the Grand Trunk Pacific responsibility.

Mr. NICKLE. Why?

Mr. CAHILL: The Transcontinental is the connecting link between the old Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Grand Trunk are now in the position of owning a railroad in the west with no connecting link from Winnipeg to the East. That connecting link was taken from them by the Government of this country, and when that was done, I think the Grand Trunk were quite right in assuming that the Government were also going to relieve them of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Mr. MANION: Does the hon. member think that the Grand Trunk should be relieved of its liability or not?

Mr. CAHILL: I am not debating the point whether it should be relieved of its liability or not. If it should not be relieved, the Government should have taken action when they relieved that company of the Transcontinental. They relieved the Grand Trunk of the connecting link. It is a debatable question whether they should be relieved or not. The Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada have not received from the Dominion of Canada $10,000,000 altogether for the construction of railroads in Canada. The Grand Trunk was a pioneer road during its whole career. It is owned by British people in the old country who invested their money here for the development of Canada. The Canadian Pacific came along and got in the neighbourhood of $100,000,000 from the Treasury of Canada. The Grand Trunk got a few million dollars to build a conecting link from the boundary line down to Portland.

Mr. NICKLE: They got £3,000 a mile from Montreal to Toronto.

Mr. CAHILL: The report here will show that they did not get anything which they did not pay back except a few million to build a road from Portland to the boundary

Mr. LALOR: They had assistance from the municipalities through which they went, and they did not pay anything back.

Mr. CAHILL: I am not speaking about the municipalities; I am speaking about the Government. My own county of Pontiac has assisted roads by bonuses, and I do not think that is quite the right thing to do. I think it is a mistake. But we are not speaking about the assistance they got from the various municipalities; we are speaking about the assistance they got from the Government. As they have not received nearly as much assistance from this country as the Canadian Pacific or the Canadian Northern has, I think they are justified in asking for fair treatment in this matter. I think they are justified in asking that they be released from the Grand Trunk Pacific obligation, especially as they have been released from the Transcontinental obligation, as that leaves them without any connecting link whatever. We are rushing into this thing haphazard with apparently no policy. The Government say that they are being guided by the Drayton-Acworth Report, but, apart from the matter of taking over the road, they are not following the report in regard to management or operation or payment for the road. They are simply taking the road and throwing it into the hands of the Canadian Northern crowd, the Mackenzie and Mann outfit, who apparently want to grab the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific. If there is an obligation on the part of the Grand Trunk, that obligation should easily be determined between the railway company

and the Government. It is only in connection with the Grand Trunk guarantees, and has nothing to do with the Grand Trunk Railway Company itself, because the Gr nd Trunk Railway Company claim that they are able to operate. They have never made default in their operations or in paying interest on their bonds. The only operation they are being " crowded " on is their guarantees of the Grand Trunk Pacific bonds. It seems that the Government think the Grand Trunk should be relieved of that—and the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) apparently thinks so himself, because he says the Government offered them a certain amount of money which would relieve them of the obligation. He says: If they insist on taking up the Grand Trunk Pacific obligation, they have no equity whatsoever. Yet he says that they should be relieved of the responsibilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No.

Mr. CAHILL: Well, it is practically that, is it not? The Acting Prime Minister says that the Grand Trunk, if they are held responsible regarding their obligations to the Grand Trunk Pacific, have no equity. Yet he says that the Government is willing to pay them an equity in the road. And he also says, if I understood him correctly, they would claim the relieving of the liability so far as the Grand Trunk Railway Company was concerned.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend misquotes me. I did state that if the liability of the Grand Trunk in respect to the Grand Trunk Pacific were taken fully into account, the value of the Grand Trunk shares would be practically nil; and I said, and said it with emphasis, that in our negotiations with the Grand Trunk Railway Company, their liabilities in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific must be regarded as an important factor bearing upon the question of what we shall in our generosity allow them.

Mr. CAHILL: If the Acting Prime Minister admits the principle that the Grand Trunk have no equity in the Grand Trunk Pacific, then why does he offer them this money at all? It seems an unreasonable proposition that he should offer them some $3,000,000 a year for something in which they have no equity, unless he admits the principle that he should relieve them of the Grand Trunk Pacific liability; and if he admits that principle, then I think they can justly state whether they want to sell the Grand Trunk Railway to the Government or not. I think they would be justified in saying: We will put a price on it, or we will not, just as they see fit, so long as they are not in default. The Grand Trunk themselves are probably anxious and quite willing to get rid of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and I think that, by this action taken by the Government, they have done so, because the Government have jumped in summarily and taken possession, without the Grand Trunk making default. I think before the Government gets through they will find they have relieved the Grand Trunk of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and they will have no further hold on the Grand Trunk.

With regard to the earnings, the minister says that it will take from $7,000,000 to $8,000,000 a year to pay the deficits. I have here a statement of the Canadian Northern gross earnings. For September, 1918, the gross earnings were $4,050,700, as compared with $3,341,500 for the same period in the previous year—an increase of $709,200. Operating expenses were $4,109,000 compared with $2,915,800 for the year previous, so that net earnings of $425,900 for September, 1917 have been turned into a deficit of $58,100 for the same month of 1918. The operating expenses work out on a similar basis. So I think it might have been better to wait a while and leave the operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific to the Grand Trunk until some amicable arrangement had been arrived at whereby the Grand Trunk would acknowledge their obligations in respect of the Grand Trunk Pacific or be relieved of them.

At six o'clock the committee took recess

After Recess.

The Committee resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. CAHILL (resuming): Mr. Chairman, with regard to the public ownership of railways, the point that I am most particularly interested in is the policy of the Government with regard to the management of the road. Reading again from the Drayton-Acworth report, I find this:

> The railway touches the life of the country at innumerable points. It can almost make one city and unmake another. It vitally affects the question whether an industry in one place is more or less profitable than in another. Every city wants to become a railway centre, to have railway works located within its limits. And the local member invariably wants it too. Every citizen wants the railway station placed where it best suits his own personal convenience, and wants that every express train shall stop at it.

I have in mind a case which I think will apply to this condition. The Canadian Northern had at Calgary some twenty or twenty-five engines operating from Calgary on the Goose Lake line. The company transferred them to Hanna for some unknown reason. They also transferred some seventy-five employees of the road. They took them from Calgary where they had every convenience as regards water supply, coal facilities and facilities for the men, and transferred them to Hanna where they are hauling water some fifty miles to supply the engines. There may be a sufficient reason for this transfer there, but it is not apparent to the people along the line. It seems to be an additional cost to the service; and it might account for some of the figures which I have quoted of the earnings and expenditures in connection with the running of the road since the Government took it over. I am not opposed to public ownership of railways, although there has never resulted any great success from such ownership, principally for the reason that the roads are always brought into politics; and if the great railway systems of this country are to become a political football and a patronage outlet for the Government we shall undoubtedly lose a lot of money. It has cost a great deal more to run the Canadian Northern this year, than before the Government took it over, and no doubt it will take more to run the Grand Trunk Pacific. The Drayton-Acworth report specifically says that it will under no consideration recommend railways to be taken over and managed by the Government, and suggests that there should be a commission appointed, and this seems quite reasonable. There are a great number of people in this country who are very anxious to have public ownership, but apparently there are very few who are giving any attention to the question of management. I fear that we will be confronted with difficulties, after we have expended a lot of money, and find ourselves in deeper water in this railway problem. We had an instance in the Railway Committee the other day. The Grand Trunk were asking to be allowed to sell some more securities, many of the members of the committee objecting strenuously. Some other promoter had a railway starting from nowhere in particular and ending anywhere, and there did not seem to be an objection to his getting an extension of time. There are some one hundred or one hundred and fifty railways projected by promoters who hope at some future time to unload them on the Dominion of Canada; and just as soon as these railroads are allowed to pass the Railway Committee, get a charter, and get organized, and sell their securities, and get a subsidy from the Dominion Government, there will be difficulties. I think the whole question should be seriously considered by the Government and the entire system worked out on some basis of public and private ownership. It seems to me that the ideal condition would be to have our present public-owned railways properly managed and leave the Canadian Pacific railway as it is. I think the Canadian National railway might form a working arrangement with the Grand Trunk that would save the country from taking over that end of it. A traffic arrangement might surely be made with them. They need the outlet in the West, just as much as the western lines need the outlet in the East; and there might be some arrangement by which the Grand Trunk and the Government railways could co-operate. They would have as competitor the Canadian Pacific railway. We would then have a private-owned road and a Government-owned road, and we could test the two plans and ascertain which is the better. But apparently the Government has given this matter no thought whatever. The Prime Minister at the last session said that it was his intention that there should be a commission, and that this matter should be taken as far as possible out of politics. Since that time, however, we find that ten new directors of the Canadian National railway have been appointed, and I have been unable to find any special reason for their appointment. So far as I can learn they had no qualifications to recommend them as railroad men. This undertaking is a large one. It embraces some 15,000 miles of railway and something over a billion dollars of investment, and should therefore surely merit the most earnest consideration of the Government. The whole problem must be carefully worked out if the situation is to be saved. There can be no advantage in taking over these railroads if the cost of operation will be more than at the present time. The people of the Dominion must pay the charges no matter whether the railways are privately or publicly owned. If the Grand Trunk Pacific as a company system cost only $7,000,000 of the people's money to run, and it would cost $10,000,000 as a public-owned proposition, we would be losing some millions. It cannot be an asset if it is a losing proposition, and it would be just as well to leave it as it is; and until we realize the importance of the management and work out a system whereby

we shall get the best possible results, we shall continue to lose money. I fail to understand why a grocer, and a broker, and a steel magnate, should be directors of a railway system; and I think that we might follow the Drayton-Acworth report and appoint the best railway men we could get in Canada, giving them a free hand and paying them good salaries. I think also it will be necessary to adopt some system of co-operation with the employees of the road, some profit-sharing system, in order that we may obtain the best service from the employees. As things are at present, under political management, they are uncertain as to the future. There may be changes of government, of management and of directors, and, naturally changes of employees, unless we can take these roads out of politics. The question of the extensions of the railroads should also be taken into serious consideration. There are places where the railroads must be extended, and there are places where we have too many roads already; and that question should be dealt with by some other body of impartial men who would not be at the beck and call of a member for any district. A road may be needed for the development of territory where it will not yield interest charges and operating expenses at first. There should be some system by which such a road could be subsidized to a certain extent, after it had been passed upon by some independent body. We should also establish the capitalization of these roads. We have the Intercolonial without capitalization, and the Canadian Northern with heavy capitalization. We should establish the capitalization on which roads within a reasonable period of years would be in a position to earn money. Hand the roads over to a commission and let them state to the Government, if you will, what they expect to require in the way of cash assistance from this country in order to put them in good shape, and what they expect to require before they can be made to pay, and how long they expect to operate before getting any returns. If we go on in our present haphazard way, however, reaching out and taking a railway here and another there, we shall certainly have difficulties. The last night of last session, about ten o'clock at night, there was brought up the question of some four or five railroads. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. J. D. Reid), a great public ownership man, turned to his friend, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), who was more or less of a private-ownership man, and with their co-operation we gobbled up four or five railroads.

I do not know how much work has been done on them since, nor what system has been adopted to put them into shape. The railway situation will never work itself out until we adopt a policy of colonization to get people along the lines of road and to get the land that is being held out of use into such a condition that people can go and settle upon it and produce traffic for the railways.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (South York): Mr. Chairman, I have listened with a great deal of interest to the hon. the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) but I cannot agree with him. I am an absolute believer in the public ownership of railways in this country. I came into this House on that doctrine. I have seen it expand and grow and take possession of the hearts of the people. The people are determined that the old system must end forever and a new system take its place. That new system is public ownership. One of the first war measures of the Mother Country was to take over the railways of Great Britain. They will never part with them. The United States have taken over the railways. They have had difficulties, but they are trying to surmount them. They are co-ordinating the roads, they are licking them into shape, and while they have not made any profits, and people say it has been expensive to run them, the real fact is that the roads had been allowed to run down and they required immense expenditures to restore them to a profitable basis.

The people of the United States have justified that expenditure. They have a body in the United States called the Council of Agriculture. That council, represented by its chairman and prominent members, waited upon the Senate Committee, discussing the railway situation, and said: We come here representing the farmers of the United States who, in their organized capacity, are in favour of public ownership and who believe that this is the only way of getting substantial relief from their transportation difficulties. They are going to continue public ownership in the United States. They have it, as a matter of fact, in England although there is some legislating yet to do. Germany held her predominence in the war largely because of her state-owned railways, all Europe has been converted to state-owned railways and no country there proposes to abandon the principle of state ownership.

We believe in it in the province of Ontario. I have watched closely the develop-

ment of public opinion on that question, I know what the people there are thinking and I have no hesitation in saying that they are in favour of public ownership. We have a provincially-owned railway. It is doing good work, it is well administered and it has opened up a new portion of the country. While it has not paid any dividends yet, it is a splendid asset for the province. We have also another fine example of public ownership in the Hydro-electric system of Ontario, which supplies the people with heat, light and power. They have made a great success of it there, and they are going to extend it to local radial railways.

I was up in the West taking part in a little campaign on that question. Those who fought the idea of public ownership in connection with the radial system were not in it when the votes were counted. The workmen and farmers in Ontario are all for public ownership when they are asked to pronounce upon local proposals of that kind. When the next election comes around the people will demand by their votes that we shall have a well-established system of public ownership. So far we have had to take the lean ends, the failures, and the roads that have been exploited by capitalists of all kinds. After the capitalists and contractors have made fortunes for themselves, and the public have spent immense sums of money, the people are compelled to come along to recover these roads and take them over.

What have we paid for this whole adventure in connection with the Grand Trunk Pacific? Not less than half a million dollars—$500,000,000 has gone into this railway proposition extending from the Atlantic to the Pacific. Then, when we take it over, we will have to pay $25,000,000 a year, which means $5 for every man, woman and child in this country, notwithstanding what we have already spent on the road. It has not been organized, it is not serving the people, although the money has been paid out. Somebody has got a lot of money, but we have to pay for it. We not only had to pay for it the first time, but now we have to take it over and do the best we can. There must be no more of that kind of thing. If any one comes into this House while I am a member of it and tries to get the people's money paid out for the construction of a railway, which railway will sooner or later be dumped on the public to be taken care of by them, I am not going to vote for it. Nor will I ever vote for another dollar of public money for any privately-owned railway.

They talk about the public not being able to administer a railway. Was there ever such incompetency in the history of the world as that which has been disclosed by the record of the railways in the United States and Canada under the management of private companies? Nearly every one of these roads has become bankrupt? Nearly every one has gone through the profits, has failed, and the people who put their money into them have been looted and ruined by the so-called executives of these railways. The public have never been served. Competition never did anything for the public, but the money was spent. The exploiters had control. They did the contracting in one way and another, with the result that the roads have been wrecked. The net result on the American continent is that private ownership has wrecked the railway systems of United States and Canada, with the single exception of the Canadian Pacific.

My opinion is that the people of Canada have determined that there shall be no more exploitation of the public in this respect, and least of all are they prepared to take the advice of the hon. member for Pontiac, who says: Appoint another commission and allow this thing to continue; let us find out what we can do. The thing is to do something now.

Mr. CAHILL: The hon. gentleman is misquoting me. I said: Appoint a commission to manage the present Canadian National Railways instead of the Government managing them.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): I know that the hon. gentleman is no advocate of the proposition before the Government. But, we have to deal with this question now. We cannot go out, get information and appoint a commission; we have to deal with the facts before us. Here is a great railway system in default. The Government and Parliament must deal with it, and the Government have come forward with a proposition. My only criticism is that they are not going far enough. When we are winding up the Grand Trunk Pacific is the time to wind up the old Grand Trunk. Perhaps that will come in a few days. That, I expect, will be the result of the provision which is being made now. I also agree with the hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) when he says it is up to the Grand Trunk to say something and do something now. The next move is theirs.

But in the meantime we are going to put an end to all this exploitation in connection with the old Grand Trunk Pacific. We will take it over if we have to. We will join it

up with the Canadian Northern, and will take over the ragged ends. As I said before, if we take the Grand Trunk Pacific we want the old Grand Trunk, which, if joined up to the Intercolonial, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the Transcontinental and the other roads that we have taken over, will make a Canadian national system which can be linked together and co-ordinated, and all unnecessary trackage perhaps thrown out. If that is done a great saving can be made. When we begin to do things like that we will really have public ownership, and we will find people in this country who can administer railroads. The people of this country will stand no longer for an administration of the public railways being made a part of a political machine—the day for all that has gone by. They administer the railways in England without politics, and for the time the Government had them they did so in the United States under the administration of Mr. McAdoo. There was not much politics in connection with the administration of the railways there, and there will be no politics in the administration of the railays in this country: we will find the men who will administer our railways properly.

Mr. McKENZIE: How does the hon. member propose to have responsible government, and yet have the management of the railroads not responsible to Parliament?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I do not think there is much in that point. We will have the railways administered by public ownership, perhaps by commission. Parliament must take the responsibility, under our system of government, eventually, but that does not mean that there will be any interference with the men who are administering the railways. I will undertake to find people in this country—any one would undertake to do so—who can run these roads. What a pitiable situation it is to se in this country the railroads already in existence —the combinations that are in existence (and they are always conspiring); they want to see public ownership defeated. That great system, the Canadian Pacific, which has been a success, what is it doing to-day? It is doing its best to prevent the Government from getting hold of the Grand Trunk. It does not want to see a success made of a national system of railways, for it knows that is coming and that it will be here in a very short time.

I approve of this Act of the Government in dealing with the Grand Trunk Pacific, but I think it must be followed a little later on by taking over the Grand Trunk and consolidating it with the railroads we now have. I would be prepared now, and I believe the people of Canada largely would be prepared, to take over the Canadian Pacific and give it a reasonable arrangement whereby we would have one national system. We are a poor nation, Mr. Speaker, after what we have done from a national point of view—from the point of view of fighting, and one thing or another—if we cannot run our own railroads in the interest of the public. I hate to hear men in public life talking about putting the administration of our railroads into the hands of politicians. I propose to put them into the hands of Canadians, I propose to have them take the administration of the roads and make a success of it. It has been made a success in Australia, in New Zealand, all over the continent of Europe, and the British Government are doing it all over Africa. India has national railroads, France has national railroads, and there is not a country which is preparing to depart from that principle. They are all coming to it, and we are coming to it—we have arrived at it. Here in Canada the people are in favour of it, and I hope it will not be long before we have, not only the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the Grand Trunk proper, in our national railway system.

Now who is it that objects to taking over this Grand Trunk adventure, after the enormous expenditure in connection with it? You will always find there are three interests in connection with railroads. First of all there is the public that is served; then there are the people who have their money invested—the shareholders or the investors—and there are always another clever lot who have the executive power in their hands. And that comes home to the men in London who have been administering the Grand Trunk for a great many years. They do not care for the public, or for the shareholders; they have been exploiting the shares of the Grand Trunk in its various forms for fifty years in the London market; and they would like to keep that power as long as they can, they would like to dabble in Grand Trunk securities, and they would like to have the patronage and the handing out of the contracts in connection with the Grand Trunk. Therefore I do not take any stock in this objection to public ownership of railways that comes from the executive of the Grand Trunk. I would make this suggestion to the Government: If it wishes to make this campaign effective, the first thing it should do is get a list of the shareholders of the Grand Trunk and send them a copy of this debate, and let the shareholders of the

Grand Trunk know what has been concealed from them, so far as I can gather—that is the actual commitments to which those shareholders have been pledged by this, so-called, executive in London. How many of them know what this country has already paid for that road—what we have paid on their account, and what commitments and obligations they have failed to perform? They do not know it. Instead of that the shareholders of the Grand Trunk in England have been told that in some way the people of Canada are robbers, that we are confiscating their property. All we have asked the company to do is to make good their undertakings. Why do they not make good their undertakings? We loaned them money, and the credit to build the Grand Trunk Pacific. The money has been spent and the roads are there, but the steel is rusting, and the farmers want the service which these railways should provide. Let us give them that service. Let us help to open Quebec and Northern Ontario with this great transcontinental system. How many millions were put into the Quebec bridge? Was it thirty millions? And the expenditure is not yet over. That is an adventure, that was not done by public ownership—that is an adventure of private ownership connected with politics. That has all got to stop. Now that we have paid the money and got these roads, we should tell these men who have made a mess of things to step down and out, and let the people run these railways.

Could there have been a worse mess than the Grand Trunk magnates in London have landed this great Grand Trunk Pacific railway into? I have heard what the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier said some time ago with respect to that scheme in which he took so much interest. I saw him introduce the project into this House, and I have followed it from its inception to the end. Apparently Sir Wilfrid put his faith in one individual, in Mr. Hays, for the carrying of it out, and when Mr. Hays died, Sir Wilfrid said it would have a bad effect on the fortunes and the future of the road. But whether that be so or not the fact remains that the people of Canada put half a billion of money into this one proposition. They put up the money, they signed the agreements, and yet these magnates in London, who made those solemn agreements, are dodging the responsibility, are trying to evade it—they want to leave the baby on the doorstep of the people of Canada. Now there is to be no more of that in connection with our railroads. We will take them over, we will try and run them, and we will put these railroads on their feet.

An hon. MEMBER: On wheels.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Very well, on wheels—and we will make them serve the people, but we want no more adjournment of the matter, and no opportunity given to the Grand Trunk to continue its plotting.

Now here is what is going on in Montreal largely: The great thing that I read in the papers there is that in some way we should not wreck this poor old Grand Trunk and we should not confiscate this property. While that argument is advanced, two things are going on: First, the Canadian Pacific has been trying for months to get control of the old Grand Trunk. I do not think anybody will deny that. The other thing that has been observed going on is that the Canadian Pacific would like to see delay in the nationalization of the railways, they would like to see it fail, and they would like to see Canada loaded up with the poor ends like the Canadian Northern, the Intercolonial, possibly, and the Transcontinental, which some people say goes through a wilderness. But now that we have paid this money, give us one good railroad in Ontario, where the main mileage of the old Grand Trunk is to be found, and let the people run it. If you do, it will be a success; it will help to carry the other roads along, and you will have a good national system of railways.

I have heard the grievances of the farmers in connection with the tariff. I have studied the tariff question, and I have studied also the transportation question. You can give real relief to the people of the West, you can settle up that part of our country, you can bring about lower freight rates, by the establishing of a national system of railways better than you can in any other way. And we must also own a national system of transportation on the sea; we are coming to that. Every time the railway commission get a reduction of freight rates for the farmers, the men who control our steamship services, especially the Englishmen, who have no special regard for this country, jump up the ocean transport charges. We do not get the benefit of reduced freight rates or of the money that we vote to secure railway competition. But when we have a national system of railways devoted to serving our people, opening up settlement and reducing the rates of transportation, our country will go ahead. If the mem-

ber for Pontiac wants to see the back country in Quebec opened up, I suggest that he appeal to the Government to take over not only the Grand Trunk Pacific but the whole of the Grand Trunk system and run it as a great public service.

Railways are only one factor in our transportation problem. Associated with railways are our express and telegraph services; and we are also trying to build up a parcel post system. We should give our people national telegraphs and a national express system, combining cheap rates with good service. In the default of the Grand Trunk opportunity has come to us to get not only the Grand Trunk Pacific, but the old Grand Trunk line as well. Other countries can make a success of national ownership of railways; why not Canada? I am tired of hearing people say that in some way public ownership will be exploited by politicians and boodlers. We are running the post office fairly well; we are running a good many things fairly well. More and more the administration of these services must come into the hands of the people. If there is one thing that the new world is preaching to-day it is that a great many things must be owned and controlled by the people, not by individuals. In England they are taking over even the coal mines, because they are recognized as a national industry which can be best administered by the people. That idea is spreading all over the world as a result of the great war. It has got into the United States. You could not pry the railroads away from public ownership there; they are to have a period of three or five years in which to find out how the control of the numerous lines there can be consolidated. The farmers of the United States have declared for public ownership. The farmers of Canada are for public ownership, and particularly the farmers of the West. What they want to-day is action. I do not want to see any more delay in this matter; I am sick and tired of hearing pledges made—even since the Conservatives came into office—in connection with the public ownership of railways. The policy is always one of putting off or waiting a little, or taking the poor end of our railway systems. First we had the Transcontinental, where there were few settlers; then the Canadian Northern; now we have to have the Grand Trunk Pacific. But the Canadian Northern is a splendid asset. It will be three times the road it is now, when it has proper connection with the Grand Trunk in the East, where the traffic largely originates. The Government should act quickly in this matter. If the Grand Trunk must go into liquidation; if the Government must liquidate it, let them do so. The Grand Trunk Railway Company are in default. They have not kept their promises and pledges; they have taken our money and spent it right and left—whether wisely or not, I will not say at the moment. It is surprising to see the press of Ontario supporting a policy of: Do not hurry; let us wait; treat the poor shareholders of the Grand Trunk decently. We are treating them decently, but they must treat us decently in return. The Government proposes to give them $100,000,000, as I understand it, for the surrender of something that some have said is not worth anything. That is more than reasonable treatment, but it affords an opportunity of arriving at a settlement of this matter and giving public ownership a fair trial. I want to see public ownership tried out with the Canadian Northern and with the Grand Trunk. I want to see it tried out in Ontario and Quebec. If we decide to do this I should not be surprised to find the shareholders of the Grand Trunk, who I understand are to meet in London to-morrow, taking a more reasonable view. I hope somebody will tell these shareholders about the commitments that have been made in their behalf by those who have been directors of the road for fifty years. The old Grand Trunk did a good deal for our country, and I give them credit for it. The shareholders never got much return from their investment, but the reason was pointed out this afternoon—the fact that the management of the Grand Trunk Railway System has been over in England. Canada started to go ahead from the day that it was first governed by its own people at home; that was the beginning of Canada's progress. But we had to fight for our emancipation in that respect, and we are fighting for something much the same now in connection with our railroads. These people have been running this road from London for fifty years, and they have failed; they have "stuck" us for a lot of money. Now we propose home government, home administration of our own railways. We have the men in Canada who can run them, and they will succeed. But let us give them a chance. Let us, once and for all, stop dallying with these people, stop toying with them; let us bring them to time.

The Government is bringing one of them to time—the Grand Trunk Pacific. Let the Government bring the other one to time, and then we shall see what public ownership, given a fair opportunity, can do for the people of Canada towards the solution of their transportation problems in the way of building up the West, and most of all, of building up that great stretch of country comprising Northern Ontario and Quebec as far the Atlantic. I appeal to my hon. friends from Quebec to support this proposal and get that country, with its minerals and water-powers, settled and developed.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): I trust the members of the House will not begrudge me a certain satisfaction, in rising this evening, that the inexorable march of events has taken us not a few miles nearer the goal that I said must inevitably be Canada's, when I spoke of the railway situation in 1914. Those of the members of this House, who, at the time, were privileged to be members of the then House, will remember that I said that the Grand Trunk Railway Company would never be able to operate the National Transcontinental, because the cost of construction had been so excessive, that the Grand Trunk Pacific would swamp the Grand Trunk, and inevitably the Grand Trunk, the parent company, would become insolvent and the Canadian National, the Canadian Northern then, had been so constructed and so badly managed financially, that it was only a question of years before that railroad would have to be taken over by the Government. But, Sir, in a discussion of the problem that is now before the House, it is of little concern what I thought in 1914, because, in politics, events are not measured by prophecy, we must deal with conditions, and the problem that confronts us to-night is what is the best thing for Canada to do in face of the railway situation as it is in Canada in 1919 and not as it was in 1914.

As I hinted on rising, it gives me great satisfaction to say that I thoroughly approve the resolution submitted by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), and I think it will have the cordial and enthusiastic support of the people from one end of this country to the other. I was a little surprised at the remarks of the hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) this afternoon. I could hardly make out whether he was defending the Grand Trunk administration, or whether he was condemning it. I could hardly reach a conclusion as to whether or not he was in favour of Government ownership, or whether or not he was in favour of the ownership we have had in this country for some time. His defence of the Grand Trunk reminded me of a story that was told me by the manager of a company, the result of whose financial operations had not been satisfactory. On his going to a meeting of the shareholders, one of them proposed a vote of thanks to which he spoke in a very half-hearted way; and on being asked as to what treatment he had received, and intending to say that he had been damned by faint praise, the general manager said that he had been praised by faint damns, and that is about the position of the Grand Trunk Railway as defended by the hon. member for Pontiac.

It is the old wail we have had in reference to that railway since 1859 or 1860. If the hon. member for Pontiac is interested in railway legislation and railway progress in this country, let him read some of the old reports of the Grand Trunk Railway, and the pamphlets that were published in the early days as to the administration of that road in Canada. It began on the distinct understanding that it was to have a Government subsidy of £3,000 per mile, and Peto, Brassey and Betts undertook to construct the railway and find the necessary capital beyond that amount. They held out alluring schemes, of dividends of 10 to 12 per cent, but it took only a few years to demonstrate that their estimate had been excessive, and the Government were then called upon to advance a loan of $15,000,000, which has never been repaid to this country, not even interest.

In speaking this afternoon, the member for Pontiac said that little or no aid had ever been given by Canada to the Grand Trunk Railway Company. If I remember his figures correctly, he said that this country had not given to the Grand Trunk Railway Company more than $10,000,000, and I corrected him by saying that my remembrance was that much more than that amount had been given. If the hon. member will turn to page xvii in the Drayton-Acworth report he will find the following:—

Government Aid to Grand Trunk.

According to Government reports, the roads now comprised in the Grand Trunk Railway Company's undertaking have received aid as follows:

(1) Subsidies:	
Dominion Government	$3,423,699
Provinces	4,077,233
Municipalities	5,502,128
Total	$13,003,060

(2) Loan:	
The Dominion Government made to the Grand Trunk Railway Company, many years ago, a loan, interest on which has never been asked for or paid, amounting to..	$15,142,633
Total..	$28,145,693

That, I think, sufficiently refutes the position taken by the hon. member for Pontiac. Then he says: Who is responsible for the railway situation in Canada to-day? I do not know that it very much matters who is responsible. The railways in Canada, like the poor, we always have with us; but there is one thing perfectly certain, and that is that neither the Unionist party nor the Conservative party were in power in 1903, when the contract between the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Dominion of Canada was made that led us into the difficulty in which we find ourselves. Nor were the Conservative party in power in 1911, when the Canadian Northern Railway system, by a subsidy granted by the then Minister of Railways, Hon. George P. Graham, was permitted to leave the Western Provinces and get an eastern connection, and to take the first step towards making what had been a local railway system into a transcontinental railway system. But I want to be just; I do not want to endeavour to place the responsibility altogether on hon. gentlemen opposite, because if they were responsible in 1903 and again in 1911, there is one thing quite sure, namely, that the Conservative Government of later years were, in my judgment, responsible when they permitted the Canadian Northern Railway system to be extended from Winnipeg to the coast, because it was a national crime to allow the parallelling of the Canadian Pacific from Kamloops to the Pacific coast along one side of the Fraser and Thompson rivers while the Canadian Pacific ran down the other side. But who were to blame? We were all to blame, because the people of Canada allowed themselves to be bribed with their own money. We were to blame because the people of Canada were led to believe that this railway expenditure and development were going to make good times, and the majority, or a great number of the people of Canada thought there was going to be something in it for them. The people allowed themselves to be bribed with their own money, and fate brought them to punishment, and we are paying to-day for our irregularity and our weakness of a few years ago.

The construction of the Grand Trunk Pacific brought great industrial activity in Canada; the recognition by the Government of 1911 of the right of the Canadian Northern to become a transcontinental railway brought further great development, and between them we had competition in expenditures. Wages rose and the cost of materials rose. Instead of the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental being built at the estimated cost of those who had launched the schemes, prices were greatly enhanced. The original estimate of the National Transcontinental was about $61,000,000. The real cost was approximately $160,000,000, $99,000,000 over the estimate, or 150 per cent.

The Grand Trunk Railway engineers had the right to draw the specifications, they had the right to supervise and the right to inspect, and yet this country in the inauguration of a public-owned system of railways is burdened down with part of a national transcontinental railway at a cost of $99,000,000 beyond what it should have cost. Now, Sir, I have said that the inflation and the competition between the two railroads tremendously increased the cost, and the members of this House have a right to ask: "How does he know it? Why does he say it? Is it a fact? Can he prove it?" I think those are fair questions, and I want to prove it, not by any isolated fact that I might produce of my own knowledge, but out of the mouth of Mr. Chamberlin himself. There is one unfortunate thing when a man takes an oath and swears to tell the truth—that is, unfortunate, possibly, from his point of view when the evidence turns against him—and that is he has no reason to complain when the people believe him and have reason to suppose that what he said was a fact. What did Mr. Chamberlin of the Grand Trunk Railway Company say when he was giving evidence before the Drayton-Acworth-Smith Commission in Montreal on the 24th February, 1917, as to the cost of the Canadian Northern, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the National Transcontinental? He said—Page 82:

> Mr. Chamberlin: In the first place, all our estimates were made on the basis of $1.50 for labour, $1.75 to make it safe. Labour is the principal part of the construction of a railway. The result was that with the other road working right alongside of us, especially west of Edmonton, we had to pay $3.50 a day right along, and even then the men would not work. If we tried to crowd them and make them work, they would simply climb over the fence, so to speak, and go to work for the Canadian Northern.
>
> Sir Henry Drayton: But your position would be no worse in that respect than that of the Canadian Northern.

Mr. Chamberlin: Not in that respect. Still, it tremendously increased the cost of the road. In addition to that, all material was increased in price. The Canadian Pacific Railway was constructing feverishly all the time to keep up with the other two. That increased the cost of material away beyond any expectations. There were also duties put on everything after that contract was made—

That is the contract for the construction of the two roads.

—such as $7 a ton on rails. So you see everything counted.

That simply goes to prove that the construction of those two roads at the one time created an inflation, increased prices, and made the cost infinitely more expensive than had originally been estimated

But the hon. member for Pontiac still seems to be willing to excuse the Grand Trunk. As I said, I want to be fair. I want to view this thing as if I were to an extent a shareholder in the Grand Trunk Railway Company. As a shareholder in the railroad I should feel myself estopped by the conduct of my management, and although I had made a loss I do not believe I should be justified in saying that what the management had done and what I as a shareholder had approved, I now had a right to claim to be freed from. When the Grand Trunk came to the Government of this country—I want to emphasize this point: the Government of the day, Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Government, did not go to the Grand Trunk and ask them to build this railroad, but the Grand Trunk came to the Government of Sir Wilfrid Laurier and endeavoured to enter into a contract to permit of the building of the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific, because the Grand Trunk Railway wanted a western outlet, wanted a long haul and a western connection—when the Grand Trunk came to the Government they asked the Government only for a railroad from North Bay westward. That was a sound policy and probably if that arrangement as contemplated by the Grand Trunk had been adhered to, the difficulties we have had to contend with in this country might not have arisen. But the Government of the day—and I say it advisedly, because I think history will prove it, and certainly the facts will not disprove it—the Government of the day, and the members of the Parliament of that day, for political reasons insisted that the arrangement as contemplated should not be carried out, and they insisted on the construction of a railway away down through the northern part of this country and across the Maritime Provinces to Moncton. They loaded the Grand Trunk down with a load it could never hope to carry, but the Grand Trunk knew before they signed the contract what the contract was to be, and I do not see how it lies in the mouth of the Grand Trunk Railway to come to this country now and say that we are hard and unreasonable when we ask them to live up to the contract they made. And the Grand Trunk do admit that the contract they are asked to live up to is a contract that cannot be lived up to. You ask me why I do say this. I again turn to the sworn evidence of Mr. Chamberlin at Montreal—page 79. Mr. Chamberlin had been giving evidence as to why the Grand Trunk should not be asked to live up to its obligations, and after he had given his first reason Sir Henry Drayton said to him:

Sir Henry Drayton: Your second ground is that of impossibility?

Mr. Chamberlin: It is an impossibility.

Sir Henry Drayton: If it is impossible now, it was always impossible.

Mr. Chamberlin: It was always impossible.

In other words, the Grand Trunk Railway Company entered into a contract with the Government of this country which Mr. Chamberlin says was always impossible for that railroad to carry out.

What reason has the Grand Trunk Railway to come to us and ask to be relieved of its obligations? What reason has the Grand Trunk Railway to come to this country, which has done much more for the Grand Trunk Railway than we ever promised to do, and say: "You are treating us harshly. Relieve us from our obligations."

You listened this afternoon, Sir, to the very excellent summary of the Acting Prime Minister, and what did it show? It showed that the outstanding liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific to-day are approximately $200,000,000; that in 1909, beyond our original agreement, we gave them $10,000,000 of a guarantee, the Grand Trunk also joining in that guarantee; that in 1913 we gave to the Grand Trunk Pacific a guarantee of $15,000,000, the Grand Trunk also joining in the guarantee; that in 1914 we guaranteed $16,000,000 more, in which guarantee the Grand Trunk did not join; that in 1916 we gave $8,000,000 of a loan; in 1917 we gave $7,500,000 of a loan; in 1918 we gave $8,000,000 of a loan. In other words, Canada has given to this undertaking by way of loans and guarantees $63,500,000 more than this country ever promised to give, and we have paid out $99,000,000 more than we estimated for the construction of the Transcontinental. And yet people had the audacity to say to the shareholders of the Grand Trunk Railway that we are confiscating their property,

dealing unfairly with them, demanding our pound of flesh and repudiating our national obligations. The hon. member for Pontiac said this afternoon that this country was clubbing the Grand Trunk Railway Company. Clubbing the Grand Trunk Railway? It would be as reasonable for my gardener, if I caught him stealing my vegetables, robbing my fruit trees, taking my silver and forging my name to a cheque, and if I told him to go because I was getting another gardener to look after my interests—it would be as reasonable for him to say "You are clubbing me." This country has been singularly generous to the Grand Trunk Railway. I am not as tender with that corporation as the Acting Prime Minister would be. To my mind, an obligation entered into solemnly is an obligation to be respected. Confiscation? There has been no confiscation; there has been generosity. Let us see what Mr. Chamberlin says in regard to confiscation in his evidence given at Montreal:

> Sir Henry Drayton: You speak of confiscation in your letter Mr. Chamberlin. No person is thinking of confiscating the investment that I know of. If you can afford to carry it you will be allowed to carry it. That was not really meant, was it? Suppose you are left to yourselves the thing crashes, no one confiscates it. Isn't that right?
>
> Mr. Chamberlin: To a certain extent, yes.
>
> Sir Henry Drayton: To every extent, isn't it?
>
> Mr. Chamberlin: To every extent.

If the venture turns out to be a success the company shall have the cream of the undertaking; while if the undertaking turns out to be a failure, the country shall have the water. That is not my idea of confiscation. My idea of confiscation is that you do something by the passing of an Act that you have not a legal right to do; but you do not confiscate when you live up to the full purpose and intent of your obligation and more, and ask the other man to do the very thing that he should do under his agreement. As I said when I rose, I approve of the Order in Council. Why? For the reason that I have endeavoured to elucidate, that I believe that the rights of the people should be maintained and respected. If I were to give advice to the Government—it is not likely they would take it—I would say to the Government: "Just leave the Grand Trunk proper alone." If I were going to synopsize my advice in a very few words I would say, "Leave it alone, and it will come home, bringing its debts behind it." The Grand Trunk Railway to-day is hopelessly insolvent. There is no possible way, unless the Government comes to its aid, in which it can pull itself out of the position in which it now finds itself, and where it has got simply because the original management of a few years ago was short-sighted and did not show business acumen. But, Sir, I do not like the suggestion made by the Prime Minister to the Grand Trunk people in London last year. I do not like this idea of a 999-year lease. As you know, Sir, I am a government-ownership man, and have been a government-ownership man since 1914. I said in 1917 in this House, speaking on the railway situation:

> To give the House some idea of the progress Government ownership and operation of railroads has made, I might direct the attention of the House to the fact that in 1880 there were in the world only 10,000 miles of railways under Government operation and ownership, whereas at the present time there are 225,000 miles of railways under Government operation and ownership. Sweden, Germany, Italy—practically all—in all 55—the great countries of the world now own or operate their railroads. I would be wrong if I were to say that they all do, because I would leave out the two great countries of the world that have not yet adopted a policy of government ownership.

I went on to explain how Great Britain and the United States had not at that time adopted government ownership, but we have gone a long way since 1917. I remember in 1916 being in England at a luncheon given at Hadfield Works, when Sir John Hadfield, in replying to the toast of his company, rose and said he believed that if England were to hold her place in the industrial world after the conclusion of the war it was absolutely essential that Britain should own and operate her own roads, and have control of transportation. And Mr. Lloyd George, in addressing the people of England some time prior to the last election, emphatically stated that the Government policy was one of government ownership. The United States has also gone some way since 1917. The experiment there has not been perhaps just as successful as we might have desired it to be, but I think that a close student of American politics and affairs will reach the conclusion that possibly one of the reasons was that those who were in railway administrative control in the United States were not sympathetic with the desire to make government ownership a success.

With regard to arbitration—and that was another suggestion that the hon. Acting Prime Minister made to the directors of the Grand Trunk Railway—I must say that my faith in arbitration, if I may use a slang expression, got a bit of a jolt as a result of the Canadian Northern Railway award. The upset price, without any evidence apparently being adduced, was too close a guess at the award to just meet my approval as to its being accidental. I al-

ways had a feeling that possibly political and extraneous conditions were not altogether eliminated by the arbitrators but were treated as being something to be taken into consideration when one values a road as a going concern. I therefore do not look quite as favourably as I did in 1917 on the idea of taking over railways by arbitration.

Yet, Mr. Chairman, rather than lose the Grand Trunk, if we had to adopt it, I would be willing to consent to arbitration because I would like to have these railways taken off our national back as privately operated. I am not quite as tender towards capital as the Acting Prime Minister appears to be. I know that he is a gentle, sympathetic, courteous gentleman, but when he talks about that peremptory letter and you realize that the directors of the Grand Trunk Railway Company would have stopped operations and left the people of the western part of the country without railway connection probably in the hope that such a hue and cry would have been raised that pressure would have been brought on the Government to come to the aid of the Grand Trunk, I am at a loss to understand why he is quite so sympathetic toward the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk proper.

My experience has been that as a rule capital will take care of itself. I would care for capital in relation to the Grand Trunk with just the same tenderness as capital was prepared to take care of Canada when it was prepared to leave our western people without accommodation. Because I am just as satisfied—without being able to prove it as a fact—as that I stand on my feet in this House to-night, that the Grand Trunk people forgot the War Measures Act; and I am not criticising them therefor as being unskilful business men, because, unless one had had the privilege of reading the War Measures Act, no one in the world would have imagined that Parliament would give such powers to any government as we in 1914 gave to the Government of this country. Yet, I want to add that I am extremely glad that we did give them that power. That power has been well exercised by the Acting Prime Minister and the Government in the present case in being used for the purpose of taking over this road. The action which the Government have taken, I believe, will redound to the advantage of this country in the long run; because Canada must finance these roads and if to the Grand Trunk Pacific we can add the old Grand Trunk Railway we are going to have a great Government-owned system.

Some one may say: That is all very well but you are an enthusiast in regard to Government ownership and you see nothing but the bright side of the picture. He might say: Leave the Grand Trunk alone; take hold of the Grand Trunk Pacific but give the Grand Trunk a chance to work out its own destiny. Would that be a wise thing for Canada to do? The wise thing to do, if the Government is going to take over railways, is to take them over in such a way as to enable them best to work out the destinies of the country. Suppose we take over only the Grand Trunk Pacific, leave the old Grand Trunk under the control of its overseas management and let them work out a scheme. I say they could not do it. Their credit is not good enough to finance it. What Canada wants is to get the very best railway system that it can get, and Canada must take whatever steps are necessary to get that system. The reason I say that the Grand Trunk Railway cannot work out its system is this: I refer again to the Drayton-Acworth report which is a sort of railway bible, at present much endangered by higher criticism. At page xxxiii the commissioners say:

> Grand Trunk Maintenance Expenditure.
>
> Further, the Grand Trunk Railway has not been and is not being adequately maintained. No depreciation fund has been created for equipment. Mr. Chamberlin's view, as shown by his evidence, is that 5 per cent on the cost of equipment ought to be annually charged under this head.
>
> He says:—Take engines and cars, they are either worn out or out of date in twenty years.
>
> This item, according to his evidence, would have required an annual sum of $2,750,000. He also states:—"If we had $25,000,000 now, it would put us in fine shape."
>
> The Vice-President in charge of operations, Mr. Kelley, has direct responsibility for the plant. On Mr. Chamberlin's evidence being put to him, he agreed with it. He has since submitted to us a full report on the question of deferred expenditure. "Deferred expenditure" means, in plain English, expenditure which has not been made, but which, in the view of those charged with the duty of maintaining the plant, ought to have been made.
>
> We give below Mr. Kelley's summary in tabular form, but we do not think it necessary to reproduce all the supporting tables.
>
> Grand Trunk Railway System—Summary of Deferred Expenditures.

Rebuilding and reinforcing freight car equipment		$8,943,971 14
Equipping freight and passenger cars with safety appliances—		
Original estimate	$850,722 50	
Already expended	392,220 89	
Balance to be expended		458,501 61

Equipping engines with safety appliances—		
Original estimate..	$17,828 00	
Already expended...	553 68	
Balance to be expended.. .. ..$		17,274 32
Deferred renewals in Maintenance of Way Department—		
In Canada..	$6,182,672	
In United States.. ..	5,578,926	
		$11,761,598 00
Total.. .. ..$		21,181,345 07

Montreal, March 5, 1917.

That must be met to cover the additional expenditure on maintenance account.

Grand Trunk Capital Expenditure Required.

The $21,000,000 dealt with above represent the money which the responsible officers of the company estimate to be required to put the existing plant into good normal condition. This is a revenue liability. But the existing plant is quite inadequate for existing traffic and requires large additions, for which new capital must be raised. The estimates of necessary capital exepnditure submitted to us are as follows:—

Requirements for rolling stock, shops and machinery..	$26,150,000
Requirements for automatic block signals (main line in Canada only)..	3,533,000
Requirements for installing rock ballast crushing plant..	467,500
Total..	$30,150,500

Putting together revenue and capital expenditure, we find that the Grand Trunk Railway, in the opinion of its own officers, requires over $51,000,000 spent upon it to put it into a position to meet the requirements of its to-day's business. We see no reason to expect that under existing conditions this necessary money will be provided.

Now, Sir, to put that into short metre, it means this: That we have given the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific railway, by loans and guarantees, $63,000,000 more than we promised them. We have taken over the National Transcontinental, which stands this country at $161,000,000,—$99,000,000 more than it was estimated the National Transcontinental would cost,—and the Drayton and Acworth report says $50,000,000 is required to put the Grand Trunk Railway system in adequate operation and so maintain is as to give satisfactory service to Canada. And yet the member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) hesitated this afternoon in saying that the time had come when Canada should act, not only to save her credit, but also to secure an adequate railway system for this country. I do not believe that is the opinion of the people of Canada. If I can read aright the policies we hear enunciated from the Atlantic to the Pacific, it is that the time has come when Canada is to cease subsidizing railroads, that we are going to own what we pay for. If we have got to pay the costs in any event, then we are going to have the profits if there are profits. But just here, Sir, I would like pause to make one remark. I said if there are profits we are going to have the profits. But as a Government-ownership man I want to have a fair chance, I want unnecessary paralleling of lines eliminated, I want the whole of the system co-ordinated, and I do want the additional capital that has been absorbed by these undertakings through improper construction, fraudulent specifications, inadequate checking, and all that we summarize in the cost of irregular and irrelevant construction, eliminated from what I might call the capital charges against the venture. I do not want the Canadian national system of railroads loaded up with the interest on $100,000,000 of overhead charge through the unfortunate cost of construction of the National Transcontinental. I do not want the system loaded up with all the cost of paralleling lines that never should have been built. Government ownership in this country must get a fair show, and then it must stand or fall on its merits. But if it is to have a fair show, there must, as I said, be co-ordination of the various lines, there must be an elimination of waste in management, there must be the squeezing out of all the water represented by improper, and, as I said, irregular construction and flotation.

Somebody has said that you cannot have government operation and administration of railroads, because you cannot get men to run them honestly. I may be an idealist, I may look forward to Utopia, but in the eleven years I have been in public life there is one thing that I have learned, and that is that we are making a tremendous advance along the line of the willingness of big men to do public service. When the war broke out we saw men for an ideal go to the Front, willing to sacrifice their lives for $1.10 a day,—I was going to say, remuneration. No, they did not go to the Front to sacrifice their lives for $1.10 a day; they went to the Front moved by that enthusiasm which makes men realize that to die for one's country is sweet; and I believe, Sir, that the aftermath of this war will bring Canadians to realize that if it is dear and sweet for a man to die for his country, it is equally sweet for a man to live for his country. And I believe the time is coming, if the time is not already here, when great men may be had in Canada to run our national railway system. Not great business men, simply because they have succeeded in a business that is not

a railroad, but great men who have mastered a railroad system, great men who understand railway operation, experts in railway administration. I may say, Sir, that I agree with the hon. member for Pontiac that the present system is a long way from being ideal. I would no more think of taking a grocer and asking him to run a dry goods store, than I would think of taking a man from managing a steel plant or running a cement works, and asking him to run a railroad. What I should like to see this country do is to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific—we have already the Intercolonial, Transcontinental and the Canadian Northern systems—take over the old Grand Trunk—because it is insolvent and cannot finance itself—press the water out of the system, get the best railway men that the country can produce; and if Canada cannot produce the men let us get them from England or the United States, but let us secure the very best men we can get. Let us have a railroad system owned by this country and operated by independent, courageous men, and let us demonstrate to the world that Canada can do, and successfully do, that which she determines to do well.

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I would like to make one or two comments on the railway situation as it has developed out of the resolution before the House. First of all, I would congratulate the Acting Prime Minister and the Government on the resolute action they took when the Grand Trunk put them with their backs against the wall, so to speak, with their ultimatum that the Grand Trunk Pacific would stop operating at 1 a.m. on the 10th instant. Speaking in this House last Session I put on Hansard a set of figures with regard to the National Transcontinental, the Grand Trunk Pacific and the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada, that so far have not either been contradicted or disproved. I pointed out at that time—I am not going to weary the House with the details, any one who wishes can find the figures on Hansard—that through the construction of the National Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific railways, for all of which the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada was either directly or contingently liable, and for all of which the people of Canada were either directly or contingently liable, $260,000,000 had gone into something that was not the construction of a railway. We are not going to get anywhere if we start in to throw bricks at each other as to who is responsible for that, but the fact remains that $260,000,000—not $100,000,000, as my hon. friend has told us on the National Transcontinental east of Winnipeg, but $120,000,000 on the National Transcontinental east of Winnipeg, and $130,000,000 on the Grand Trunk Pacific west of Winnipeg—went into something that was not the construction of railways. That was not due to any wrong estimate, or to any increase in the wages paid to workmen, or the cost of steel or anything else, but was deliberately applied to some other purpose. In support of that statement, take the construction of the Canadian Northern, which was carried on side by side with it, and you will find, by simply estimating, the value of the physical assets of each, that what I say is absolutely correct. Now the point is simply this: As has been emphasized—and I think it should be re-emphasized in order that the people of this country may not be misunderstood by those who have put their money into the Grand Trunk Railway Company, or by English or European investors who may have put or or may hereafter put their money into any industry in Canada—the Canadian people are not responsible for anything more than they did themselves on the National Transcontinental east of Winnipeg. Let me repeat again what I said in this House last year, that if the Canadian people are willing to assume the responsibility for what they themselves threw away east of Winnipeg, there is no logical reason why the Grand Trunk Railway of Canada should not be responsible for what their officers threw away on the construction west of Winnipeg.

I agree with the Acting Prime Minister that we should be reasonably generous, but I do not agree that we should be generous to the point that has been suggested. It is not a difficult matter to estimate the value of a railway. It is just as easy for a railway man to determine what a railway is worth as it is for a builder to determine what a building is worth. All you have to do is to measure the railway, take stock of its physical condition, the number of locomotives and cars of all descriptions it has, and you can determine its value without the least bit of trouble. Not what it cost. If you are going to build a house you are not going to ask the owner how much money he has sunk in schemes of architecture, but you will endeavour to find out what the value of the building is.

A railway is simply worth its mileage valuation, assuming that it was properly projected and reasonably constructed. And that is the situation with regard to the

Grand Trunk Railway system. But, that we have to take it over and assume responsibility for it has become evident to everyone who has studied the railway situation ever since we became loaded up with the Transcontinental and the Grand Trunk Pacific. Now that we are going to do it, as the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) has said, let us do it in such a way that there will be reasonable probability of our making the thing a success. I said last year in this House—and I was questioned very pertinently from both sides in this regard—that we should squeeze the water out of the Grand Trunk, the Grand Trunk Pacific, the National Transcontinental. And somebody must squeeze $750,000,000 out of the capitalization, as given to us by the officers themselves, of the Grand Trunk Railway system. The figures may be found in the Drayton-Acworth report.

You will find in that report that the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company, Mr. Chamberlin, was asked specifically by Sir Henry Drayton during the course of his examination why it was that during the number of years when, by his own statement, the railway was depreciating in value, a large sum of money had been paid out in dividends, and why that money had not been used to keep the rolling stock and locomotives, the general physical condition of the road, as it ought to be. In effect, Mr. Chamberlin's answer was this: We were contemplating going on the London market with a block of bonds in connection with putting in a further amount of capital, and in order to stabilize that market we wanted to have a good record in the payment of dividends; in other words, we wanted to pay to ourselves annually over a number of years money that should have gone into the road, in order that we might induce the public to think that this was a good investment and that they should buy our bonds. If any one of us did that, we would find ourselves behind prison bars within a very short time. But that is what the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada said his company did instead of putting the money into ties, rails, locomotives, cars, and everything else that was necessary to keep the road operating. However, we are faced, not with a theory, but with an actual situation. The Grand Trunk Railway Company have come to the point where they say they cannot carry their obligation any further and are going to stop operating the Grand Trunk Pacific. a part of their own system that they themselves brought into existence; and that we may take it or leave it, as we like. In the most direct way possible, the Government of Canada should take the Grand Trunk Railway system at their word, acquire the property, co-ordinate it as quickly as possible and get rid of all unnecessary lines. Certain lines of railway in Canada are built side by side with other lines. We might as well make up our minds to tear them up. I have heard people say: "Why, that piece of railway cost ten, fifteen, or twenty millions." Suppose it did; if we can get three or four millions out of the rails or make use of them somewhere else where they are really required, why should we continue to operate lines of railway where they never could earn anything and where the country through which they run is already amply served? I told the Minister of Railways in this House last year that I could show him where he could get $10,000,000 worth of steel rails that will never earn money enough to keep the rust off them; that run parallel with other lines which serve all the purposes for which a railway was ever designed. It looks like bad housekeeping on our part, but we went into these things with our eyes wide open, and we have to take our medicine. Whether it looks well or whether it does not, action will have to be taken if we are to co-ordinate this national system of railways and make it a complete success.

Some of the things that I have said in this House may have led hon. members to think that I am an out-and-out advocate of the public ownership of railways. In that respect I disagree with the two hon. members who have preceded me. If some one could show us a method by which we could get out of the tangle in which we find ourselves and get back into the position we were in fifteen or twenty years ago, I would hold up both hands for it. The only reason why I support the idea of taking over these lines and co-ordinating them into one national system is because I cannot see any other way out. It is a tremendous problem to take these railways and put them into such a condition that they can be successfully operated. Notwithstanding all that has been said with regard to the large number of men who can be found whose ideals of service will cause them to give their time efficiently and conscientiously to the public, and all that kind of thing, I submit that human nature is human nature and will continue to be so. So far as I can see, the one bright spot in the horizon is the presence in Canada of one complete, well-equipped and splen-

didly managed system of railways. The possibility of success lies in linking up all the other lines and operating them in competition with that efficient system, saying to the men whom we put in charge: Here is your line of railways capitalized at not a dollar more than the one you are competing with; your physical conditions are on the same plane; you can bring the mileage of the national railways up to exactly the same cost value as the Canadian Pacific railway by eliminating the results of wasteful expenditure; simply look upon the sums of which this country has been virtually robbed as money that we spent while on a spree, so to speak; and charge the railways up to what they should have cost, approximately $65,000 a mile, brought up to 100 per cent efficiency. If we do that, appoint a Board of Management of practical men and operate the national railways in competition with a system that is run on practical lines, there is, I believe, a possibility of success. Then, these railways, instead of being a continually recurring burden, will earn their own way and give the people what they are looking for—service.

The member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) referred to the success of Government ownership of railways in all parts of the world. If he will take the trouble to investigate he will find that in no country under the sun, except in the United States, is a ton of freight carried a mile as cheaply as it is in Canada. The Australian system of publicly-owned railways has been held up to the world as a model, but for twenty years it has cost two and a half times as much to move a ton of freight a mile on the railways in Australia as it has cost on Canadian railways. The effort made in the United States by the Government to co-ordinate all their railways has been referred to as a great success.

It was not so much of a success last year when boats were held up in the harbour of New York for ten days at a time, when the railways could not get coal in there for them. It was not even a success from the standpoint of operation. The very first thing the United States Government did when they undertook to co-ordinate the railways of that country was to do the very thing they had been refusing permission to the railway companies to do themselves. The United States had been developing a policy that made it utterly impossible for one railway to assist another in the movement of its traffic, it mattered not what the conditions were. But apart altogether from that, the operation of the United States railways in 1918, when one takes into consideration the excess freight rates and the deficit involved, cost about $1,250,000,000, and the co-relative effect of that is that every man, woman and child in the Dominion of Canada is paying, in the year 1919, $9 for freight and railway services more than they were paying before. We are, however, talking simply along theoretical lines. We might discuss this matter all night and we would never get the Grand Trunk and the Grand Trunk Pacific off the backs of the people of Canada. Our business is to put these railways in such a condition that they can operate successfully in competition with the best managed and best equipped railway under the sun to-day, namely the Canadian Pacific, the one railway system in the whole civilised world that never broke down during the whole period of the war through which we have passed. Had it not been for the service which that railway company, privately owned and managed, rendered, this country would not have been able to do the big things we did in this great war.

May I repeat: We should get a Board of Management—I do not care what you call it; I do not like the present arrangement in connection with the Canadian National railways. I do not like the name. Instead of making the Canadian Northern a part of the Canadian National railways, we have made the Canadian National railways a part of the Canadian Northern. I would call the system the National Railways of Canada. I do not like the Canadian Northern mixed up in it at all. Do not misunderstand me in connection with that. When the Canadian people got the Canadian Northern at the valuation at which they got it, they got the cheapest railway ever built on the North American continent, mile for mile and dollar for dollar. The Canadian people can spend $190,000,000 on the Canadian Northern, on improvement of the roadbed, construction of terminals, purchase of rolling stock and all the things that go to make up a standard railway, and they will have it on the same valuation as the Canadian Pacific.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was it the valuation of the Drayton-Acworth report?

Mr. G. B. NICHOLSON: I do not know anything about the valuation of the Drayton-Acworth report. I am speaking about the value of the railway. Take the railway as it is; you can spend $190,000,000 on it and my hon. friend, if he will look up Hansard of last year, will find that there is a margin of $50,000,000 for contingencies over and above the estimate required to

bring that railway up to 100 per cent efficiency, which $50,000,000 we may never have to spend. If we do spend it, we shall have $190,000,000 over and above what was paid for the railway, every dollar of which is to link that up with the other system, co-ordinating them properly, eliminating the waste mileage and putting them under proper management. In that way we shall be able to complete the system and give the people the service for which they are asking.

Let me say this final word to the Government: Get busy and do this just as quickly as you can. There is no problem facing the people of this country in a physical sense that is so vital as the railway problem. We got into it with our eyes open; now let us get out of it. The country will be able to carry the burden and the railway will give us good service.

Mr. J. A. ROBB (Chateauguay-Huntingdon): The debate this afternoon has developed the idea that it is the policy of the Government to have public ownership of the railways as soon as possible. The Acting Prime Minister, in presenting his case so well as he is able to present it, made the admission that negotiations for the ownership of the Grand Trunk Railway, not the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, were started by the Government in a communication to Mr. Smithers. It is, therefore, quite apparent that the Government, having acquired the Canadian Northern Railway, which turns out unprofitable, now find it necessary to acquire the old Grand Trunk Railway in an effort to make the Canadian Northern pay. I take it that the Government are not unanimous upon this question. No later than last summer, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), speaking before the Canadian Club in Montreal, left the impression with the business men of that city, that the Government were not favourable to public ownership. It seems to me that the House and the country are entitled to some better reason than has been presented this afternoon as to why this change of policy occurred. The Minister of Public Works comes from a province where the people have had many years' experience of Government-owned and operated railways, and his statement of the case was that Government ownership was disastrous to the country. We all know that the Maritime Provinces have suffered from Government ownership. Those rich provinces have not been developed as they should have been developed had they had the advantage of private capital and private enterprise pushing out its branch lines here and there where they would bring traffic to the main line. I feel that the policy of this Government in rushing into public ownership will have the same disastrous effect upon the great prairie provinces as the ownership and operation of the Intercolonial railway has had upon the Maritime Provinces.

I notice also that the Government have changed their ideas as to the powers that they have under the Order in Council passed under the War Measures Act. I have in mind that in 1917, on a trade measure, the reciprocity in wheat, hon. gentlemen who are now members of the Government criticised that Order in Council, claiming that it was illegal, and stating that when peace came the Order in Council would cease to have effect. Those gentlemen are now members of the Government, and apparently they have convinced the Minister of Finance—who was then certain that under the War Measures Act he had all the powers necessary to enact the reciprocity measure, and that the same authority that enabled him to pass the Order in Council, made it law just the same as an Act of Parliament—that his views were wrong, because he now comes before Parliament to ratify this Order in Council.

The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), who has argued in favour of public ownership, has told us that if we cannot find in Canada men capable of making Government ownership of railways profitable, we shall go down to the United States. The hon. gentleman, who is a student, has surely not forgotten the experience of the United States during the past year. That experience was pointed out by the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) who made his speech against public ownership, but wound up by declaring himself in favour of it. Government railway operation in the United States has been disastrous to the people of that country. The whole system broke down last year in the transportation of coal. It has cost the people, as was pointed out by the hon. member for East Algoma, $150,000,000 of a deficit in operation, notwithstanding the freight rates which cost the people of that country almost $1,000,000,000. Therefore, the Government should go very carefully in their policy of Government ownership. It may be that Government ownership suits a certain section of this country, but the issues are clean cut. It is not a question of taking over the Grand Trunk Pacific; it is a ques-

tion of gradually approaching the nationalization of railways. If I stand alone upon this question—and it is not a party question on this side of the House— I am opposed to public ownership and operation of railways, because I believe it is not the best thing for this country.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): As one who has taken a great deal of interest in the railway situation and transportation generally, I followed very closely the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) in his admirable speech this afternoon when he laid this matter before us and showed us exactly the position of affairs. It is certainly one that causes every thinking man to use the best powers he has to decide what it is best in the interest of this country to do at the present time. I have had the pleasure of hearing only two hon. gentlemen opposite express their views, and neither of them has made it at all clear to me what they would do in the situation. Our good friend, the hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon (Mr. Robb), who is an excellent business man, has not told us what he proposes to do with regard to the Grand Trunk's failure to meet its obligations. The hon. member for Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) tells us that if this action was to be taken at all, it should have been taken long ago. He tells us that when the Grand Trunk failed to take over the Transcontinental and carry out the arangements, then was the time for the Government to step in, and I am rather inclined to think that is the best remark and the best criticism he made. The Government would, at that moment, have been justified in stepping in and telling the Grand Trunk management straight: You are under an obligation from which you cannot be relieved, and unless you live up to it we propose to take over the road and your shareholders will suffer accordingly. That is business. It may be hard-hearted, but in order to be just to the people of this country we sometimes have to be a little hard-hearted. And I am not sure if the Acting Prime Minister has not a little more tenderness of heart than he ought to have towards the Grand Trunk, which we all love so much.

I remember very well hearing about the Grand Trunk since I was a child. I think it came into existence about the time I was born—I trust hon. members will not look up the date, or they will know how old I am. It is an object of affection to me. The Grand Trunk has done a great deal for Canada. I am only sorry that the company has run its head into a noose with its eyes wide open and finds that it cannot now get out, and this country cannot afford to let it out. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), I think said that we were going to get hold of a going concern. I think we may go further and say that we are going to get hold of a coming concern, by the look of it. I cannot see that anything else is possible. The Grand Trunk have undertaken obligations amounting to $125,000,000 or $150,000,000 with their eyes wide open. They have induced this country to put in two or three hunderd million dollars that never should have been put in. Do not say that I am a prophet after the event. I opposed that with all my might in 1903 and 1904. I fought it to a finish in that election and finally won out on that issue alone, namely, that it was a monstrous burden to put on the shoulders of the people of Canada. I said that it was a gigantic white elephant that would eat hay day and night if we are not careful, and that is what has happened since then. In the first place, the railway was built far in advance of its time. Everybody knows that Canada cannot reasonably support three transcontinental railways. I do not think it is possible to make them pay; and even if the suggestion of my good friend the hon. member for East Algoma (Mr. G. B. Nicholson) were carried out and the capital were reduced to one-half, I doubt if it could be made a success on that basis, because it is far in advance of its time and it may not pay even for the running. But the Government was forced to take action. The Grand Trunk gave notice that on a certain date they would cease operations. What would one do in such a case? Several thousands of miles of railway are going to come to a standstill and hundreds of millions of dollars of the people's money are invested in them. Are you going to allow that road to cease operation? Are you going to allow all the freight to be thrown out and the passengers to go afoot? Such a condition of affairs could not be thought of. This Government was forced to take action. I find fault with my hon. friend (Mr. Robb) that he did not tell the Government what they ought to do. One gentleman says that the Government did not take action early enough; the other one apparently is blaming the Government for taking the action now. In my judgment the Government should have taken action in the first place. That was business. But the Government wanted to be lenient, and it often happens that leniency is interpreted into one's being a

dead easy mark. That is apparently what the Grand Trunk thought. They thought that this Government was a dead easy mark, and that as they had unloaded 1,000 miles of comparatively worthless railway on to them, it would be just as easy to unload 1,500 or 2,000 miles in the same way and slip from their obligations, and apparently forget all about it, because, in a letter which the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) read this afternoon, the Grand Trunk Railway forget altogether that their name is on this paper. They are calmly oblivious of the fact that they have obligated themselves to pay to this country, in round figures, $125,000,000 to $150,000,000. I, for one, am not at all disposed to let the Grand Trunk out. I agree that they helped this country at a time when it sorely needed assistance; but they, as a corporation, have undertaken obligations that they now, in an honourable way, as business men, are called upon to carry out. Unfortunately the shareholders are over the water, and, as too often happens, they may think, because they do not know the facts, that we are acting unjustly. I think this country has been most remarkably lenient with the Grand Trunk. We have delayed too long. I am only sorry that the action has to be taken now when the tremendous financial burdens of the war are confronting the Minister of Finance. I am sorry for him and for the country. I am, in a large measure, in favour of the nationalization of railways; and in spite of the fact that it has not paid in some countries, I believe they may be made to pay in Canada. I am sorry, however, that this Grand Trunk question has come up at this moment when we are submerged by financial obligations in other directions. But it had to be faced because the wheels of commerce were slowing, and this Government has, I think, at last taken heroic steps to meet the situation.

I do not know whether they have fully observed one fact, and I want to call special attention of the minister to it, namely, that the Grand Trunk, which may possibly come into our hands sooner or later, has a large mileage in the United States. Both its eastern and its western terminals are in the United States, beginning at Chicago and ending at Portland, Maine. I do not know whether the Dominion Government is competent to run railways in the United States. Probably the Government has looked into the matter. I have not heard the minister make a statement in reference to the question, but it is one that is worth while looking into. Will the United States allow the Canadian Government to run railways within their borders just the same as they would a private corporation, or will the Canadian Government be under some special obligation that a private corporation would not be under? Is it necessary to take out special charters under which those lines may be operated? There is also the question of the Port at Portland and the terminals at Chicago which have to be dealt with. I think that is a very important matter and that it must not be overlooked in the taking over of the Grand Trunk Railway Company.

Mr. NICKLE: There are branches of the Canadian Northern in the United States.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not think there are many branches there. There are thirty or forty miles of road running through the corner of Minnesota, but it is a very different proposition from the Grand Trunk.

Mr. McMASTER: It is the same principle.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That may be, but our Government was not running the Transcontinental until very recently: I do not know whether they have struck any snags with regard to it. I am pointing out that I did not hear the minister say anything with regard to that phase, and I hope the matter has not been overlooked because it is of great importance. The hon. member for Algoma (Mr. Nicholson) has given us some very interesting figures, as he did last year. He is a new member, but I think he has put on Hansard the best exposition of the railway situation given by any man in the House, bar none. I am not speaking of his speech to-night so much as the one he made a year ago in this House. I have perused it often and he certainly put on Hansard an enormous amount of material. I do not know whether he prepared them all himself, but if he did he is certainly an encyclopedia on figures. Be that as it may, as he stated to-night, the figures have stood the test of time. I have not heard a single hon. member endeavour to prove incorrect the figures he gave. His speech last year was very valuable, and if any hon. member has not read it and desires to be seized of the railway situation in Canada, he could not do better than read that speech because it hits the situation off admirably.

One point I have not heard mentioned, to-night is the earning powers of the railways per mile and I think that is important. I see by page xii of the Drayton-Acworth report that the old Grand Trunk is earning more per mile than

any other road in Canada, its earnings being $10,983 per mile. That is a very respectable earning, but unfortunately, as so often happens, there is something else to be taken into account which makes the road one of the poorest paying railways, instead of one of the better paying railways, and that information is given on the bottom of the same page. It shows that the Canadian Pacific cost in round numbers $68,000 per mile, the Canadian Northern $44,000 per mile, and the old Grand Trunk $127,000 per mile. The Grand Trunk was built in pre-war times when everything was supposed to be mighty cheap, and yet it cost more than double either of the other roads.

Mr. McMASTER: They must have charged a large amount to capital which should have been charged to maintenance.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: I do not think so. I think their maintenance is in rather poor shape. What I believe is that the directors, living in the Old Country, did not have their eye upon the road when it was building, and some contractors got rich while the railway got poor. I think that is a far more likely explanation. The Grand Trunk has always been a poor-paying enterprise and has never yielded a commensurate return to its shareholders on the money invested. In the final analysis the return on the investment is what justifies, or otherwise, the existence of a road. The Grand Trunk has not paid, and now the time has come when we must face the situation. The hon. member for Chateauguay-Huntingdon said the Government had been forced to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific in order to make the Canadian Northern pay. How on earth he could make a statement of that kind in the face of what has happened, I cannot imagine. The hon. member is certainly a business man, and has been plainly told that notice was served on the Government that the railway would not run beyond a certain date. If we are losing money on every mile, how on earth he expects we will make the Canadian Northern pay by taking over the Grand Trunk passes my comprehension. That certainly would be one way of getting all the railways of Canada; the more miles we have the more money we shall lose, according to him. I believe the railways of Canada can be made to pay, but I agree with the hon. member for Kingston that we want the right kind of men to run them. It is early in the day yet, and I do not want to criticise anybody, because I have a lot of friends on that board—indeed I hope they are all my friends—but I am not sure that we have got the right kind of men. However, I did not have anything to do with the appointing of them, and I do not suppose I shall have anything to do with the dismissing of them, but I think perhaps in some cases better men could be got. I am told that it is the policy to have on the board a representative of each province of Canada. I do not think that is wise. If we can get the railwaymen, in the city of Ottawa five or seven men, right here who will prove to the satisfaction of the Civil Service Commission—that they can make all these railways pay, I would say, give them a chance, because I want to see the thing done. It is true it has not been done in other countries. It may be that our passenger and freight rates will have to be revised. I think freight rates have been too cheap in Canada, although shippers who are paying a large amount each year in freight will not think so. But the fact remains that under existing operating conditions, even with the advance in freight rates that has been granted, the railways do not pay. That being the case, I say that we should be ready to pay a little higher passenger and freight rates per mile, because we must put the railways of Canada on a paying basis.

Nationalization of railways is not a new thing. It is being carried on in almost every enlightened country in the world. It is true the United States did not make a great success of it during the war, but notwithstanding that, although I am not a great admirer of the United States in many respects—I see the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) shaking his head; I am only telling him the truth—I am a great admirer of the United States in some other respects. I believe they are among the smartest railway people in the world, if not actually the smartest. I believe railway enterprise has reached its greatest height in the United States. I am an admirer of British enterprise, but so far as railways are concerned, I think the Americans have trimmed the British out of their boots. In the first place, they can build a railway in the United States three times as fast as they can in Britain, and for about one-third the price.

Mr. McMASTER: They have not so many hills in the United States.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: They have a good many mountains. They cross the Rockies, and they are pretty hard to cross. They do things in the United States on a quicker basis. That was well illustrated during the war. I remember the Prime Minister of

Canada (Sir Robert Borden) telling a story in the House with regard to what Canada had done in the building of railways at the front. When he came back from the front two years ago he said that after Vimy Ridge was taken a certain piece of railway had to be built. The British railway experts were asked to look over the ground and say how long it would take them to do the work, as it was wanted in a great hurry. They said it would take six weeks to build that road. The British generals shook their heads and said "That is no use to us. We must have something better than that." And some one told them to get Captain Jack Stewart. He was sent for, and came and looked over the ground and said: "Give me two battalions of railway construction men and I will build the road for you in a week." They took him on, and what did he do? He had the road all built in four days. That is on Hansard, and was put there by the first Minister of Canada. Therefore I say that we know how to railroad in both Canada and the United States. We know how to build; we can build as quickly and as cheaply as any nation in the world. I am firmly convinced of that. We have the class of men that can do it, but we must secure them. I am not sure that we have all that we should have in the Commission to run all the railroads the Government purposes taking over, but I think the Government are well advised in taking this step; and if they are to be criticised they are to be criticised for being slow, not for being too fast. They have been long-suffering with the Grand Trunk. In my judgment these people have been defaulters for the past two years. It is a strong term to use, but the moment they said that they did not propose to carry out their agreement with regard to the Transcontinental, I think they broke their agreement absolutely, and every business man, I believe, will say so. This is the second time, and apparently they thought their bluff would work. Fortunately the War Measures Act was there. I think it is the salvation of the whole situation. I do not think the Grand Trunk expected what has happened, but they are up against it, and we have to see it through, and that money has to be raised to do it. As I said, I am sorry it has come at this time, but, I, for one, am willing to support the Finance Minister in this matter, and I think we can be defended in the country, and that the people of Canada, once they realize its absolute necessity, will say, "The Government has done wisely. Go ahead and win out and we are with you," and will help all we can to make the great national enterprise of Canada in the railway business that success that I feel sure it ought to be, and can be, if managed properly by the right men.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince): I want to say a few words along some new lines. I really consider that the action that the Government has taken, and has been taking, in this matter involves some of the most serious questions that to-day confront Canada —questions far more serious than repatriation, remobilization or reconstruction. Far more serious than any of these things is the present railway situation in Canada. I desire to draw your attention to the fact that the Canadian Government railroads have adopted the McAdoo scale of wages and time limit, with the result that some of the conductors on the railroads to-day are getting $5,000 a year, and the highest-paid workers in all Canada to-day are the railroad employees. The railroad runs from the Atlantic to the Pacific, with hundreds of thousands of employees, all of whom are bound together in one solid brotherhood; and when you adopt a rate of wages borrowed from a politician in the United States who is looking for the Presidential nomination, and give that rate to our railway employees, is it not obvious that you have produced, not a military despotism but a railroad despotism which will be a chain around the neck of fair Canada and will drag her to her grave unless you are extremely careful? How will you lower the wages of these men? They are linked together in one great brotherhood, and can hold up the whole railway system and can make any government get down on its knees within half an hour. It seems to me it must follow that all wages must go up proportionately, and I think the high cost of living will have to be maintained on that basis, because these things follow one another from mathematical necessity; and so long as that condition of things obtains, just so long will the high cost of living continue. The cost of transportation has doubled, and in some cases more than doubled. That may be very well in war time but how is it to be remedied in peace time when you have produced such a purely artificial condition of things? As I said last session, I am personally in favour of government ownership of railroads provided they can be managed the same as private corporations. The question whether government ownership is good or bad all depends on the management, and that is one of the most serious problems in connection with

the ownership of railroads. Indeed, I think it is the most serious question before the country to-day. We have suffered very much from our government railroad system in the province of Prince Edward Island. Our province has sold itself body and soul; it has sold its birthright for a mess of pottage, a narrow-gauge railroad, as crooked as a ram's horn. However, that does not enter into this question. The whole question is, how are you going to overcome the difficulties confronting this Government, or any other government, with regard to the adoption of the McAdoo scale of wages? A man who is representing a constituency through which a railroad under this system runs, should he dare open his mouth,—as I am doing to-night,—and call the attention of the public to the danger of the situation, is apt to be roughly handled by these railroad employees when he goes to the country again. It is only one man in a thousand who will dare open his mouth if the railroad goes through his constituency. However, I have a public duty to perform, and I do not care very much whether I come back or not. If I have to run, I will take my chance and will "hew to the line, let the chips fall where they may."

Mr. NESBITT: I do not know anything about the legal aspect of the question, but I do not see how the Government could do anything else, from a business standpoint, than pass the resolution. Whether, from a legal standpoint we are in a good position or not, I am not prepared to say. As a matter of fact, the Grand Trunk, I understand, did not default. Therefore, that puts them, I should think, in a better position than otherwise they would be in. As to the future of the Grand Trunk, the only question, to my mind, is whether it would be cheaper and better in the interests of the country, owing to the position in which the Grand Trunk finds itself, to make a contract with them to deliver freight to our Transcontinental road on a certain basis, or whether it would be cheaper for us to operate the road ourselves. These lines run all through the northern, central and southern parts of Ontario. They are able to feed the transcontinental railways whether they be the Canadian Pacific or the Government Railway, and give them very good service. Many of these branches of the Grand Trunk are not paying, and cannot be made to pay within any man's lifetime. Whether it would be wise for us to operate these roads in face of the fact that they cannot be made to pay, or whether it would be better for us, now that we are in possession of the Grand Trunk Pacific, to make a traffic arrangement whereby they should deliver freight to us for the long haul, is a question for this House to decide.

The legislation does not propose to take over the old Grand Trunk. It proposes to take over and operate the Grand Trunk Pacific. I do not see, from a business standpoint, what else the Government can do. My hon. friend from Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) spoke about the cost of the Grand Trunk. The Grand Trunk cost more than any other railway because it was built through the Canadian wilderness. They had to carry their supplies at an enormous cost by ox teams and other means of transportation. The old Great Western Railway, now part of the Grand Trunk, had to be chopped through the country that it traversed. I do not wonder that it cost more than it would in modern times because in modern times in building railways you have the benefit of the railways in existence, to a certain extent, to haul your supplies.

With reference to the Canadian National Railways, it is absurd to have so many men on the directorate, and it is equally absurd to appoint men who know nothing about railways, no matter what their other business experience has been. My experience has taught me that if you have been brought up in a certain line of business and you go into another line of business you know nothing about, and invest in it, you are liable to lose your money. There is nobody who is capable of doing everything, and the man who makes a success in one line of business, whether it be farming, manufacturing, or merchandising, deserves success because competition is very keen. Why you appoint men as directors of these roads who know nothing about railroading is more than I can comprehend. It is not what the late Government promised us when the Canadian Northern Railway was taken over. I think the directorate of the Government road should be dependent upon Parliament itself. The directors should be chosen regardless of price from amongst capable railway men who know their business. If the Government own the railways, if they cut out all duplications, especially duplications of terminals, and run them from a practical business standpoint, there is no reason on earth why the transportation system of this country should not be made to pay.

With reference to the statement that the government operation of railways in Eng-

land has been made to pay, we read in the paper the other day that it had not paid during the war. Yet the railways in England were conducted on the very best possible basis. They appointed the managers of all the great railways in England to operate them during the war. We know that the German system of railways paid but they paid much lower wages and they charged twice as much for transportation. Some person said to-night that we had in Canada cheaper transportation than any country in the world except the United States. And he might as well have said, "including the United States."

In so far as the operation of the railways by the Government of the United States is concerned, anybody who has travelled since the taking over of the railways in the last two or three years knows that the accommodation given to the public is nothing like it was before. The inconvenience to the public is disgraceful on many of the roads in the United States. There never was such a glut in freight. I do not blame them for that because it was an exceptional time, the weather was very severe and there were some things that went against them. But the United States Congress voted a revolving credit of $500,000,000 and recently they asked for another $750,000,000 revolving credit. They did not get it. They owe in rentals on the properties taken over something in the neighbourhood of $700,000,000. That would not, in my judgment, be an argument against the Government operation of railways in the United States. Had they been operated by a man who understood the business there might have been a better showing. No matter how good a Secretary of the Treasury Mr. MacAdoo may be, he did not know anything about the operation of railways. He thought he did. He is just another of those men in this world who think they know something about everything and who try to make a success of some business other than their own but end up by making a failure. It all comes back to the same principle; if we are going to operate railways, we must operate them on business principles and we must have men who understand their business practically regardless of price. If we do not follow that plan we will not make a success of them. The reason I got up was to suggest that we might find it cheaper, in place of taking over the old Grand Trunk, to make a running arrangement with them, whereby they would feed our railways, and do it cheaper than we could feed them ourselves.

Mr. JEAN J. DENIS (Joliette): Mr. Chairman, I have heard hon. members on the other side of the House say that no practical proposition or plan had been suggested on this side of the House as to what should be done. I will take the liberty of giving my humble opinion to the Government as to the policy that should be pursued.

Now, I am considering this as a mere business proposition, and regarding the Grand Trunk Railway proper, and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway as individuals who have contracts with the Government. Here we find three parties to a contract or obligation. One party is the Grand Trunk proper. The Grand Trunk proper has assumed the responsibility of running the Grand Trunk Pacific according to a contract, or a lease which has been referred to and sufficiently explained. Suddenly the Grand Trunk Railway fails to fulfill its obligations, and serves a notice to that effect upon the Government, just as a man who signs a note at the bank advises the institution three days before the note matures that on the date fixed for its payment he will be unable to meet the obligation. Under the circumstances the bank would be justified in taking all necessary means to protect its interests, and this is what the Government has been doing in the present situation. Because the interest of the Government in this matter is twofold. One is the general interest of the country;—the Government owes it to the country to see that these roads continue to run, because that is absolutely necessary; the soundness of this everyone will admit. The other interest which the Government has in this matter is a pecuniary one, because it has endorsed the notes of the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific Railways. One of the parties serves notice upon the Government that he is not going to fulfill his part of the agreement, and at once the Government take advantage of the War Measures Act and puts this railroad into the hands of a receiver. To my mind, there was nothing else it could do. However, this is not a solution of the problem, and all that we have heard so far has been a plea on the part of the Acting Prime Minister that the Government acted properly in placing this road in a receiver's hands. For the time being, I quite understand, the Government had to face a situation which could not be delayed, a situation of urgency, and it took control of the railway. So far I am satisfied with the stand that the Govern-

ment has taken. But what is it going to do with the railway, now that it is in possession of it? I have one suggestion to make. In my opinion the Government should go direct to the Grand Trunk Railway Company and tell it: We will give you so much time to fulfill your obligations; if you do not do so, if you have a white elephant on your hands, you need not expect that the Government will relieve you of it; if you entered into a bad business proposition, that is no reason why the Government should relieve you of the responsibility; the Grand Trunk Railway Company has got to discharge its obligations and should be called upon to do so; if it does not do so then it must assume the responsibility and will be held strictly accountable for it.

Now, there is a way of doing that. The Government has a mortgage on the Grand Trunk Railway properties for the money which the Grand Trunk owes to it. Very well, the Government will act in the same way as an individual does towards another person who owes him money and does not pay it. The Government will take control of the road and then it will have the two railways, and it will be a bad proposition for it because the Government cannot make money out of operating railroads. It may be a bad proposition for the time being, and this leads me to the point which was argued at length by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle), viz: Is it a good or a bad policy for the Government to own and administer railroads? I do not think it is a good proposition for any Government to own railroads when it can avoid doing so. If it cannot avoid it, but is forced to assume the ownership and operation, it must continue to administer and own them until it can dispose of them. If, later on, it transpires that the Government, in some way or another, can dispose of these roads, then so much the better for the country, because I do not think that that Government will ever make any money out of Government ownership of these railways. If the Government cannot avoid doing otherwise, it is better for it to take hold of the Grand Trunk Railway now, than to assume control of that railway in one or two years. It would have been better for the Government not to have loaned money, not to have guaranteed the loans of the Grand Trunk and Grand Trunk Pacific Railway, as it has been doing for the last three or four years, or perhaps longer. When the Government found out a year ago, or two or three years ago, that these railways could not be successfully operated, and that it was only a question of time before they would pass into the receiver's hands, I think it should have taken the pill then and saved the money which has been expended in the period which has elapsed since that time. Every one admits, I believe, that the Grand Trunk Railway will never be able to meet its obligations. If the Government is now convinced that it will not be able to do so, then it should take control of the Grand Trunk as well as the Grand Trunk Pacific; it will lose less money by taking control of the road now than it will do in a few years from now.

The Acting Prime Minister told us this afternoon that the Government wanted to be lenient towards the Grand Trunk, and not exact what he called "the pound of flesh." I do not think that is proper. This is a business proposition, and the Acting Prime Minister, no more than any one else in the Government, has any right to give up one dollar of the people's money. If the Grand Trunk Railway Company owes money to this country it should pay every dollar of it. That is my contention. The Government and the country is sufficiently in need of money to warrant the collection of every cent that is owing to Canada.

At any rate what are we going to do now? The Government has a deficit of $100,000,000 a year, taking the financial situation as it now stands. We have to tax the people of this country in order to meet our obligations by means of an Income Tax, which is equivalent to taking money out of the people's pockets directly. However, no one will blame the Government for doing so because it is an unavoidable procedure. We are not in a position to give anybody a present. It is the duty of the Government to force the Grand Trunk to fulfil its obligations to the letter. If the Grand Grand Trunk cannot fulfil its obligations, then let the Government take possession of the system and do now what will be even more difficult to do a year or two hence if this matter is delayed.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbiniere): On February 28, 1919, the Prime Minister was informed that the Grand Trunk Railway Company did not intend to carry on the operations of the Grand Trunk Pacific after the tenth of March. There must have been some previous conversations or correspondence between the officials of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government, and before the Government is compelled to take over the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system without giving the matter further consideration, I think the Acting Prime Minister should tell us, if

he is in a position to do so, what conversations took place and what correspondence was exchanged between the officials of the Grand Trunk Railway Company and the Government.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I placed that information on Hansard the other day when I made my statement to the House respecting the passing of the Order in Council.

Mr. VIEN: What has been placed on Hansard is not exactly what I want. The letter which my hon. friend read must have followed correspondence, or at least conversations, between representatives of the Government and officials of the company.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understood my hon. friend to refer to the letter of March 4, in which the Government was notified by the president of the Grand Trunk Railway Company that, in view of the fact that the increased rates applicable to the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway had not been sufficient to meet the increased operating expenses, it would not be possible for the company to continue its operations when the present funds had been exhausted, which would be about the 10th instant. There had been no conversations relating to the cessation of operation of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, and in my cable to Mr. Smithers, which I presented to the House, I stated that this notification was of a peremptory character, without previous intimation or discussion. To show my hon. friend that there would have been no use in attempting negotiations with the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, unless the Government decided to change its opinion and decision and to make further advances to the company, I wish to read the following cable from Mr. Smithers, dated March 11, 1919, in reply to the message which I had sent to him:

> In reply to your message I assure you nothing peremptory was intended. Government having taken position in message received here March 3rd that they would not render further assistance and Grand Trunk Pacific working cash being exhausted owing to heavily increased expenses beyond power of company to control, we had no alternative but to notify Government of our inability to continue in order to prevent inconvenience to the people of Canada served by Grand Trunk Pacific. Special general meeting of Grand Trunk Railway Company has been called for Friday, 21st.

I place that on Hansard in order to give my hon. friend all the information we have respecting the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Is it the intention of the Government to assume all the liabilities of this road?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The position of the Government is that of receiver. The Government is not assuming the responsibilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific. Application will be made by the Government to the Exchequer Court for the issue of a receiver's certificate to meet any deficit in operating expenses, and the Government will, of course, be obliged to meet the interest upon Grand Trunk Pacific securities which it has guaranteed. But with regard to other securities, its position is merely that of receiver.

Mr. McKENZIE: When the Government took over the Canadian Northern they took also all its liabilities and paid for the equity of redemption, some $10,000,000. I cannot see much difference between the Canadian Northern Railway Company then and the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company in this case. In the former case the Government established a certain precedent, and I wanted to know whether the Government intended to follow that precedent in this case.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: What I understood my hon. friend to suggest was that the Dominion Government, instead of being merely receiver, should assume all the liabilities of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and relieve the Grand Trunk Railway Company of them entirely.

Mr. McKENZIE: Oh, no. When the Government takes possession of this property nolens volens unless they get clear of it by an Act of Parliament they are responsible, as a matter of law, to the owner of these securities.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I do not concur in my hon. friend's view. The Dominion Government is receiver under an Order in Council which has the effect of a statute or an order of the court; and a receiver is not responsible for the liabilities of a company. The position of receiver appointed by a court is that of a custodian to continue the operation of a business subject to and pending further orders of the court from time to time. This legislation makes the Minister of Railways the receiver in this case, with the duties and the powers attaching to that office. The resolution defines the position of the Government in respect of the system in express terms, indicates the duties and powers of the receiver and expressly states that the Dominion Government is not liable to the Grand Trunk Railway Company or to any other

creditor. When this Order in Council is approved by Parliament it will become of the validity of an Act of Parliament, and its effect will be determined in accordance with its provisions, and not otherwise.

Mr. McKENZIE: I quite understand the minister now. The position which I take, speaking for myself alone and not for any party, is this: I do not for one moment admit that the Government have any jurisdiction to do what they have done in this matter, unless we validate their action by Act of Parliament. The Government are simply mortgagees in possession and are in exactly the same position as a mortgagee in possession would be in without foreclosure. If the third, fourth, or fifth, or even the first, mortgagee goes into possession without foreclosure he assumes all the encumbrances on the property. Every lawyer sitting around the Minister will admit that that is good law and unless we validate by Act of Parliament the action of the Government, I am afraid that any judge would say they had assumed the responsibility when they took over the property. For a creditor of the Company might say: If you had let the Company go on it would have paid off my liability, but as you have prevented that you must pay the money that is owing to me. Of couse if there is to be legislation whereby we put ourselves in the place of a receiver and take all our instructions from the judge, that is a different matter. If the Government are going to put the road up to auction and will only pay what the road brings at auction that puts it in a different light entirely. But the Minister did not in his very excellent speech this afternoon tell us that that was going to be done. If the Minister will tell this House that all the steps that a receiver would take under the orders of a court of this country are to be taken by the Minister of Railways and Canals, and that the country will only pay for this road what it brings at auction, I have no fault to find. But I do feel we had no business to step in and take hold of this property and make ourselves liable for $200,000,000 when, as hon. gentlemen have frequently told us, the property is not worth it. With the liabilities away above what the property is worth we are certainly not making any bargain.

Mr. ROBB: This afternoon I drew the minister's attention to a statement he made with regard to branch lines, as to whether the provinces had prior rights over the Dominion. The minister promised to clear the point up and let the House know where we should stand in regard to branch lines that are a part of this system. I think he forgot to mention that this evening.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The position of the Minister of Railways is receiver for the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company, including the branch lines. His position is not different from that of a statutory receiver, and the rights of all parties are preserved. The rights of the provinces as guarantors are preserved and remain under the several instruments or trust mortgages under which they can claim. The receiver must take his orders from the Exchequer Court. Just as the rights of all other parties are preserved, so are the rights of the Dominion Government preserved. It is open to the Dominion Government to enforce, by permission of the courts, any rights which it has as creditor, or as guarantor, or as mortgagee under the first mortgage or afterwards. There is no question as to the Receiver's position. His duty is to conserve, operate, and act under the orders of the Court. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition this afternoon called attention to the Winding-Up Act. The Winding-Up Act concerns the liquidator. It is the duty of a liquidator to bring a business to a termination and to sell, but the duty of a receiver is to conserve, operate, and carry on.

If hon. gentlemen will observe the terms of this resolution, they will find the jurisdiction of the Exchequer Court is really enlarged, the intention being that the operation of this railway system, being, as it is, in the national interest, shall be continued under the orders of the Court, and that in all orders which the Court shall make it shall have regard not only to property rights but to paramount national interest.

Mr. ROBB: Perhaps I did not make myself clear. Is there anything to prevent the provinces which have priority rights on branch lines from foreclosing and selling the branch lines to others, thereby leaving the Grand Trunk Pacific without feeders?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If default occurred under the terms of the mortgages securing the issues which they have guaranteed, the provinces could make application to the Exchequer Court, of which application they would have to give written notice to the minister, who would appear by counsel at the hearing. The Court in determining what should be done would take into consideration, under the terms

of this order, which will be validated by our legislation, not only the property rights involved, but the national interest. The intention of this order was to ensure the continued operation in the public interest of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system, and it was not possible to accomplish that in any other way than the one we have taken.

Mr. VIEN: There is some further information required to complete the minister's statement. When the Grand Trunk failed to accept that portion of the line which was constructed by the Government from Moncton to Winnipeg, was any written agreement made between the Government and the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No.

Mr. VIEN: Then was the company put in default?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government claim they are in default, but the company set up various grounds on which they consider themselves not liable. In reality, the cost was so great that the objection was really on that ground. The interest at three per cent on $170,000,000 amounted to about $5,000,000 a year on a line which does not meet its operating expenses.

Mr. VIEN: Was any agreement made at the time of default between the Government and the Grand Trunk or the Grand Trunk Pacific?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: No. The Government stepped in because it had built the line. The title was in the Government. The Grand Trunk Pacific having declined to execute the lease which under the original agreement we claim they were bound to execute, the Government had to provide for the operation of the line, and has been in possession since.

Mr. VIEN: But as the Government did not put the company in default when they failed to take up their obligations it may have given up its right under the agreement to compel the company to do so.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think all rights are preserved.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 28, to confirm an order of the Governor General in Council respecting the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway system.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

On motion of Sir Thomas White, the House adjourned at 11 p.m.

Friday, March 21, 1919.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

COMMITTEES OF THE HOUSE.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

That the name of Mr. Reid (Mackenzie) be added to the select standing committee on Railways, Canals and Telegraph lines and struck off that on Privileges and Elections; and that the name of Mr. Wright be added to the select and standing committee on Agriculture and Colonization and struck off that on Standing Orders.

He said: I understand this matter has been made the subject of arrangement.

Mr. SPEAKER: It is only by unanimous consent that this motion may be put.

Motion agreed to.

IRRIGATION ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion for the third reading of Bill No. 8 to amend the Irrigation Act.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): On the motion for the third reading I desire to ask that the word "lake" be inserted after the word "watercourses" in sub-clause 2 of section 1. I believe this can be done on the third reading if there is no objection on the part of the House. If there is any objection, I will move the House back into committee.

Mr. SPEAKER: That amendment can only be made by unanimous consent; otherwise, in the ordinary course, the practice would be to move the Bill back into committee.

Mr. McKENZIE: There can be no objection to the amendment.

Amendment agreed to, and Bill read the third time.

ST. JOHN AND QUEBEC RAILWAY.

Bill No. 5 to authorize a further extension of time for the completion of the St. John and Quebec railway between Gagetown and Westfield—Hon. Mr. Reid—read the second time, considered in committee—Mr. Boivin in the Chair—and reported.

AID TOWARDS ELIMINATING LEVEL CROSSINGS.

The House in committee on the following proposed resolution:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that the sum of two hundred thousand dollars per annum be appropriated and paid out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund for ten consecutive years from the first day of April, nineteen hundred and nineteen, to aid actual construction work for the protection, safety and convenience of the public in respect of highway crossings of railways at rail level, in existence on the first day of April, nineteen hundred and nine.—Hon. Mr. Reid—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): This simply extends for a period of ten years the provision in the Railway Act which expires on April 1 next. There is no change whatever except as to the extension of time. The Act was passed ten years ago and expires in April. It is necessary to pass a Bill founded upon this resolution in order that the Board of Railway Commissioners may continue paying the Dominion Government's proportion on any crossing that they may decide it should pay.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Can the minister give us any information as to the number of crossings towards the elimination of which aid has been granted?

Mr. REID: No, I have not that information. We will have this question up again when we have the Railway Act before the House. In the Consolidated Railway Act, which we shall have before the House in a short time, it is proposed to amend the present Act by increasing the Government's contribution to twenty-five per cent of the cost of the actual construction work, but it shall not exceed in any such case the sum of $15,000, and no such money shall be applied in any one year to more than six crossings on any one railway in any one municipality, or more than once in any one year to any one crossing. If the Consolidated Railway Act were in existence it would not be necessary to pass the present Bill, but as it may take some time to enact, we deem it well to bring down the present Bill.

Mr. ROBB: Is there a fixed policy which the Board of Railway Commissioners follows, as beween the railways, the municipalities, and the Government?

Mr. REID: The Board of Railway Commissioners determines what proportion of the cost should be paid by the municipalities, the railway companies, and the Dominion Government respectively.

Mr. ROBB: Is there a fixed policy that governs throughout the country, in the country districts as well as in the cities, with respect to this matter? What is the policy of the Government in connection with new roads that are constructed? Is the construction of such roads allowed to go on, regardless of the level crossing arrangement, subject to that being fixed up afterwards, or is there a definite policy that governs before construction is undertaken?

Mr. REID: I could not say what the policy of the Railway Commission is. It is left entirely to the Board to decide in each particular case. I do not think the Board has any general policy that a certain percentage shall be paid on every crossing, whether it is in a rural district or in a city; each case is considered on its merits. If the matter is brought to the attention of the Board prior to the road being built, it, of course, has power to take action.

Mr. MURPHY: Does it rest with the Board of Railway Commissioners alone to determine where and when the crossings shall be constructed?

Mr. REID: No, the charter granted by Parliament entitles the company to run through any part of the country unless appeal is made to the Board of Railway Commissioners prior to construction having been commenced. If the road has been constructed the Board can take action.

Mr. MURPHY: My hon. friend did not catch the nature of my question. I inquired whether it rested with the Board of Railway Commissioners alone to determine where and when railway crossing such as are mentioned in the motion are to be constructed.

Mr. REID: I cannot answer my hon. friend explicitly, because I am not fully aware of the powers of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. MURPHY: The date mentioned in the resolution is first of April, 1909. Should that not be the first of April, 1919?

Mr. McMASTER: Might I suggest that the hon. members who are on their feet should speak louder, and that those hon. gentlemen who are seated should either converse less audibly or not at all?

Mr. REID: The resolution provides the present Act expires, and this Bill is to continue its provisions for another ten years. I think the date should be 1919.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: What amount has been paid by the Government under this Act?

Mr. REID: I will answer that question when we are in Committee on the Bill. If hon. gentlemen desire any information their questions will appear in Hansard and the information will be on hand when we go into Committee on the Bill. When the House is considering the Bill in Committee I will have an official from the Railway Commission here to afford all the information hon. gentlemen desire.

Mr. ROBB: The law at present as I understand only applies to railways already in existence, and the new legislation will enable assistance to be given to new railways.

Mr. REID: It is not proposed to deal with anything more than continue the law as it stands at present, until the Consolidated Railway Act comes into effect, which, of course, will nullify this legislation. If the present Bill is not passed, and the Consolidated Railway Act is delayed for some time, or even if it should not pass the House this session, we shall be powerless to continue this subsidizing of railway crossings.

Mr. FIELDING: If these provisions are taken from the original Act I have no objection to offer, but I should think the language might be made clearer.

Mr. NESBITT: The minister says that the date should be 1919. Is it intended to cover the railways that were built previous to 1909? I think he will find that the Railway Board has power now to deal with crossings constructed since that date.

Mr. REID: The hon. member from Russell drew my attention to the last date in the resolution which appears as 1909. This refers to all level highway crossings in existence ten years ago. I see no reason why the date should not be changed to 1919, thus making the resolution applicable to all highway crossings in existence at the present time.

Mr. NESBITT: The Minister had better look the matter up before he makes the change.

Mr. REID: We can amend it, if necessary, when the Bill is in Committee.

Mr. VIEN: Is this to apply only to railways incorporated under federal charter?

Mr. REID: Yes.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Mr. VIEN: If the Government determines upon the nationalization of Canadian railways, we shall have only two great railway systems, the Canadian Government Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway. I do not see why we should now determine for a period of ten years the policy of the Canadian Government in the matter of aid in the construction of highway crossings, particularly in view of the fact that our railway policy is not yet finally decided. The Canadian Pacific Railway can construct without assistance such crossings as are required by the regulations of the Board of Railway Commissioners. I suggest, in view of all the circumstances, that this proposed legislation be not extended over a longer period than one year, or two years at the outside.

Mr. REID: My hon. friend suggests that under a policy of the nationalization of railways there will be only two great railway systems in Canada, the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Canadian National Railways; that the Government would in any case pay for crossings constructed on its own lines, and that we should not assist the Canadian Pacific Railway Company in the construction of highway crossings required under the regulations of the Railway Commission. The Canadian National Railways are now practically all under the direction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and whatever should be done for the Canadian National Railways should also be done for every road that is under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission. Otherwise, you do an injustice to the Canadian Pacific or to any other privately-owned road which is subject to the regulations of the Railway Commission. No partiality should be shown to the Government roads; all should be treated on the same basis.

Mr. VIEN: I agree that all these lines should be on the same footing, but I would do away entirely with the granting of aid in the constructing of highway crossings. So far as the Canadian Government Railway system is concerned, it does not matter much whether or not we aid the construction of highway crossings, because if we do so we simply transfer money from one department to another. I repeat that the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are financially strong enough to look after the building of highway crossings on their own lines without assistance. They come under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners; let that board decide what

share the Canadian Pacific Railway Company should contribute and what share the various municipalities interested should contribute towards the construction of highway crossings. In view of the fact that our railway policy is not finally settled, it might be advisable to aid the construction of highway crossings for a year or two, but I fail to see how we can justify the laying down of a policy of this kind and providing that it shall be carried out for a period of ten years. The period of the proposed aid should be limited to two years at the very extreme.

Mr. SHEARD: Is this proposed legislation to have an obligatory and mandatory effect regarding all the crossings that were in existence prior to 1909? I hope it will have that effect, because the matter particularly concerns large centres, which suffer probably quite as much as any other part of the country in this respect. It is in the interests of the Dominion at large that these level crossings be done away with. If an appropriation will assist in bringing this about, it is certainly very desirable that the appropriation should be made. I should like to know clearly from the minister how generally this is going to be applied to low level crossings.

Mr. REID: When a complaint is made to the Board of Railway Commissioners, they can, if they so desire, order the change to be made. They have power to order that any crossing which they consider dangerous shall come under this measure and be removed.

The point raised by the hon. member opposite(Mr. Vien) as to doing away with this payment altogether is one that may be considered by this House. But the Act which was passed in 1909 was passed for this reason: There are crossings which are considered dangerous; in fact, I have in mind crossings at which people have been killed, and the Act of 1909 was passed for the purpose of assisting in removing all those dangerous crossings. The aid was given in the public interest to save life, and so as not to put the whole cost, which is sometimes very heavy, on municipalities which could not afford to pay the full amount for which they might be assessed. In the same way, it was felt that it would be a great hardship on the railways to make them pay their full share. Therefore, it was decided at that time that the Government should give aid to the extent of 20 per cent of the cost. The hon. member wishes us to do away with the payment of this 20 per cent and to put the Board of Railway Commissioners in this position, that if a complaint is made that a crossing is dangerous, the board shall have the power to order that a subway or whatever else is necessary to remove the dangerous crossing shall be constructed, and that the cost shall be assessed on the railway and the municipality concerned. There are cases where such a course would be a great hardship on other railways than the Canadian Pacific, and it would be a great hardship on some municipalities to construct a very large subway. As the railways are operated in the public interest, it was considered desirable that a small amount should be paid to assist in removing dangerous crossings. The amount, $200,000 a year, is not very large, and as the removal of dangerous crossings has saved many lives, I think the amount is worth the purpose for which it is appropriated.

As we now own one-half of the railways in Canada, this aid, in so far as the Canadian National railways are concerned, is only taking money out of one pocket and putting it into another. I feel that the Canadian National railways, being owned by the Dominion Government, should not be treated in a different manner from any other railway that has received a charter from the Government of Canada. The Canadian National railways should continue in the same position, so far as the Board of Railway Commissioners is concerned, as they did prior to the Government becoming the owner of them, and they should compete, just as though they were privately owned, with the other railways. Therefore, I feel that if this proposed appropriation is passed, it should be extended to the Canadian Pacific and the other railways just the same as before. It would be a bad thing if we were to cease rendering this assistance at the present time. We should continue rendering it in order to remove all these dangerous crossings as quickly as possible. If the members of this House feel that this proposed appropriation should be struck out, then we shall have to bring it up again in connection with the Railway Act which will be before the House and a subcommittee as soon as we can reach it.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: As this is a very small amount to cover all the crossings in Canada, and as there will be many applications for assistance, what percentage is to be devoted for doing the work on a certain crossing? Is it to be ten, twenty-five, fifty or one hundred per cent, and is this

to apply to radial roads as well as to steam roads? In my constituency there are many dangerous level crossings which are run over at high speed by radial roads, and accidents have occurred there. I think the sum is entirely inadequate to cover the number of crossings demanding attention. What share of this proposed expenditure is to be applied in each section of the country? I believe there are from fifty to a hundred or perhaps more accidents caused by level crossings in a year. I have known five or six people having been killed and many injured in one accident in my district. This is a serious matter and we want to encourage the minister in every possible way in dealing with it.

Mr. REID: The only railways that come under this measure are those under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: Would that cover radials?

Mr. REID: Only those that have a Dominion charter and are under the Board of Railway Commissioners. The manner in which the money is distributed is this: It does not matter from what part of Canada an application is made to the board to remove a dangerous crossing. If a complaint is made to the board by any individual or corporation or municipality, in regard to a dangerous crossing, the board investigates, makes a report, and, if it so decides, passes an order compelling the railway company to remove the dangerous crossing by constructing a subway or otherwise, and assessing the proportions that the railway, the municipality and the Dominion Government shall pay under this measure.

So far, the appropriation of $200,000 has been a sufficient amount each year for the past ten years to cover any sums the Dominion Government has been called upon to pay, and that is the reason why I have continued that amount in this resolution. If in any year this amount should not prove sufficient, we would have to ask Parliament that the Act be amended increasing the amount.

Mr. NICKLE: I might suggest to the Minister of Railways and Canals—and I feel sure he will not consider it an impertinence, as he is not a lawyer—that he do not change the figures "09" in the last line of his resolution to "19," because I think the resolution is correctly drawn. If the minister will refer to the statutes of 1909, section 7 of chapter 32, he will find that in that year the principle was introduced in Canadian legislation of a certain amount, $200,000, I think, for five years being set aside to be administered for the purpose of assisting municipalities and railways in getting rid of dangerous level crossings. At the same time that section 7 was passed enunciating that principle, section 6 was also passed which amended the Railway Act and declared the principle to be that any railroads constructed after 1909 should, at their own expense, take such steps as might be necessary to protect the public.

That this House may be more fully conversant with the legislation, let me read the two sections of the Act, which was assented to on May 19, 1909. Section 6 reads:

> The said Act is amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 238 thereof:—
>
> 238A. In any case where a railway is constructed after the passing of this Act, the company shall, at its own cost and expense (unless and except as otherwise provided by agreement, approved of by the Board, between the company and a municipal or other corporation or person), provide, subject to the order of the Board, all protection, safety and convenience for the public in respect of any crossing of highway by the railway.

Section 7 reads:

> The said Act is further amended by inserting the following section immediately after section 239 thereof:—
>
> 239A. The sum of two hundred thousand dollars each year for five consecutive years from the first day of April, one thousand nine hundred and nine, shall be appropriated and set apart from the Consolidated Revenue Fund for the purpose of aiding in the providing by actual construction work of protection, safety and convenience for the public in respect of highway crossings of the railway at rail level, in existence on the said first day of April.

If the minister should yield to the suggestion of the hon. member who sits on my right that the word "nine" should be changed to "nineteen," the effect of his resolution taken in conjunction with the legislation on the Statute Books might be that this country should assist in construction work, by way of subways or otherwise, in respect of all railway crossings in existence on the 1st day of April, 1919. Now that is not what this House wants to do at all, if I understand the purport of the minister's resolution. I take it that what the minister is endeavouring to do is to place at the disposal of the Railway Commissioners a specific sum of money that may be used for bettering conditions in respect of railway crossings that existed on the 1st day of April, 1919, but not to relieve the railway companies from responsibility in respect of crossings constructed since that date. But if he were to adopt the suggestion made by the speaker on my

right the effect might be to relieve the railways of this country of all responsibility in respect of crossings constructed during the last ten years. I do not believe it is the intention of the resolution so to do.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is right. However, I have already said that the point will be considered when we get into Committee on the Bill.

Mr. NICKLE: Leave it at 1909 for the present.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: The minister has not answered the objection I made with reference to the ten-year period during which this appropriation is to be made. All he said was that an expenditure of $200,000 a year was a comparatively small amount, and we need not bother very much about it. I think the time has come when we should cease talking in millions. During the war an expenditure of $500,000,000 was a small amount, and hon. members on this side of the House never unduly obstructed votes of money required for carrying on war. The other day the Minister of Public Works told us that there would be a deficit in the coming year of something like a hundred million dollars, and he did not know how that deficit was to be made up. I think that the time has now come when we should consider a yearly expenditure of $200,000 as a matter of importance. If the House will only enter upon a policy of thrift, and cut down this item as a start, I am confident that the Estimates can be reduced very considerably. In 1911 when hon. gentlemen opposite were talking of the extravagance of the Laurier Administration, they characterized an expenditure of something like $125,000,000 a year as wholesale extravagance. This Government now presents Estimates for $437,000,000, and the Supplementaries are still to come, and the Minister of Railways tells us this afternoon that an expenditure of $200,000 is not worth discussing. That does not harmonize very well with the statement made by the Minister of Public Works the other day, to the effect that he did not know where the $100,000,000 was to be raised to make both ends meet. The minister has said that the Canadian Government Railway system should be on the same footing and run in the same way as a private-owned railway corporation. But that does not answer the objection that I made, that the Canadian Government Railway system and the Canadian Pacific Railway system are both in such a strong financial position as to be able to carry out without any difficulty any orders the Railway Commissioners might make with regard to railway crossings. In so far as the municipalities are concerned, I think it would be much more equitable to have the full amount paid by the railways. The railways make their own financial arrangements, and in addition receive assistance from the Government, and I do not see why a railway which is seeking the privilege of crossing a certain portion of this country should not be compelled, by law, to build the road in such a way that it will not be a public danger. If the responsibility for making the crossings safe rests upon any one, surely it rests upon the railway companies, and I think they should be called upon by the Railway Commissioners to make such changes as are required to make the crossings safe. The minister has failed to explain why this blanket authorization should be given for a period of ten years.

Resolution reported, read a first and second time and agreed to.

Mr. Reid thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 29, to amend the Railway Act, (aid for railway crossings.)

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

COMPENSATION TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WHO ARE KILLED OR INJURED.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals) the House went into Committee on the following resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Act to provide compensation where employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duties, chapter fifteen of the statutes of 1918, and to provide that no employee of the Canadian Government Railways who is an employee within the meaning of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway Employees' Provident Fund Act and becomes permanently disabled from following his usual occupation in the service as a result of injuries received while on duty and actually at work in the service shall be entitled to receive compensation, under the provisions of the Act hereby proposed to be amended, for such injuries unless he elects to accept prior or subsequent to the injuries such compensation in lieu of the allowance payable under the provisions of the Provident Fund Act, section twelve, Class D, and gives notice in writing of such election both to the management of the Railways and to the Provident Fund Board: Provided, however, that the dependents of any such employee who has been or is killed subsequently to the passing of the Act hereby pro-

posed to be amended and who has not elected to accept compensation under the said Act as aforesaid, shall nevertheless be entitled to compensation under the said Act as though such employee had so elected; and further that any compensation or costs awarded under the said Act be paid by the Minister of Finance out of any unappropriated moneys in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada, or the Minister of Finance may from time to time take such amount of money as may be authorized by the Governor in Council from the Consolidated Revenue Fund and deposit such money with the Board, officers, authority or court authorized by the law of any province to determine compensation cases, from which deposit such Board, officers, authority or court may pay any compensation and costs awarded under the provisions of the said Act; and in any province where the general administration expenses of maintaining such Board, officers or other authority or court are paid by the province or by contributions from employers, or by both, the Minister of Finance may pay out of any unappropriated money in the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada such portion of such expenses as is fair and reasonable and is authorized by the Governor in Council.—*The Minister of Railways and Canals.*

Mr. REID: I think it is necessary to make a few explanations. Last session I presented to Parliament a Bill, which was passed, entitled, "an Act to provide Compensation where employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duty," in order to bring the Canadian Government Railway employees under the Compensation Acts of the several provinces throughout Canada. It applied to all Government employees, but it was passed at the request of the employees of the Government Railways. I consulted with the representatives of the Provident Fund of the Intercolonial Railway employees, and before the Bill passed a representative of the employees pronounced the opinion that it protected those who were receiving benefits under the Provident Fund Act. I stated in the House at the time that if the Act did not work out satisfactorily to those who were receiving benefits under the Provident Fund, we would amend it. Sub-section 4, of section 1, of the Bill passed last year does not work out in practice. The employees do not elect before injury, and therefore cannot claim under the Compensation Acts, nor can their dependents. The object of the present amendment is to enable a man to elect after injury, when, of course, he will take the more favourable of the two funds, either the Provident Fund or the Compensation Act. It places the employee, if he has been injured, in the position of choosing that one which is more beneficial to him. If an employee is killed and has not elected prior to the accident, then his dependents cannot apply under the Compensation Act. The present amendment is intended to cover these points. In order to be able to assure the House that the employees of the Government Railways were perfectly satisfied with the amendment, I requested the solicitor of the railway to have them sign their approval to it. If the House desires to know the names of the heads of ten different organi-

4 p.m. zations who have signed the document, I can furnish them. I have their signatures to show that they are perfectly satisfied. I repeat what I said last year, that if we find that the amendment proves unsatisfactory, we shall have to come back to Parliament and seek another amendment.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The resolution as it stands now, I think, is acceptable to the employees. It seems to have changed its form since it was first put on the Order Paper.

Mr. REID: I do not think so.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I think so. It strikes me that the Provident Fund should be eliminated from all consideration in this connection. The Provident Fund was organized for the purpose of paying old age pensions. It had been found on the Intercolonial that when men had got up in years they were almost useless to the road and it was difficult to turn them off without doing something for them. A Bill was introduced in 1907 for the purpose of retiring men who had become unable to carry out their duties on the road. That was the main purpose of the Provident Fund. The fund itself is made up from contributions by the employees amounting to one and one half per cent of their monthly wages and a similar amount paid by the Government. This money is funded and from it the old age pensions are paid. These are ridiculously small. I do not see how old employees can live on $20 a month. The question of dealing with this Provident Fund, I think, should engage the attention of the minister. This is a good opportunity because while the Provident Fund makes provision for paying a monthly allowance to the man who is totally disabled, that was not the original intention of it. As the minister is making provision now to deal with all cases of accident, through a Compensation Board, there is no reason why the old age pension system should be mixed up with accidents at all. It strikes me that the proper course

would be to devote the Provident Fund altogether to giving pensions to retired employees of the road. Provision, in this resolution, and in the Bill that will be introduced, is made for all kinds of accidents, so that there is no necessity for a man who is injured in an accident having anything to do with the Provident Fund.

There is another fund called the Relief Fund which is also made up by contributions from the wages of the men and by a small allowance from the department. In case a man is injured by a slight accident, he gets the small sum of about $3 a week while he is kept out of work as the result of that injury. The minister has not told us what he intends to do with that fund. It strikes me that it is unnecessary that that should be carried on at all if we are going to vote the railways under the compensation boards of the various provinces. I am not familiar with the compensation boards of the other provinces but we have in Nova Scotia a very well equipped, and active, compensation board. All the industries in the province, divided up into twenty classes or more, contribute to the fund. All the accidents that happen throughout the province are provided for out of that fund.

The minister has power under this resolution to pay to the funds of the various provinces a certain amount, but he has not told the House whether he intends to do so or not. Are we to understand that the Government railway will submit itself to the jurisdiction of the local boards in the various provinces and that, according to the mileage of the road in any particular province, a certain number of dollars will be paid into the fund? Is it proposed, whether there is an accident or not, that money will be paid into the fund and kept there to provide for any accidents that may occur? Is that the plan that the minister has in his mind, or does he propose simply to pay such allowances as are made from time to time by the board?

This is a matter that created a great deal of interest in the province of Nova Scotia when the Bill was introduced last year and the legislature of that province passed a resolution in regard to it at the last session approving of the proposal to bring the Government railways under the board but insisting at the same time that they should submit to the jurisdiction of the board and pay in to the fund like any other industry. Is that what the minister intends to do?

Mr. REID: The Dominion Government subscribes a certain amount per annum towards carrying out the purpose of the Provident Fund. What I said to some of the employees in connection with the Provident Fund was this: When the Government were operating the Intercolonial alone, there were certain funds, such as the Provident and Relief Funds, and they could be dealt with by the Government and the employees because there was only the one road. Now, the Government has taken over other roads including the Canadian Northern. On each of these roads they have similar relief organizations or pension systems. My own feeling is that we should let matters rest until we get the whole railway situation straightened out. Then I believe we should have a Dominion compensation system that would apply to the whole of the Government railways, and to all railways if possible, but at all events, to all Government railway systems, so that if any employee was injured in Nova Scotia, he would get the same compensation as an employee would get if he were injured in British Columbia or any other province. It should be uniform from one end of the Dominion to the other. I do not see how we can carry out that system by having different organizations on the Government railway system. I believe that those who are operating the railway system for the Government will have to take up and consider as soon as possible some policy which will be universal and which will apply throughout the whole system. The Provident Fund on the Intercolonial railway may be more advantageous than a similar organization on the Canadian Northern system, or vice versa. I do not think it will be in the interest of the railway to have one organization at one end different from another organization at the other end. My own feeling is that we should let matters go on in so far as these different organizations are concerned until we get the railway organizations all working together harmoniously and then try and see if we cannot devise some scheme whereby an employee in Vancouver will get the same treatment, and the same relief, as an employee in Halifax or in any other part of the country.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is it proposed to eliminate the feature of accidents from the Provident Fund altogether and apply the fund to old age pensions?

Mr. REID: I am not changing the policy that has been in existence for some time, and I would not feel justified in changing this law at present. Possibly, before the session ends, there could be a change made

that would apply to the whole system. In the meantime I think matters should continue as they are.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): There is a definition of what constitutes an employee of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railways. Does that include all the employees on those railways?

Mr. REID: It includes all those that are members of, or subscribers to, the Provident Fund—only those that would receive any benefits under that Fund, and they must subscribe and pay their contribution to the Fund.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Then this Act does not apply to any employee who is not a member of the Provident Fund?

Mr. REID: It does not. The hon. gentleman asked whether the Government intends depositing a certain amount with the Central Compensation Board to meet a portion of the working expenses. What the Government now does or rather the provision which has been made in the other Act, is, to pay whatever amount of compensation, or award, the Board may decide upon with respect to an employee. We felt that it was not necessary to deposit any money with the Compensation Board, and I think the Board is not pressing that demand. It was brought to my attention, however, by some of the different compensation boards that there was no provision in the Act whereby we could pay a portion of the cost of operation of the compensation board, and I felt that it was only fair and just that the Canadian National Railways should pay their proper share of whatever charge would be involved under the operation of the provincial Act in a particular province. Therefore I added this last clause in the amendment, which reads:

> And in any province where the general administration expenses of maintaining such board, officers, or authority or court, are paid by the province, or by contributions, from employers, or by both, the Minister of Finance may pay out of any unappropriated money in the consolidated revenue fund of Canada such portion of such expenses as is fair and reasonable and is authorized by the Governor in Council.

That covers the point that the different compensation boards are interested in. The boards now receive their share as if they were a private corporation, and when an award is made the Department of Finance will pay it out of the consolidated revenue fund.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: As regards the employees who are permanently disabled as a result of an accident, I think the proposed law is sound, and I do not agree with my hon. friend from Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) that we should not take into consideration the Provident Fund at all. That fund applies to two cases—an employee who retires on account of old age, and an employee who retires on account of permanent disability. It would not be fair that the same employee should get a life pension under the Provident Fund, and also a life pension under the Compensation Act. With respect to employees who are killed as a result of an accident, I congratulate the minister upon the change he is now making. We told him last year that the position of the dependents of such employees would not be improved as a result of the Act then passed. Of course, the dependents of an employee who was killed in a railway accident could not have any right to the benefits of the Provident Fund at all. The Provident Fund provides a pension for a disabled employee, or an aged employee, but nothing for the dependants of an employee who is killed. It was absurd, therefore, to require that such employee should waive his right to something that he was not entitled to. His dependents could not be granted anything from the Provident Fund, and surely we could not require that the employee should waive his rights. Yet that is what we did last year. As a result of that Act, I had in my practice the cases of two men named Senechal and Frève, who were both killed in a railway accident. The Railway Department refused to pay compensation on account of the clause in last session's Act, which was absurd. I am glad that the resolution as it reads will have a retroactive effect in the case of the dependents of those men, and that they will now be entitled to pensions.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Is the minister making the provision retroactive?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Retroactive as far as last year's Act is concerned?

Mr. REID: It is retroactive as regards last year's Act. The hon. member (Mr. Lapointe brought the point to my attention, and I saw the injustice of it. It is because of the hon. member's action in that regard that I am now making the provision retroactive so that its effect will be as though it had been enacted last year.

Mr. GAUVREAU: We are all satisfied if that is the case.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE: There is another feature of the Act of last year to which I desire to call attention. Last year a clause was added stating that Orders in Council would be passed defining the service that should be made on the Crown, that is against which party the writ should be issued, whether against the commissioners of the Canadian National Railways, the Minister of Justice, or the Crown. I wrote to the Department of Justice a few months ago, and they told me that no such Order in Council had been passed. I would like the minister to take the point into consideration before the Bill is passed, so that we may know exactly the method of procedure.

Mr. REID: I will do so.

Mr. WIGMORE: Is it intended this year to bring in a resolution to increase the superannuation? That amount was fixed about ten years ago at $20 a month. It might have been possible at that time for a man to exist in some way on that amount, but it is really out of the question to-day. I think some provision should be made for an increase of the amount, and I would be glad if the minister would take the matter up in connection with any changes which he may be here contemplating.

Mr. REID: I might say to the hon. gentleman that the employees themselves contribute a certain amount towards this fund; it is not entirely furnished by the Government. We subscribe a certain amount, I think $100,000 per annum, and the employees themselves make up the balance of the fund. Therefore we could not increase the allowance of those who have already been superannuated, or who may be superannuated in the future, without the consent of those employees who are interested. That is one of my reasons for considering that we should have some new arrangement applicable to the whole Government Railway system. When that is taken up and gone into, some arrangement might be made with regard to the position of old employees. We do not control this fund; it is the employees who decide how much shall be paid to those who are retired. The Government have only one member on that Board, and it could not increase the pensions to employees without taking the matter up with the whole Board.

Mr. WIGMORE: If a petition were sent to the Government and the Government decided to adopt its suggestions, an Act would have to be passed along these lines, would it not?

Mr. REID: No, the Provident Fund Board regulate the amount of the pensions. All we do is subscribe to that regulation.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I placed on the Order Paper the other day a question with regard to this very matter. Is it the intention of the minister to press this new board to deal with this question? The employees who come under this fund want an increase of pension; those who contribute to the fund are ready to increase their monthly contribution to the fund provided they are eligible for a higher pension. Is the minister going to do anything for these employees?

Mr. REID: The matter is referred to the management of the Canadian National Railways in order to obtain a uniform policy throughout. I suggested that an effort be made to have one organization for the whole Canadian Government railway system, which would include the Provident Fund relief organization on the Intercolonial and the Canadian Northern. I do not think it would be well to have one end of the system under a different organization. The only reason there can be for delay in the matter is that which is found in the whole railway situation, and that cannot be taken up and dealt with as the hon. member knows, for some little time.

Mr. COPP: I think the minister is on the right track in this matter. I have had considerable correspondence from employees of the Canadian Government railways on the subject. Some days ago I had an interview with the solicitor for the Department of Railways and I drew his attention to a number of matters brought to my attention by railway employees. I think that the minister has adopted in the resolution some remedy for the grievances that have arisen and that have been placed before the departmental solicitor and himself. But I am not sure that this resolution goes quite far enough. I have before me a letter from a member of the Compensation Board of New Brunswick drawing my attention to a number of matters of interest in connection with this resolution. I assume that the different Compensation Acts passed by the provincial legislatures are not all alike. In our province a certain fund is placed in the hands of the Com-

pensation Board by the contributing employers and when an employee is injured and reports have been submitted in due course by the employer, the employee, and the attending physician, the Compensation Board begin at once to pay weekly compensation to the injured person. These payments continue until evidence is adduced before the Compensation Board and a decision rendered. As soon as the man is reported as having been restored to health, the whole amount of compensation is paid over directly by the board. Now, under this proposed plan it is necessary that a certain amount be placed in the hands of the Compensation Board by the railway company or by the Government to enable it to make payments by way of compensation to railway employees along the lines that I have stated. There is a provision in the resolution in regard to that, but it says that the Minister of Finance "may" do so and so. I think it should go further and say that the Finance Minister must see to it that in each province where the Compensation Act provides for the weekly payment of compensation as soon as the report is laid before the Board, funds should be provided to enable the Compensation Board to pay that weekly indemnity. Railway employees should be placed in as good a position as employees of any other kind.

Mr. REID: Under this resolution we have power to do that. The object of the resolution is to make everything work satisfactorily and harmoniously in co-operation with the Compensation Boards in the several provinces. We are taking power to pay them their share of the cost of the operation of the board, and we can easily deposit from time to time small amounts to facilitate the carrying out of the work of the Compensation Board. We have been working very harmoniously with the board; of course, we had to act in accordance with the legislation passed last year. If this resolution is passed and a Bill founded upon it adopted, I feel sure that there will be no trouble or difficulty either with the Board or in connection with any employee that may be injured or killed.

Mr. COPP: As I said at the outset, I feel that the minister is on the right track and is endeavouring to meet fairly all the points brought up by the Compensation Board. But while we are doing this, let us see that everything is absolutely understandable by the Compensation Boards and by the men to whom this legislation is intended to apply

[Mr. Copp.]

Under the resolution before the committee, if the intention of the minister is to see to it that the funds are placed in the hands of the Compensation Board; that will be very satisfactory to the different associations representing the employees of the Intercolonial railway.

In answer to a question put by the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) as to whether a man employed on the Canadian National Railways must be a member of the Provident Fund before he can come under this Act, I understood the minister to say that he must be a member of the Provident Fund and contribute to the fund before he can come under the provisions of the Compensation Act.

Mr. REID: Any employee of the Canadian Government Railways, say of the Intercolonial railway, who is not a member of the Provident Fund, comes, in any case, under the Compensation Act. But if he is a member of the Provident Fund, he must, of course, elect under which he will come.

Mr. COPP: That is not the way in which I understood the minister to answer my hon. friend.

Mr. REID: Perhaps I did not understand the hon. member.

Mr. COPP: An employee comes under this Act whether he is a member of the Provident Fund or not?

Mr. REID: Every employee of the Intercolonial railway comes under the Compensation Act whether he is a member of the Provident Fund or not.

Mr. COPP: Then this resolution and the Bill to be founded thereon would cover the case about which I wrote the minister a few days ago. I refer to Mr. Edward Gould who was killed at Aulac station on the Canadian Government Railways.

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I wish to add my approval of the suggestion made that something should be done for those old men who retired from the road some years ago. The compensation that they receive now of $20 a month is entirely inadequate. In fact, I know of several cases in which there is a great deal of hardship. The minister has stated that this is a general scheme by which all these matters may be dealt with, but there is great danger that those men may be dead before their case is considered. I would urge, with other hon. gentlemen who have spoken on this point, that this matter

should be dealt with as soon as possible, and that relief should be brought to those men who are getting such small salaries, who could not have foreseen that the cost of living was to be so high as it is now, and who, if they had thought there would be no decrease in the cost of living, would have made some further provision for their old age. I hope the minister will realize that there are a number of cases of hardship suffered by those poor men who have given their days of usefulness and activity to the road and who are not now able to work. They should be provided for in any case by the institution to which they have given the best part of their lives. It is too bad that a man who has given good service for twenty years or more to the Government, and who, under this scheme, has retired, should find himself in want and unable to supplement his means by any other kind of employment.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Does my hon. friend support a general superannuation scheme for Government employees to which they should contribute; or is this somewhat along the lines of a provident scheme?

Mr. McKENZIE: I would be in favour of anything suggested by the minister for those who are now able to contribute towards a fund of that kind. But what I am particularly directing my remarks to is the case of men who gave their days, during which they were able to work, to the service of the railway, and who were making, as they thought, sufficient provision for their old age, but who found that as the cost of living has risen in this country, that provision is not anything like sufficient for themselves and their families. Under such circumstances, this country whose employees they were, should not see them in want, and some steps should be taken to better their conditions.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough): I hope the minister will take that matter into consideration. Wages have increased largely in recent years. An employee on the Intercolonial railway gets a much higher wage now than he did ten or fifteen years ago, and consequently, the percentage that he pays is considerably more, because he pays into the fund one and one-half per cent of the wages that he receives. But the amount paid to the employees out of the fund has not been increased. The ordinary employee gets about $20 a month as a retiring allowance whereas with the increased cost of living the increase in the amount that he pays in month by month would seem to indicate that he should, when he retires from the railway, get a larger amount than he gets at the present time.

Another matter that I should like to draw to the attention of the minister is the administration of the Provident Fund. I have complaints from employees of the road that the administration is too stringent. I knew a man who had a right to participate in this Provident Fund, who had removed in his old age to British Columbia and who was requested to come back to Halifax in order to be examined by a doctor in that city before he could make his application to go on the Provident Fund. He had to take the journey all the way across the continent to be examined by the doctor in Halifax, as the officials would not consider his case at all unless he was examined by that particular physician. When he arrived in Halifax, he was unable to get in touch with the doctor in question, and so he got another prominent doctor to examine him and certify as to the condition of his health. He then went home to British Columbia, but the board would not consider the certificate of his doctor, because the man did not happen to be examined by the special doctor that they had appointed. Regulations of that kind are impossible to be carried out, and I would like the minister to take some interest in the matter and see if the regulations imposed upon employees by the people in charge of the fund are not too stringent.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The regulations are administered by the employees themselves.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Partly.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Wholly.

Mr. REID: There is a representative of the Government on the board administrating the fund. Of course, the board, as a whole, would control the situation.

Mr. MICHAUD: Can a railway employee elect to bring his case before the Compensation Board of the province in which he works? In that case, can he avoid paying his monthly dues to the Provident Fund?

Mr. REID: I hardly understand the hon. member's question. All permanent employees of the railway are supposed to be members of the Provident Fund. Of course, if an accident should happen, the case of the employee should and would come before the Compensation Board in the

province in which the accident took place. He can elect under which Act his case shall come. If it is the Provident Fund Act, the board would take up his case and deal with it.

Mr. MICHAUD: Supposing the employee, in case of an accident, elects to have his case come under the Compensation Act, would he still have to pay his dues to the Provident Fund? Has he the power to choose between them?

Mr. REID: Yes, he has that choice.

Mr. MICHAUD: But he would have to pay his Provident Fund dues just the same.

Mr. REID: The purpose of this legislation is to provide for employees who have to retire through being permanently incapacitated. The Provident Fund makes provision for those who are only temporarily disabled.

Mr. FIELDING: Is there any appeal from the decision of the Provident Fund managers with regard to the compensation allowed? I am reminded of the case of an old official of the railway who has received some allowance from the Provident Fund, but who thinks he has been very unjustly treated. Is there an appeal to the Government from the Provident Fund's decision?

Mr. REID: There is an appeal to the minister, and his decision is final.

Mr. FIELDING: The deputy minister has had this particular case under consideration and I take for granted that probably there may be good reasons for not giving this man larger compensation. At all events, I will mention his name and perhaps the minister will look into the matter. I am not saying for a moment that he has any grievance, but he thinks he has. His name is Mr. George Laird, resident in the neighbourhood of Truro. He was severely injured in the station yard at Truro. Perhaps the deputy minister to whom I gave the facts of the case a short time ago has already given the case all possible consideration. All I care to do now is to mention the matter to the minister, so that if there has been any omission to do justice to this man, his case may be looked into.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

Hon. Mr. Reid thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 30, to provide compensation where employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duties.

[Mr. J. D. Reid.]

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RECLAMATION OF DOMINION LANDS BY DRAINAGE.

The House again in Committee on Bill No. 9, to authorize the reclamation of Dominion Lands by drainage—Hon. Arthur Meighen—Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

On section 2—power to reclaim land by drainage works:

Mr. ROBB: This work is apparently to be done under Reclamation Acts passed by the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I notice that section 6 provides for the appointment of a Director of Reclamation Service. It seems to me the minister is providing the most expensive way of doing this work. If the work is to be done under the Provincial Acts, would it not be more economical to use the provincial officials? Is not this appointment simply to provide a good fat job for some one to roam around the country and make reports to the minister which will probably be shelved?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am rather surprised the hon. gentleman should suspect anything of that sort. A Director of Reclamation Service has already been appointed; he has held office in the department for a great number of years, being appointed, I think, some fifteen years ago. The work is not to be done by the provinces at all. As I explained to the House on the second reading, this Bill is to take care of the work that the provinces do not do. Certain works in the way of drainage are done by the local authorities, following the arrangement that was arrived at between the representatives of the provinces and the Dominion. The second two classes of drainage projects are undertaken by drainage districts, or by the provinces themselves, and the actual responsibility for the drainage work is theirs. We are providing here for taking care of the fourth class. Where the Dominion owns a great tract of land, we do the work; we undertake the engineering, and actually construct and operate the drainage works. In doing so, however, we operate under the laws of the provinces passed for the purpose, in just the same way as would a company that undertook to construct these works. We come in as the Dominion Government. We actually do the work, but in doing so we follow the regulations and laws passed by the provinces.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Do you do it under the Interior Department, or the Public Works?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Under the Interior Department. The lands are themselves under the administration of the Interior Department. The Crown Lands of the Dominion, which are administered in the Interior Department, are the lands that are mainly to be affected by the work.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Does the hon. minister expect the work to be confined to these two provinces?

Mr. MEIGHEN: We cannot operate anywhere else, but there is a clause in the Act providing for the extension of the work should any other province pass an Act under which we could come in.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I would like the minister to outline what he proposes to do under this Act, and what expenditure he thinks the Government will find it necessary to make. It is a new venture, and at a time like this, when it is difficult to find funds to run the ordinary business of the country, it strikes me that it is hardly a proper time to embark on this project unless it can be shown that there is some good reason for it. There is a reference here to the fact that the land may be turned over to the Soliders' Settlement Board, but I do not think the soldiers will agree to settle in these low swampy places. We would therefore like to know what the hon. minister intends to do, and how much he expects to spend under this Act.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The minister has no very pretentious plans on foot. The United States Government has launched a programme of reclamation along this line involving an expenditure of $100,000,000. What we do contemplate in the Interior Department is what you might describe as an experimental undertaking, at all events, an initial undertaking. What we have in mind is the reclamation of Waterhen lake. If we go ahead with that first, it will require about $120,000. Something in the neighbourhood of 12,000 acres will be reclaimed—land that at present, I understand, is absolutely valueless; not only valueless in itself, but its remaining in its present condition impairs the whole district and renders less valuable much land in the neighbourhood. That project is recommended to us by our engineers as perhaps the one we should undertake first. The lands adjacent to the lands that would be reclaimed are worth to-day from $30 to $50 an acre, and there is no reason to believe that these would not be worth the same, not immediately after reclamation, possibly, but shortly after.

5 p.m.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Would it not be better to submit to the Provincial Act and pay in proportion the amount required to drain these lands? I understand the Provincial Act applies to all lands where drainage is required and operations are started under the Provincial Act, it would be better for the Dominion Government holding lands in that area to submit to the jurisdiction of the province, and pay their share of the lands they own.

Mr. MEIGHEN: That alternative was very carefully considered. In it is involved the question of the jurisdiction of the province to tax Dominion lands; indeed, not only the question of jurisdiction but of the wisdom of submitting to taxation at the hands of the provinces; and it was deemed best to solve the difficulty in another way. In cases where the bulk of the land is privately owned, or in cases where the province wants work done for the sake of roads, then the province or the local authorities undertake it, and if we have land within the area affected we have arranged to sell that land to the province, at a certain fixed rate, and the province, after the land is reclaimed sells by public auction, and out of the proceeds of the sale the cost of reclamation is first taken. Over and above that, the surplus comes back to the Dominion. Where we have a great body of lands the province takes the ground that the work is ours, and, we think, properly so. We undertake the work, the provincial legislation provides provincial officers, assesses the proper share against private lands, and we just pay our share; and upon the sale of that land we are recouped for the expenditure we make. Of course, as respects our own land the surplus is ours.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it the intention of the Government to turn these lands over to the province before the next election?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not really think that the hon. member was thinking of the next election. I have not yet given it a thought at all, and I am afraid it would take me some time to come to a conclusion on that point.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Sale of reclaimed lands.

Mr. ROBB: Will the minister explain subsection 3 of this clause which reads:

> The minister may, instead of selling such lands, lease the whole or any part of the same, and may also lease any land unsold.

Does that refer to lands other than those that are reclaimed?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Oh no, that could only refer to lands included within the area of reclamation, lands affected by the reclamation scheme. It means this: An upset price will be fixed on the valuation before they are offered for sale at public auction. If the upset price is not bid we are empowered to rent the lands in the meantime until they are otherwise disposed of. It strikes me that possibly it would be wise to have power to rent the land before offering it to public auction, because lands reclaimed by drainage do not reach their full value for some time. It takes cultivation and exposure to the sun to free the land from that moisture that has been in it for so long. I think the best time to sell these lands would not be immediately after reclamation.

Mr. ROBB: I should have read the whole clause to the minister. There seems to be a confusion of words. Why this distinction? It would look as if it referred to two different classes of land.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think that the words are unnecessary.

Mr. MURPHY: Would the insertion of the word "such" before "land" meet the hon. gentleman's suggestion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It might make it clearer. I understand that the point of the hon. gentleman is that the words are surplusage?

Mr. ROBB: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: But it is intended to have this legal effect, that the minister may, instead of selling the land, lease the whole or any part thereof. It might be held that the minister could elect whether he could lease or sell, but once having elected, could not change. We want to make it clear that while he may elect to sell he may lease.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): According to subsection 1, the minister may sell the lands subject to the conditions prescribed by the Governor in Council According to sub-section 2 he may transfer them to the Soldiers' Settlement Board at a valuation to be fixed by the Governor in Council. But under subsection 3 he may lease the land at any price he may see fit to ask. Why not make the rental under the lease subject to the approval of the Governor in Council, as well as the price in case of sale?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not have any objection. Of course, the rental in leasing is not so vital as the price on a sale. Indeed, as we had the Bill at first, the Governor in Council was not required to assent even to the price on sale. So much goes before Council——

Mr. McMASTER: You will be bringing some of it before Parliament pretty soon.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I will be very sorry for Parliament if it all comes before it. The only effective and practical way is for the minister to handle it. I have no objection to it going before Council. It is something of a protection for the minister, but anybody who has been a member of Council knows that the deliberation is not increased a great deal.

Mr. MURPHY: Might I suggest to my hon. friend that special legislation affecting these lands after reclamation should be unnecessary in view of the fact that the general land Act would apply to such land in the absence of a special provision. Is there any necessity for this special provision, inasmuch as the land would become ordinary land after reclamation, and, if so, would not the ordinary law apply to it?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, but the general law does not permit of sale except in very rare cases. The power of the minister to sell land is so limited that it would not be sufficient to leave this to the operation of the general law. He can sell fractions of quarter-sections, and only a certain amount and under certain conditions. We want to sell this land by auction so that we can recoup the treasury the cost of improving it.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is there any provision made in the Estimates for the coming fiscal year to administer this Act?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Not yet.

On section 4—Payments for land, how to be made:

Mr. MEIGHEN: These are the alternate terms of payment in case of sale by auction, but the House must observe that the previous section provides that the land can be turned over to the Soldiers' Settlement Board for disposition by that Board. In that event these terms do not apply. In the event of an ordinary sale the terms that are applicable to the operations of the Board would not come into play.

Mr. ROBB: Does that mean that you will accept those ten or twenty year terms and nothing short of them?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not recommend anything shorter than ten years. The price would be affected adversely if we did. School lands are selling on a ten year term. There is considerable agitation to make it more than ten years but there is no question but that the school land fund is to-day at a much higher figure than it would be if a shorter term were fixed.

Mr. MURPHY: Could sales not be made for cash under the clause?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Cash could be paid and a man could get title but I would not be empowered to offer land for sale for cash by auction. I would not be prepared to make the term cash. On the other hand, if a man purchased land and afterwards desired to pay cash he could do so. But, according to the terms, a man will not be asked to come in and bid at auction against another man who is able to pay cash.

Mr. MURPHY: What is the practical application under this last section?

Mr. MEIGHEN: For example, John Smith buys a section of land at auction on the 20-year amortization plan. Then the minister is empowered to allow John Smith to pay the whole thing right off or any part of it at any time.

Mr. McMASTER: The last paragraph of the section says:

> The Minister may give such privileges of prepayment of instalments as he may deem fit.

Would that go so far as to allow the minister to give a heavy discount on prepayment?

Mr. MEIGHEN: No. I would never give any discount at all. I do not think I would be empowered to do so.

Section agreed to.

On section 5—application to Dominion lands in Manitoba:

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What legislation is contemplated by the province of Manitoba?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I would not like to say than any legislation is contemplated. That would be for the government of that province to say. But if they pass any legislation it should be legislation under which we could undertake works of this kind.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That is what is called "the necessary legislation" in this clause?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It means legislation similar to the reclamation Acts of Saskatchewan and Alberta—any legislation under which we could operate.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Do the swamp lands in Manitoba belong to the Dominion?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My recollection is that they once belonged to Manitoba, that we bought them back and paid a very large sum of money for them. Now, we propose to drain them at the expense of the Dominion.

Mr. MEIGHEN: They belong to the Dominion. We cannot under this Bill, unless they pass an Act, do anything in the way of drainage. There were representations made to myself that it would be well to investigate the possibility of draining one of the larger lakes of the province.

An hon. MEMBER: Lake Manitoba?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Lake Manitoba. We have not seriously considered it as yet, because there is no Act in force in that province under which we could operate. The opinion is also held that there are other surface waters in that province that should be drained first, and that it would pay us to undertake inasmuch as the lands are ours.

Mr. CAMPBELL: The minister referred yesterday to the added territory of Manitoba. I did not quite catch the connection in which the reference was made, and I was wondering if that part of Manitoba was affected differently from the rest of the province?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did draw a distinction between the jurisdiction of the Dominion in respect of the older part of Manitoba and the added territory, and the distinction is this: Under the Irrigation Act, passed in 1894, the Dominion asserted control over the surface waters of Alberta and Saskatchewan, and the territories now embraced within the added district of Manitoba. That control the Dominion asserted and now has in respect of those territories. The Dominion also has control of the Crown lands in the old portion of Manitoba, but none over the surface waters. We could, however, do reclamation work in the old portion of Manitoba if there were adequate provincial laws under which we could operate. The only difficulty is that the old Irrigation Act does not apply to the old portion of Manitoba.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Does subsection (b) of section 5 apply to lands in all the provinces of Canada?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, it is intended to apply to the work that is gone on with in any province by arrangement with the Provincial Government. That is the intention. I would not like to indicate that it was likely any arrangement could be made, or that it would be wise to make it. This Act is for the purpose of reclaiming lands in the Dominion of Canada for the benefit of the Dominion.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Will the minister say in what year the Dominion purchased the swamp lands of Manitoba?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Dominion took back the swamp lands in the year 1912. That was part of the terms of the settlement of 1912, by which the subsidy provisions applicable to Manitoba were raised to the standard of those of Alberta and Saskatchewan.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It seems to me that we incurred a liability at that time that we were not expecting. Prior to that date the swamp lands belonged to the province of Manitoba, and it would have been better for us, perhaps, if, as was insisted at the time by hon. members on this side of the House, the Government had left the title of those lands in the provincial government instead of vesting the title in this Government. It was done, as I understood at the time, as a pretext to enable the Dominion Government to give some money to Manitoba, to conciliate Manitoba by handing out to it Dominion cash. In that way we incurred the liability of looking after those swamp lands, which has now come back on us and is going to be a bill of expense for some years to come.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The hon. gentleman should not get the impression that because the lands are capable of improvement they are a liability. If they were not capable of improvement they would be a liability, but the very passage of this legislation is an assumption that the lands are capable of improvement. The great part of the swamp lands of Manitoba are valuable; and I have not the slightest doubt that they are much more valuable than they were in 1912 when taken over by the Dominion. If this Bill passes it will make them still more valuable.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My object was to point out to the hon. gentleman that the policy advocated on this side of the House at the time was to leave those lands to Manitoba to drain and look after. By refusing to accept the course advocated by hon. gentlemen on this side, the Government has assumed the ownership of these swamp lands, and we are required to spend large sums of money in making them fit for occupancy, which liability should have been undertaken by the province of Manitoba.

Mr. MEIGHEN: We will get the money all back, perhaps a hundred or two hundredfold more. What will the hon. member say then?

Mr. McMASTER: Does the minister say two hundredfold?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps a hundred or two hundredfold, I would expect so. If these lands are worth $25 an acre, the price at which some of the lands in the neighbourhood are sold, it would represent two and a half times the estimated cost of reclamation.

Mr. KAY: Where reclaimed lands are sold by auction, is it intended there shall be an upset price?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, always.

Mr. MURPHY: Has anything been done towards the drainage of lake Manitoba, or is it intended to do anything of that nature in the near future?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Nothing has been done, nor can I say that anything is intended immediately in that direction. It is possible that Manitoba may pass an Act which would enable us to operate in that province, in which event we would take into consideration the possibility and the wisdom of draining that lake, among perhaps other experiments that may be tried. For myself I would not like even to indicate an opinion that it would be the part of wisdom to attempt to drain the lake.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Director of Reclamation Service.

Mr. ROBB: Who is that officer?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Mr. Drake, who is sitting in front of me.

On section 7—Annual Report.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I do not see anything in this Bill which authorizes the expenditure of money. Is there any limit to the amount which the Government should spend? Will the minister point out the clause bearing on this point?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the first subsection of subsection 2 providing for defraying the cost "out of moneys set apart by Parliament for that purpose."

Mr. SINCLAIR: Will there be an estimate brought down?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Section agreed to and Bill reported.

UNITS OF ELECTRICAL MEASURE.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, Bill No. 17, respecting the Units of Electrical Measure, was read the second time and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

On section 2—ohm, ampere, volt:

Mr. DEVLIN: There is a word in this section which I do not understand. It is the word "ohm"—it sounds German. Would the minister tell us what that word means?

Mr. MACLEAN: The definition is in the Act. Technically speaking, the ohm is the method of measuring the resistance of electricity as it proceeds through the conductor. I think the word is of German origin. In 1893 a conference was held at Chicago to fix electrical standards—the standard of quantity, which is known as the ampere, and the standard of pressure, which is known as the volt. The international arrangement reached at Chicago in 1893 was put into the form of legislation, in 1903, I think, and is to be found in Chapter 53 of the Revised Statutes of Canada. In 1908 another conference was held at London and the standards of electrical measurement adopted by the Chicago conference were amended in a few respects, chiefly technical. The standards adopted at the London conference in 1908 were adopted by all the leading nations of the world there represented. Since that time these nations have put into the form of legislation the standards adopted at that conference, and the purpose of this Bill is to put into statutory form in Canada the agreement reached respecting the adoption of electrical standards of measurement. This Bill should have been introduced in 1911. At that time the Department of Weights and Measures was under the Inland Revenue Department, and someone facetiously remarked to me to-day that the reason why the Bill was not introduced before was because ministers were leaving that Department so frequently that there was no time to gain even a passing acquaintance with the matter. The Bill is in the same form as that adopted by England, United States, Germany and all the leading countries of the world.

Section agreed to.

On the schedule:

Mr. McMASTER: Can the minister explain the algebraic formula given at the top of page three of the Bill? It is beyond me.

Mr. MACLEAN: I would rather promise to afford any hon. friend an opportunity of having that explained privately by the technical officers of the Department. I shall be glad at any time to make an arrangement with him to that effect.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT AMENDMENT.—LOBSTERS.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean, (Acting Minister of Naval Service), the House went into committee to consider the following proposed resolution, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend The Meat and Canned Foods Act, chapter twenty-seven of the statutes of 1907, as amended by chapter thirty-three of the statutes of 1917, by providing for the more exact definition of dry lobster meat, for the sizes of cans for canning lobsters, and the amount of the contents thereof.

Mr. MURPHY: Will the minister explain?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I purpose merely advancing this resolution another stage, and later on, it will be taken charge of by the Minister of Marine and Fisheries (Mr. Ballantyne), when he returns to the House. I shall, however, give a brief explanation of it. The purpose of this resolution and of the Bill which will be founded on it, is to determine the weight of dry lobster meat in the various sized cans. In 1917, the weight of dry lobster meat contained in cans was fixed by Statute. I am reading from section 12 (d) of the Act of 1917:

Cans of lobster shall contain the following minimum amounts of dry lobster meat:—

1 lb. can, 14 ounces, avoirdupois; ¾ lb. can, 10½ ounces, avoirdupois; ½ lb. can, 7 ounces, avoirdupois; ¼ lb. can, 3½ ounces, avoirdupois.

It is further provided that:

No other size of can shall be packed unless the written permission of the minister has first been obtained.

At the last session of Parliament, the Minister of Marine and Fisheries introduced

a Bill for the purpose of amending the section which I have just read. That Bill, I think, passed the House of Commons, but was defeated in the Senate. It is unnecessary for me to state the provisions of that Bill inasmuch as it did not become law. There was apparently a great deal of opposition in the eastern provinces, which alone are interested in the lobster canning industry, to the provisions of the Bill which was introduced last year. Since the close of the last session of Parliament, a conference was held during the summer of 1918 at Halifax. That conference was, I believe, quite representative of all those interested in the lobster canning business, and a conclusion was reached by those interested, and the fishermen, or producers of the lobsters. The conclusions arrived at are embodied in this resolution. The Bill, which I shall introduce on the passage of this resolution, provides:

There shall be four sizes of cans for canning lobsters. The cans of each size shall always contain not less than 3 ounces avoirdupois, 6 ounces avoirdupois, 9 ounces avoirdupois, and 12 ounces avoirdupois respectively, of dry lobster meat.

No other size of can shall be used for packing lobsters without first obtaining the written permission of the minister. Such written permission shall state the minimum amount of dry lobster meat that is to be packed in each size of can so authorized.

That will give to the committee substantially the purpose of the legislation which will be founded upon this resolution. After the Bill is printed, hon. gentlemen will perhaps find the proposed measure much easier to understand, and it will remain upon the Order Paper for some time yet, at least until the return of the Minister of Marine and Fisheries to the House.

Mr. COPP: I understand that in 1907 an Act was passed making regulations in regard to the weight of lobster meat to be packed in each of the different sized cans used in packing lobsters. That Act was amended in 1917, and I think the weights were increased. The matter was discussed by a special committee of which I was a member. We recommended that the weights be 14 ounces, 10½ ounces, 7 ounces and 3 ounces respectively, as contained in the Act of 1917. Does this resolution purpose bringing the weights back to what were provided in the Act of 1907?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think my hon. friend is substantially correct. At least, it reduces the weight of lobster meat in each can as compared with the weights provided for in the Statute of 1917 as originally introduced.

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

Mr. COPP: Does it bring the weights back to the same as provided for in the Act of 1907?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have not that Statute before me just at the moment, but I think my hon. friend is right.

Mr. COPP: The minister says that there was held in the city of Halifax a meeting of those interested in the packing of lobsters as well as the fishermen. I do not see how the fishermen are interested because they sell their catch to the canners at so much a pound, and then the canners pack the lobsters into cans and the minimum amounts in the different cans are provided by Statute. I remember very well that, during the discussion before the committee in 1917, a great deal of evidence was adduced to show that, as regards the lobsters which were packed by the different lobster packers throughout the Maritime provinces and which were placed on the market, the consumer was paying for a pound of lobsters, but was getting only twelve or thirteen ounces. The committee, from the evidence adduced before them, came to the conclusion that the consumer was not being fairly treated in the matter, and they made the recommendations which are contained in the Act of 1917. We should have some very good reason before consenting to reduce the weight of the can which is supposed to contain one pound of lobster meat from fourteen ounces to twelve ounces.

The CHAIRMAN: Shall the resolution carry?

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: No. We want some explanation on that point. It is quite true that there was a meeting of canners in Halifax, but the consumer was not represented; and if it is proposed to reduce the quantity from fourteen ounces to twelve ounces and require the consumer to pay for a can of lobster the same price that he was paying before, I am opposed to this resolution and would like to have from the minister some explanation as to why this change is being made.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Apparently one of the reasons which induced the members present at that conference to arrive at this conclusion, was that they were endeavouring to ascertain and declare the exact content of the cans now used by lobster packers. That seems to have been the principal reason for the change. As I said before, I am putting this resolution forward just one step, as I want to get the Bill printed so that hon. gentlemen may have an opportun-

ity of studying it. I purpose circulating it in the Maritime Provinces which are the only provinces interested in the matter, and I would like the committee to permit that to be done. It will be another three or four weeks before the next step will be taken.

Mr. MURPHY: While the committee appreciates the position of the minister in charge of the resolution, the point raised by the hon. member for Antigonish and Guysborough is so important that it is questionable whether the committee should advance this resolution any further. If by the Bill to be founded upon it we shall be enacting legislation whereby the consumer will get less for his money than he previously got, surely legislation of that kind ought not to commend itself to hon. members.

Mr. LOGGIE: I was present at the meeting in Halifax. The object of this legislation is to have a uniform weight in the cans. It was found that some of the packers were not putting fourteen ounces in the cans. It was contended by some that a half-pound can would not hold seven ounces. Personally, I took the opposite view, and I do to-day. I think also that a quarter-pound can will hold comfortably three and-a-half ounces. However, the large packers, including Roberts, Simpson & Company, and O'Leary & Lea, who are the principal exporters of canned lobster in Canada, were practically unanimous in contending that what is known as the one-pound can would not contain fourteen ounces of dry meat,—that is, the meat after the fluid has been drained off. Of course, it is essential that the net contents should be on the label for the Canadian and American markets. The law, however, provides that cans can be exported without a label, and it is up to the legislators of the countries to which these cans are exported to protect their consumers. I do not think the consumer is being deceived, because the Canadian and American consumer can plainly see by the label what the can holds, and if the can is reasonably full, there would be no loss to the consumer. To have a can capable of holding more than is put into it is simply a waste of money. Nevertheless, the large packers were practically unanimous in asking for a standard weight of twelve ounces for what is called the pound tin. A one-pound tin does not mean that the tin contains one pound of meat. The two-pound corn can, for instance, contains only from one and-a-quarter to one and-a-half pounds net weight, so there is no greater deception in the case of these lobster cans than in the case of any other can; so long as the net contents are plainly shown on the label. As to the consumer paying more, I do not think my hon. friend's argument is at all applicable. The price is regulated by the law of supply and demand. The market regulates the price, and I do not think the change in weight will have any effect on it. Certainly, if the packers put three and-a-half ounces into a can, they should receive a higher price than for a can containing only three ounces.

Mr. McMASTER: I understand there are fourteen ounces of lobster meat in a one-pound can. What do the other two ounces consist of? Preservative?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The other two ounces consist of a liquid which is absolutely necessary to preserve the lobster meat. The lobster packers contend that the cans can not contain the quantity of lobster meat prescribed by the legislation of 1917. Many of these canners have machinery for making cans of particular sizes, and they say that, to comply with the law, they would be compelled to instal new machinery for turning out cans of a different size. That would put them to very considerable expense, and would also place them at a disadvantage—the facts have not been clearly put before me—as compared with packers in Newfoundland. The packers contend that, although the cans they are now using will not hold the quantity prescribed by law, they will hold the amount prescribed by this Bill, plus the liquid required as preservative. I might give the statutory definition of dry lobster meat:

> Dry lobster meat means the meat after a can has been opened, turned upside down so as to permit free escape of the liquid and allowed to drain one minute.

Mr. McMASTER: The hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) says that there is no danger of fooling the American or Canadian consumer because the label will show the contents of the can, but apparently in the case of cans exported no questions are asked and no lies told. A can will go across the sea to the Irish consumer, for instance, without any indication of the weight of meat inside the can. It would seem to me to be in the interests of the commercial reputation and progress of this country to show plainly on the label the exact amount of edible meat contained in the can. I do not think that would put

the lobster exporter at a disadvantage, but rather the contrary, because the consumer would know exactly how much edible meat he was buying.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That really was the position of the lobster canners last season. Although the cans indicated a net weight of fourteen ounces of lobster meat, the packers contended they could not possibly get that amount of meat into the one-pound can.

Mr. McMASTER: It does not make very much difference how much meat there is in the can, so long as the amount is plainly stated on the label. That would protect the commercial reputation of Canada.

Mr. LOGGIE: This matter was before the House five or six years ago when the law was being amended, and it was then pointed out that lobster for export was demanded in plain cans. The buyers in France use their own labels, and I think they have laws protecting the public in that country, as we have here; and the finding on that occasion was that for export it was allowable to let the cans go without any labels, as it would very materially interfere with the canned lobster industry if we were compelled to put labels on here, and these labels had to be taken off and the buyers' labels put on on the other side of the Atlantic.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not think the minister should press the resolution without some further consideration. The reasons do not appeal to me at all. We are told that in Newfoundland the can is smaller, or the quantity is smaller. The Dominion of Canada is the largest lobster packing country in the world; and why should we change the size of the can to suit the little island of Newfoundland? There is no good reason for it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I did not say that.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Where does the uniformity come in? No lobsters are packed in the United States. We have a monopoly of the packing business outside of Newfoundland. There is no lobster packing in Europe, as far as I know. If the idea is to aim at uniformity, let us make it uniform here, without raising any question about any outside place. If we say the quantity of lobster to be put into a can must be 14 ounces, it will be uniform as far as we are concerned. It is also said that the machinery that the packers have for making their cans is not adapted to the quantity that is now put into the cans.

[Mr. McMaster.]

That is not a good reason. It may be a reason for one season, or for some temporary arrangement, but it is not a sufficient reason for the passing of an Act. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) says that changing the weight would not affect the price. That is quite true, but it affects the quantity you get out of the can.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think this is in the interests of the consumer, because he will know the exact quantity of lobster meat he is buying. Heretofore he was deceived, because lobsters were sold by the pound can, three-quarter pound, and half-pound cans, and naturally the purchaser believed he was obtaining 16 ounces of lobster meat in the pound can, whereas it was impossible for the can to hold 16 ounces, since it had to contain a certain amount of liquid preservative. The purpose of this Bill is to fix the number of ounces of lobster meat that will be contained in the can. It is in the interest of the consumer just as much as of anybody else, because every provision is being put into the Bill to safeguard the consumer. With regard to the lobster canner, I think the position he takes is perfectly sound. The law required him to put a certain amount of lobster meat into certain cans, which he could not do. Now, I do not see who will be injured by this Bill. I think it is eminently wise legislation and that the committee should accept it.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

CONSIDERED IN COMMITTEE.

Bill No. 12, respecting W. C. Edwards and Company, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 20, to incorporate Canadian Merchant Service Guild.—Mr. McQuarrie.

Bill No. 21, respecting the English Valley and Hudson Bay Railway Company.—Mr. Fripp.

Bill No. 23, respecting the Manitoba and North Western Railway Company of Canada.—Mr. Cruise.

MEAT AND CANNED FOODS ACT AMENDMENT.

The House resumed consideration in committee of the whole on the resolution to

amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. COPP: Mr. Chairman, it is not my desire to offer any factious opposition to the resolution, but I feel that the minister has not given a sufficiently satisfactory argument to this committee why it should be passed at the present time. He tells us that some time last summer the lobster packers of the Maritime Provinces, in conclave at Halifax, had come to the conclusion that some change should be made in the Meat and Canned Foods Act by decreasing the amount of dry lobster meat that they should be required to place in a pound, three-quarter pound, half-pound, or quarter-pound cans. During the dinner recess I looked up the Act of 1907 which provides for making regulations in regard to canned meats and foods. In that Act I could not find any regulation by which the container, or can, should contain a certain number of ounces of dry lobster meat.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There was no legislation prior to 1917.

Mr. COPP: During the session of 1917, as hon. gentlemen who acted on the Committee of Marine and Fisheries will remember, and at the time when Sir Douglas Hazen was Minister of Marine and Fisheries, this matter came before the committee and we were very much surprised, if not astounded, to learn that when we were buying what we supposed to be a pound of lobster we were getting not more than from ten to thirteen ounces instead of sixteen ounces as everybody naturally supposed. The explanation made at that time by those who were interested in the lobster packing business was that it had got to be a sort of unwritten law amongst themselves that they would not put sixteen ounces in a pound can but they would put whatever the packer saw fit. The Minister of Marine and Fisheries of that day, realizing the importance of this matter, took a very great interest in it and, coming as he did from the Maritime Provinces, he had a very general knowledge of the situation. He and his staff at that time realized the importance of putting on the statute books a legal definition of what should be known as a pound, three-quarter pound, half pound and quarter pound can of lobster, so that the buyer might really get the amount specified in the can. That was only reasonable and proper. What happened? That committee sat day after day during a large portion of the session. Finally they agreed upon the matter and recommended that what was known as a pound can should contain fourteen ounces, a three-quarter pound can ten and a fraction ounces, and so forth. When the committee recommended this the lobster packers pointed out that owing to the fact that it was getting along in the spring and they were preparing for lobster fishing, they having to prepare their cans a year ahead, they were going to have a lot of those cans upon their hands which would be a waste and a loss to them. To meet their views the committee placed a rider in the Act saying that the Act should not come into force until December 15, 1918. Therefore, this Act has never come into force at all because there has been no lobster packing in the Maritime Provinces since that date. Then what happened? The lobster packers meet and say: We are not going to have this put in force at all; it will not affect us now, and we will apply to Parliament and have it changed and put back to where it was prior to the introduction of this legislation in 1917. This Parliament after due and careful consideration legislated upon this subject, placed before the public what a can of lobster should contain and delayed the operation of the Act until the 15th day of December, 1918.

And now, only three months after that law was to go into effect, legislation is proposed to do away with it altogether. My hon. friend from Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) tells the Acting Minister of the Naval Service, this afternoon, that he attended that convention in Halifax, and, as a practical lobster packer, stated that he was not in favour of reducing the weight of the dry lobster meat in these cans; some argued that the cans they were using for the purpose were not large enough to contain sufficient liquid to preserve the lobster properly while it was in transit and before it was sold to the consumer. The hon. gentleman, from practical experience, must know that the can is sufficiently large, because he advocated this afternoon that what is commonly termed the pound can should contain fourteen ounces of dry lobster meat. I am sure there is not a man in this House who has a better understanding of the conditions of the lobster packing industry than my hon. friend from Northumberland, and yet he says he advocated, at the convention of lobster packers referred to, that the weight of the can should remain as specified in the legislation of 1917. Having come to the conclusion, after considerable investigation and inquiry, that the Act placed upon the statute book at that time was a proper one, why the necessity for this change? That

Act was not to come into force until December 15, 1918, which gave the lobster packers every opportunity to prepare themselves for the required change. They have made no preparation, so far as I can see, and yet they come back and ask—I presume they have asked, although we have had no evidence that they are making any particular demand, except the minister says that the packers met at Halifax and thought some change should be made for some trifling reason, which to my mind is not satisfactory evidence—that we should make this change at the present time. If there is any evidence in favour of making the change my mind is open to conviction. But, Sir, although I come from a constituency in which a large number of lobster packers operate, not one of them has spoken to me in reference to this proposed change. All the evidence in support of it that we have is, simply the Acting Minister of Naval Service coming forward and asking for the passage of this resolution. I say candidly that in my opinion better evidence and more conclusive arguments should be advanced before we are asked to undo what we did in 1917.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN: If my hon. friend thinks that the conclusion reached by the Fisheries Committee in 1917 was a wise one, he should criticise quite severely the legislation which was then passed, because the Act does not embody the conclusions of the committee. In 1917, for the first time, a Bill was introduced defining what should be the quantity of dry lobster meat in the several cans. Cans of certain sizes had been in use in the lobster industry for a great many years. They were known as the pound can, the three-quarter-pound can, and the half-pound can, and it was known to the public—at least to everybody in the trade—that these cans did not contain sixteen ounces avoirdupois of lobster meat. A Bill was introduced into the Commons by the then Minister of Naval Affairs providing that a pound can should contain thirteen ounces of lobster meat; a three-quarter-pound can, nine and three quarter ounces; a half-pound can six and a half ounces; and a quarter-pound can three and a quarter ounces.

Mr. COPP: When was that Bill passed?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The Bill containing those provisions was introduced by the minister in 1917. It was referred to the Fisheries Committee and was there amended to the effect—so I am instructed by the officers of the department—that the pound cans should contain sixteen ounces of dry lobster meat.

Mr. ROBB: Had not that been the custom for many years, that there should be sixteen ounces to the pound can?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: There never was any legislation whatever upon the subject prior to 1917.

Mr. ROBB: But sixteen ounces was in accordance with the custom of the trade?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: A standard can was in use in the lobster canning industry, but there was no statute requiring that there should be any stated number of ounces of lobster meat in the can. That was required for the first time in the legislation of 1917. I am informed that the Bill, as amended by the Commons, went to the Senate, where it was again amended to the effect that a pound can should contain fourteen ounces, which apparently was one ounce more than was demanded by the Bill as originally introduced. Apparently, the fourteen-ounce provision was a compromise. Now these cans, while selling as pound cans of lobster, never did contain sixteen ounces of meat. The Department last year purchased a great number of cans in order to determine the average quantity of lobster meat which each can contained. I will give the Committee the weight of dry meat in six cans that were purchased, these being the products of Canadian canneries.

No.	Weight of contents.
1	12·38 ounces
2	11·89 ounces
3	13·41 ounces
4	11·57 ounces
5	12·38 ounces
6	11·38 ounces

It will therefore be seen that the average content of the pound lobster can was about twelve ounces —sometimes a little over, sometimes a little less. In Newfoundland the average weight in a can of lobster is just about the same as in Canada. That was an undesirable condition of affairs, and I cannot understand how any hon. gentleman can argue that it is at all proper, from the public standpoint, or from the standpoint of the consumer, who has a right to know the exact content of any container in which food is placed. The purpose of this Bill, and it is quite in harmony with recent legislation, is to provide that there shall be four sizes of cans for canning lobsters. The cans of each size shall each contain no less than three ounces avoirdupois, six ounces avoirdupois, nine ounces avoirdupois, and twelve ounces avoirdupois re-

spectively of dry lobster meat. Further, each can must have a label giving the name of the packer, and the exact quantity of lobster meat that the can contains. Now, we have never had legislation before to that effect. I think that such legislation is eminently desirable and proper.

Mr. DUFF: If these cans are marked, will they be marked "1 pound" or "12 ounces?"

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: They will be marked 12 ounces, 9 ounces, 6 ounces, 3 ounces. Heretofore the cans have been known as pound cans, three-quarter-pound cans, half-pound cans and one-quarter-pound cans. These designations have been misleading to the consuming public, for the cans do not contain that exact amount of lobster meat, for the reason that in the export trade the cans must contain a certain amount of liquid as a preservative. The principle of the legislation is, therefore, to compel canners to use not more than four different sizes of cans without the written permission of the minister. These cans must contain a definite minimum amount of lobster meat, the amount to be stated on the label. Therefore, from the standpoint of the public and of the consumer, the legislation is fair and should have been enacted long ago. My hon. friend says that the Bill of 1917 did not become effective until December 15 of last year. That is quite true, but the legislation was suspended, not for the reason that he gives, but because the canners had on hand a large quantity of labels and wanted to dispose of them before the Act came into effect. The same is true of British Columbia. Certain canning industries there are compelled by virtue of the Canned Foods Act to print upon the labels additional matter; they still have on their hands a considerable quantity of old labels and they desire that the application of the Act be postponed until the labels which they now have on hand are used.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If the weight of the dry meat is to be stated on the label, the present labels would not be suitable; they would have to be re-printed.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Yes, if the legislation is changed, new labels will probably have to be printed. However, that is not important. Under the statute of 1917, every canner of fish must apply to the can a label setting forth a true and correct description of the contents of the can, including the vernacular name and the minimum net weight of the fish in the can plainly printed in a conspicuous manner, and stating the name of the place where the same was packed. Now, the canners have been using a standard can for a long number of years. That standard can is known to the Canadian trade and to the export trade, and naturally the canners do not wish to change its size. They say—and I believe it is true,—that they cannot get into this can fourteen ounces of lobster meat without doing danger to the meat. It may be done in some cases, but in the majority of the cases it is not done, and the purchaser thinks that he is buying sixteen ounces of lobster meat. The canner asks that he be permitted to place in these cans the amount of lobster meat which the can will reasonably hold. The public are protected in the fact that the canner must state upon the label the exact amount of lobster meat in the can.

Mr. McKENZIE: Did the request for this legislation come from the exporters, or from the consuming public?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Well, I suppose it originated with the lobster canners. I have informed the committee of the action of the fisheries convention at Halifax, at which it was decided that legislation should be introduced as set forth in the resolution. It cannot be said that this legislation is in the interest of the canners only; it is equally in the interest of the consuming public.

Mr. COPP: Apparently my hon. friend has misunderstood my argument in regard to this matter. I understand that this proposed legislation, except in so far as it reduces the amount of dry lobster meat to be placed in the cans, does not change the legislation of 1917. My hon. friend's suggestion that we should have this legislation in order to secure uniformity, is not an answer to my argument. The point I make is that we now have this legislation on the statute book; why make the change?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: For this reason: The statute of 1917 provided that a pound can should contain fourteen ounces of lobster meat; the trade says that is impossible. If the trade is right in its representation, the amendment is a proper one.

Mr. COPP: What evidence can the minister give the committee that the trade is right in stating that fourteen ounces of lobster meat cannot be put into a pound can?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I have already given my hon. friend the reasons. At a conference attended by the lobster canners of the Maritime provinces and technical offi-

cers of the Fisheries Department, it was agreed that twelve ounces would be the proper statutory requirement for the pound can, because the greater quantity could not well be placed there. It may be partly a compromise; I do not say that you could not put twelve and-a-half ounces in the can, or that some packers could not put thirteen in it. But it is better to say that every can of lobster must contain a specified quantity of lobster meat, than to say that a pound can shall contain fourteen ounces, when in all human probability it cannot contain that amount.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend is like myself, not an expert, and he says that the officials in the Fisheries Department are. The officials in the department here who have charge of the fisheries, were before the Committee, and that was not the information they gave, nor was it the information upon which the Committee made their recommendations to this House. Let me quote the words of one whom I consider an expert in the matter—and I am sure the minister will agree with me in calling him an expert—a man who has quite as good a reputation in the fishery business as some of the officials in the Department of Marine and Fisheries. In this House, on September 6th, 1917, the hon. member for Northumberland, N.B. (Mr. Loggie), who has a very great interest in this matter, made these remarks which will be found on page 5426 of the revised Hansard:

> Mr. Loggie: I happen to be a member of the committee to which this Bill was referred but unfortunately I was absent when it was under discussion. I certainly would not have given my assent to the report of the committee as it came before the House, nor to the Bill as it passed the House and went to the Senate. As to the contents of tins, whether they should be 16 ounces of dry meat, or 13, or 14, or 15 ounces, that is a matter of opinion. It has not been the practice to put 16 ounces of dry meat in a pound can of lobster for a good many years.

He does not say that it could not be done, but that it has not been the practice for a good many years. Evidently it must be inferred that, for a good many years, packers of lobsters in the Maritime provinces honestly wanted to give the consumer 16 ounces to the pound, and that for a good many years they did that. But, he says, that for a good many years they have not been putting in 16 ounces. He continues:

> Dry lobsters are not considered as acceptable to the trade as those that have a little juice in the can when it is opened. It has been the practice for many years by most packers to put 15 ounces of meat in a pound can and one ounce of pickle.

If it was the practice for many years to put into the can fifteen ounces avoirdupois of dry lobster meat with one ounce of pickle to preserve it, surely the same can might now be held to contain at least fourteen ounces of dry meat and one ounce of pickle. My hon. friend said that I was altogether wrong with regard to the reason why the coming into force of the Act was delayed until the 15th December, 1918. If I remember correctly, he was not a member of that committee and did not hear the arguments adduced before it. I had the privilege of being present, and I took some interest in the discussion; and while I will not say that the question of labels was not considered at all, I have a very distinct recollection that one of the strongest arguments made for delaying the coming into force of the Act 15th December, 1918, was that many of the lobster packers had their cans ready for that year's operation; further that they had the machinery for making the cans, and it would mean quite a loss to them if they had to change that machinery before another year's operations.

Mr. LOGGIE: Who gave the evidence regarding the machinery?

Mr. COPP: Quite a large number of those who professed to know the lobster business gave the information to the Committee. My hon. friend himself gave some information with regard to it.

Mr. LOGGIE: Not to that effect.

Mr. COPP: And he gave information, as he gave the House information in 1917, that the cans for many years contained fifteen ounces of lobster meat. He advises us now that there should be at least fourteen ounces of dry lobster meat in the one-pound cans. He is prepared to stand behind the recommendation that was made by that committee. He told the acting minister, before the dinner recess, that at the conference at Halifax he advised the delegates not to make application for a change. I am not taking the ground that the cans should not be labelled; that the packer's name should not be on the can; nor that the amount of dry lobster meat should not be stated on the can. My hon. friend apparently misunderstands my position. I say that those regulations are placed in the statute book now and they have never been in operation since Parliament passed the legislation; and now, to suit the whim of a few individuals—and he does not give the Committee the advantage of knowing who is making application for this change—he asks Parliament to change the enactments made in 1917

and not coming into force until December, 1918. He says that we were all wrong then and that we should go back to the time when the lobster packers were imposing upon the consumer a one-pound can which, as my hon. friend stated to-night, contained only twelve or sometimes thirteen ounces. Until we have further information, this committee should not be asked to pass this resolution, nor the House to pass the Bill to be founded on it.

Mr. LOGGIE: I presume the hon. member (Mr. Copp) was a member of the Marine and Fisheries Committee when they asked this House to pass the legislation making the net weight thirteen ounces. That recommendation for a thirteen-ounce can came from the Marine and Fisheries Committee. When it came before this House, I was absent. This House changed the weight, making it sixteen ounces, and sent the Bill up to the Senate. The Senate rejected it, and it came back to this House, and the weight was compromised at fourteen ounces. Thus it became effective on the day the hon. gentleman has mentioned. Let me tell the Committee why this legislation is asked for.

Mr. COPP: That is what we are endeavouring to find out.

Mr. LOGGIE: A number of years ago, Parliament passed an Act to provide that all canned goods should bear a statement of net weight.

Mr. COPP: When was that passed?

Mr. LOGGIE: I cannot recall exactly, but it was quite a number of years ago. I am not sure whether the net weight was to be on the can or not, but the name of the firm was to be set out on the label. On account of that and because of legislation in the United States that compelled all packers to put on the label the net contents of the can, it became desirable that a similar law should become effective in Canada.

Mr. COPP: Was that after reciprocity was defeated or before?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: In what year was reciprocity defeated?

Mr. LOGGIE: I can recall in what year reciprocity was defeated, but that has nothing to do with this matter. The reason for this legislation is that the Department of Marine and Fisheries have asked that a standard weight be made law as to the net contents of a can of lobster.

Mr. COPP: We have that now.

Mr. LOGGIE: My hon. friend is asking why this legislation was asked for. I am pointing out that the demand came from the Department of Marine and Fisheries.

Mr. COPP: And we answered the demand.

Mr. LOGGIE: The Marine and Fisheries Committee in 1917, recommended thirteen ounces. The House, however, made the net weight sixteen ounces, and in the Senate this was changed to fourteen ounces. The acting minister spoke of six cans the net contents of not one of which weighed fourteen ounces. There is a difference of two ounces in some cases. The object of this legislation is to have a uniform weight. Personally, I have no objection to the law as it now stands, but the majority of the large packers when they met in Halifax decided that twelve ounces should be the standard weight.

Mr. COPP: That is more profitable for them than sixteen ounces.

Mr. LOGGIE: The selling price is based on the net contents. This legislation has been in contemplation for some time, and some of the packers have their labels marked at fourteen ounces—

Mr. COPP: What right had they to assume that Parliament would pass this legislation?

Mr. LOGGIE: Fourteen ounces is the weight under the present law. I have already told my friend that the law in the United States requires the net weight to be shown on the label on every can of lobster entering the United States for consumption there. That has been the law for some years, and when we were getting labels we naturally had the net weight shown on them. So far as the company in which I am interested is concerned, the net weight on the label is fourteen ounces for the pound can, and seven ounces for the half-pound. Personally, I favour fourteen ounces, but I am willing to bow to the wishes of the majority.

Mr. COPP: My hon. friend is prepared to lose the money he has spent on labels, because of the extra profit he will make by reason of the reduction of the net contents of the can by two ounces.

Mr. LOGGIE: I am extremely obliged for the hon. gentleman's interpretation. After all, it is not a very serious matter to have the labels stamped. I have been in

the unfortunate situation of sending cans into the United States without the net weight being shown on the labels and have had to remove the cans from the boxes and have them stamped—the existing law was not in effect in the United States when we had the labels made. If Parliament prescribes the weight in this case to be twelve ounces, I shall be very glad to conform to the law, although I prefer the fourteen-ounce can. Many years ago there seemed to be a demand for what we call dry lobster, but conditions have changed and the trade now seems to want a lobster with some liquid in the can. The mode of packing is changed from time to time to conform with the public's taste. The hon. gentleman knows that in the lobster itself there is some liquid, and now the packers put in half an ounce or an ounce of pickle, because the can would not be acceptable to buyers without some liquid.

Mr. CuPP: The hon. gentleman has not answered my question with regard to the reduction in the contents by two ounces.

Mr. LEGER: The reasons advanced for this legislation do not satisfy me of its necessity. Why cannot a can be made to hold sixteen ounces of lobster? If the present cans are not large enough, why not make larger cans? In the district from which I come lobsters are bought by the pound, and if the weight in the can is to be reduced to twelve ounces, the consumer will lose two or three ounces on every pound he buys. Furthermore, what consideration is being given to the fisherman? The packers when buying from the fishermen demand sixteen ounces to the pound. It would seem to me that the consumer has been defrauded of a few ounces on every can he has bought for a great many years. I used to think I was getting a pound of lobster when I bought one of these cans, but now I find I was being cheated out of two or three ounces every time. One would think a lobster was one of the precious metals, which weigh twelve ounces to the pound. I think we should fix a standard weight, and if the cans the packers are now using will not hold a pound let them make larger cans, rather than pass eleven or twelve ounces off for a pound.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I do not think the minister ought to press the resolution after the discussion we have just heard. The main reason he gives us is that you could not get more than fourteen ounces, or at least more than twelve ounces, properly into a can. My hon. friend from Northumberland, who is a well known packer and who knows the trade as well as any man in the Maritime Provinces, is able to put fourteen ounces into the can. He does not say you cannot put fourteen ounces in, and his view is evidently directly opposed to that of the minister. We are told that the packers from the Maritime Provinces met in Halifax and decided that a twelve ounce can would be better than a fourteen ounce can. Why? Because they would save that much of the meat. They will not sell that can for one cent less than the can containing fourteen ounces. I have just been making a calculation, and on the pack in the Maritime Provinces, they will save no less than about $400,000 if this Bill passes, while the consumer will lose to that extent. Now, that is why the packers were unanimous in the matter. Of course, they would be unanimous! And next year they might be unanimous in the opinion that ten ounces would be sufficient to put into a pound can. These arguments do not convince me at all, and I do not believe they convince the minister. I think this matter ought to be delayed until further investigation has been made. Questions of this kind are generally referred to the Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: My hon. friend might have patience enough until there is something to refer to the committee. It was my intention, and still is, that the Bill should go to the committee.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: But the resolution?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The resolution cannot go to the committee; my hon. friend knows that. When the Bill is introduced it will go to the committee.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: If we pass this resolution it means that we have consented to the principle of the Bill, and that is the reason I ask that the resolution be withdrawn.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think that inasmuch as a Bill similar to this, when introduced in 1917, was sent to the Committee on Fisheries, it will be only proper that this proposed Bill should go to the same committee. But you cannot manufacture a Bill in a minute. Unfortunately the rules of Parliament demand—and without any good purpose, in my opinion—that a Bill of this character should be preceded by a resolution.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the reason?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Oh, I do not want to go into that question just now; but gen-

erally speaking, the reason is because the measure involves expenditure of public money. It is very difficult to 9 p.m. see why this particular Bill should require a resolution. Personally I do not believe that any Bill should require a resolution, and I hope that some day the rule in this respect will be amended.

Mr. McKENZIE: I understand that any money Bill requires a resolution. That is the practice. But why does this Bill require a resolution? Does it require any expenditure of public money?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: This Bill is only emendatory of the Meats and Canned Foods Act, which involves an expenditure of money for inspection and other purposes. If the Bill were to be considered just by itself, possibly no resolution would be required; but it is the opinion of the law officer of the House that the Bill must be preceded by a resolution. Now as soon as the Bill is introduced it will go to the committee. I fail to see why hon. gentlemen opposite are disposed to think that the public interests will suffer by reason of this Bill. The hon. member for Kent (Mr. Leger) thinks that it is a very dangerous principle to reduce the content of any can, or rather he expressed surprise that a container contains a given number of ounces. My hon. friend might as well suggest that a barrel of flour which has contained 196 pounds for a number of years should be made to contain 200 or 201, or something like that. There is no particular virtue about fourteen ounces as the quantity that a lobster can should contain. In fact, 12 ounces is a much better weight because it is three-quarters of a pound, and the content is more easily calculated by the purchasing public; and I would say that upon that ground, if I were asked for my personal judgment, it would be better to have a twelve-ounce than a fourteen-ounce can. But I have told the committee——

Mr. ROBB: Would a sixteen-ounce can not be much better and more satisfactory to the public?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Possibly it might; but gentlemen who know something about the business, and who are in a position to speak authoritatively on the matter, say that you cannot get sixteen ounces into the present can, which is a well-established container.

Mr. ROBB: Make the can larger.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: True, you can make the can larger; and you can make the flour barrel larger so as to contain 200 pounds. These are simply standardized measures, and so long as the public know the standard measurement no interest can suffer.

Mr. LEGER: The hon. minister says that the barrel containing 196 pounds of flour might be made to contain 200 or 201 pounds. We never calculate a barrel of flour on more than 196 pounds; it is marked on it.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: Therefore if a pound can of lobster contains twelve ounces, there would be no purpose in calculating on thirteen, or fourteen ounces or anything else, because it is a standard weight. This Bill proposes to establish the standards of weights in four certain sizes of cans for packing lobster.

Mr. COPP: What would you say if the millers came and asked you to change the law so that they could put 165 pounds into their barrels?

Mr. LEGER: If the committee desire to put fourteen ounces into the can, I would like it to be understood that the fishermen shall get fourteen ounces too.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: I think we can all agree that the fishermen will get it. Now, as I said in response to the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair), it was my intention that the Bill to be founded on this resolution shall be referred to a committee, who, if they see fit, may again have a hearing of witnesses, just as in 1917.

Mr. TURGEON: It has been stated by the Acting Minister of Fisheries that it had been the custom for years to have no special weight of lobster in the can, and that packers placed anywhere between twelve and sixteen ounces of the dry fish in the can, and that the reason why legislation had been introduced was that public opinion compelled it. The public had found out that on many an occasion they had been deceived, and that instead of getting fourteen or fifteen ounces of dry lobster, they were getting twelve ounces and paying for a pound. That, as I understand it, was the reason for the introduction of legislation. The hon. member for Northumberland is one of the largest packers, and controls perhaps over forty canneries in New Brunswick, half of them in the county of Gloucester which I have the honour to represent. We had him as an authority before the committee. He had not been satisfied when

the committee originally recommended that sixteen ounces be placed in the can in order to satisfy the public that they were getting value for what they were paying. After an experience of forty years in the business, the largest canner in the Maritime provinces and the keenest of them all, he declared that he was satisfied with the decision to put fourteen ounces in the can, and that decision was accepted by everybody. I have been interested in the lobster industry all my life. I represent the largest lobster fishing county in New Brunswick. I know something about the industry, and I know that if you have fourteen ounces of dry meat in a can you have a better quality of lobster than if you have only twelve ounces. That does not matter so much to the lobster packers, if they can get a regulation adopted which will permit them to put twelve ounces in a one-pound can. The people will pay the same price for the can containing twelve ounces of dry meat as they paid for the can containing fourteen ounces. The statute passed in 1917 was not to go into effect until December, 1918, and now we have the minister asking that we cancel that legislation. The canners have no excuse now for asking that the legislation be not put into force, because they have their cans made to contain fourteen ounces of dry meat. A can containing twelve ounces of dry meat will not appeal to the public. I do not see why this resolution is brought in. The hon. member for Northumberland is willing to stand by the minister now, but in the testimony which he gave before the committee in 1917 he expressed himself as ready to accept the provision which was then made. Public opinion will be against this change, and will be more strongly against it when it is put in operation. I advise my hon. friend, as strongly and as urgently as I can, to withdraw this legislation. It will have a bad effect upon the people.

Mr. LOGGIE: In the list of cans packed that we have here, there are two that are under twelve ounces.

Mr. COPP: When were they packed?

Mr. LOGGIE: I do not know.

Mr. COPP: They were packed before there was any regulation regarding the weight at all.

Mr. LOGGIE: No, I do not think so.

Mr. COPP: There was no Act at all before the 15th December, 1918.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: That would not make any difference.

[Mr. Turgeon.]

Mr. LOGGIE: I do not know that it would make any difference.

Mr. COPP: I do not see why it would not make a difference if they were not packed according to this law. They were packed according to the old law, and there was not any regulation whatever.

Mr. LOGGIE: There was not any regulation until this law came into force. But the large packers, meeting at Halifax, discussed the matter fairly and openly, and contended that more than six ounces of dry lobster meat could not be put in the present half-pound can without crushing the meat too much. As for the public interest, personally I do not see how it is not protected. When I pack a can of No. 2 blueberries the net contents are not more than twenty ounces, and yet this is known as a No. 2 can to the public. In the United States they compel us to put the net weight on. The Canadian Government is doing the same thing now. The object is to make the law uniform, that tinned goods must have the net contents on the label. The Robert Simpson Company of Halifax and O'Leary & Lee, of Halifax, are by all odds the largest handlers of canned lobsters in Canada. The hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) has referred to the output of our firm. It is only a fraction of that of the Robert Simpson Company of Halifax. The representatives of these two leading firms, at the convention in Halifax, came to the conclusion that twelve ounces was the proper weight of dry meat.

Mr. ROBB: My hon. friend said this afternoon that he opposed that idea.

Mr. LOGGIE: The hon. gentleman had better understand what I did. I did not oppose that idea at Halifax; I did not take any part in the discussion. I opposed it on the floor of the House, as the hon. member for Westmorland (Mr. Copp) pointed out. I said when they proposed thirteen ounces that if I had been present at the committee on Marine and Fisheries and they had suggested thirteen ounces I would have opposed it. I also said that if I had been present on the floor of Parliament when they changed it to sixteen ounces I would have opposed that. I agreed with the compromise of fourteen ounces when it came back from the Senate. That is all I said upon the matter.

Mr. TURGEON: If the hon. gentleman was satisfied with fourteen ounces at the time why is he not satisfied now?

Mr. LOGGIE: As far as I am personally concerned I am satisfied, but the majority of the packers are not satisfied.

Mr. TURGEON: If the hon. gentleman, with all his experience, was satisfied with fourteen ounces, why does he now tell the House that fourteen ounces is impracticable. The moment you put in four ounces of pickle you reduce the efficiency of the pickle to the extent of the water that you add. You may put in as much as you like but you reduce the quality of the fish. We have had water-soaked bacon upon the market. It makes it heavier but it does not improve the quality. The same thing applies to lobster.

Mr. LOGGIE: I presume from the remarks of the hon. gentleman that he is an expert, and it is fair to infer that Robert Simpson and Company, O'Leary and Lee, and the other large packers, do not know what the effect will be when there are only twelve ounces in a can instead of fourteen ounces.

Mr. DUFF: I suggest to the hon. member the effect will be that Robert Simpson and Company and the other packers will make a lot of money.

Mr. LOGGIE: I differ from the hon. gentleman. I think these goods will be sold on their merits according to the standard weight of the can; the public interest will be conserved, and no interest will suffer, in my judgment. As far as I am concerned, however, I am quite willing to abide by the decision of the committee, and I would suggest that the resolution be passed, as the minister has suggested, and that experts representing such firms as Robert Simpson and Company, and O'Leary and Lee, be sent for. Let them give their evidence before the Fisheries Committee, and then let the committee pass judgment, having heard the evidence. I have already given mine as far as I could do so.

Mr. DENIS: I strongly support the advice that has just been given by the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) who has urged the Government to withdraw this resolution. My information is to the effect that when the old Parliament Buildings were burned, the hon. member for Northumberland (Mr. Loggie) was making a speech on the lobster industry, and I think I should have the unanimous support of the committee in saying that we should now do everything in our power to avoid a repetition of that disaster.

Mr. MICHAUD: I think we ought to follow the advice of the hon. member for Gloucester (Mr. Turgeon) who has also given us the opinion of other lobster packers throughout the Maritime Provinces. My hon. friend expresses the opinion that fourteen ounces ought to be put in a one-pound can, whereas others say the contents of a can should weigh twelve ounces. To settle the matter I would suggest that the committee adopt fourteen ounces as the weight, and leave the matter as it stands now.

Mr. FIELDING: I once got into trouble —I may have mentioned this before—by saying I represented more lobsters than any other man in the House, because it so happens that the constituency from which I come is very largely interested in the lobster industry. Besides, I was present during a portion of the proceedings of the Halifax convention, although, unfortunately, I was not there at the moment when this particular subject was discussed. I understood, however, that there were some differences of opinion, and that finally the convention came to a unanimous decision in line with what the minister is now proposing. Of course, it would be fair to say that it was largely a packers convention, but it was not called as a packers convention, but as a convention of all the fishing interests. But the average fisherman in my constituency can hardly afford to separate himself from his work and travel up to Halifax to spend two or three days at a convention. Consequently such a convention, although not invariably, becomes a convention of the large operators, and it was so there. Still, a man may be a large operator and a fairly respectable individual notwithstanding, and many of the gentlemen who were present at that meeting are known to me as business men of high rank. My hon. friend from Northumberland mentioned one or two of them here, and I am quite sure the motives they had were excellent. Now there is more room for controversy in the matter than I had thought there was. I was of opinion that a settlement had been reached after the action of the Halifax convention, but it seems to me now that the proposal of the Minister that the Bill should pass in its present stage, and then be referred to a Committee where evidence can be heard, is necessary in order to meet the wishes of the House.

Mr. DECHENE: We have heard a great deal about dried fish and dried lobster. I would ask that the Committee be told

whether the process used for drying lobster is the same process that is employed by Sir Joseph Flavelle for drying bacon.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there a standard measure for lobster cans?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The cans are not standardized by law, but by practice. Cans of certain sizes have been in use in the lobster industry in Nova Scotia for a great number of years.

Mr. McKENZIE: It would strike me, Mr. Chairman, that when we legislate that a can shall contain fourteen ounces and then discover that a can which has been in use for a great many years is not big enough to hold that quantity, the logical thing would be to insist upon a larger can and not cut down the statutory weight. What is the good of saying in our legislation that there must be fourteen ounces of lobster meat in a can, and then drop the legislation and say, "Oh, we forgot, the can is too small?" I think it is altogether illogical.

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: The statutory requirement was to the effect that a one-pound can should contain fourteen ounces avoirdupois. That is rather paradoxical in itself, and anomalous, because the public would be very apt to expect sixteen ounces avoirdupois in a pound can. When the statute referred to a pound can, what was contemplated was the standardized can in use in that particular trade in the Maritime Provinces and Newfoundland. The House of Commons and the Fisheries Committee knew that it was not possible to get sixteen ounces into a can. My hon. friend is quite right as to the desirability of making the can larger so that it would hold very much more meat. The question therefore is, will you prescribe the exact weight of lobster meat which can go into the standardized can, or will you change the standard can and put in more lobster? I am quite content to have the committee settle the matter.

Mr. McKENZIE: What my hon. friend says reminds me of a case in which I was trying to help a man to get a little money to build a better house, and I was giving as an argument that the man's wife had to get down on her knees to go through the door, and the reply was made: "That would not bother me; let him get a shorter wife." I think we should be logical about this matter and protect the consuming public. There are comparatively few packers and exporters, and there are millions of people who buy cans of lobster. As protecting this very large number of people we said, "When you go to the store to buy a pound can of lobster you will get fourteen ounces of meat." Well, the public have a right to believe it because we have put it on our statutes, and there it is. Our only excuse is that we have found we made a mistake, that the can is not big enough, and we cannot make a bigger one. But the public will not accept that as a logical protection to the man who is consuming this very excellent and useful food. I think myself we will have to acknowledge we have made a mistake and should never have passed that statute, or else we should live up to it.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: That is done away with by the evidence of the member for Northumberland, who states that he has been able to put fourteen ounces of lobster meat in his cans. The can now used by the lobster packers in the Maritime Provinces has been in use for many years. The member for Northumberland has the reputation of being a good packer, and one of the reasons why his goods are in demand all over the country is that his cans contain honest quantities. It has been contended by the packers that a can should not contain sixteen ounces of lobster meat because there must be some liquid in the can in order to preserve the meat, and the quantity of liquid necessary was arrived at as two ounces. The experience of the member for Northumberland corroborates that; two ounces of liquid is sufficient in his business, leaving fourteen ounces of dry meat. The size of the can, therefore, has nothing to do with this legislation; we are making this change simply because the lobster packers have asked us to do so. The only question now before us is this: Is the House of Commons going to surrender to a lobster combine?

Mr. A. K. MACLEAN: If this matter is considered by a committee, it will be competent for the committee to have packers and consumers appear before it, and judge of the merits of the case. Surely it is not asking too much to suggest that we pass the resolution so that the Bill may soon come before the Marine and Fisheries Committee.

Mr. DUFF: Why is it necessary to call the packers and the consumers here at great expense to themselves and to the country when we have the evidence on Hansard now? It would be better for the minister, when he brings down his Bill, to make the amount fourteen ounces instead of twelve.

Mr. LOGGIE: The quantity decided upon by the Marine and Fisheries Committee was thirteen ounces. The change was made by Parliament, not by the Committee.

Mr. DUFF: I understood the hon. gentleman to say that the Marine and Fisheries Committee decided on fourteen ounces, and that Parliament afterwards made it thirteen.

Mr. LOGGIE: The hon. gentleman is mistaken; I said nothing of the kind. The finding of the Marine and Fisheries Committee was thirteen ounces, and this was changed by this House to sixteen ounces. The Bill went to the Senate; the Senate changed it, and this House made the quantity fourteen ounces.

Resolution reported and concurred in.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 31, to amend the Meat and Canned Foods Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

REPRESENTATION ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the House proceeded to the consideration of Public Bills and Orders.

The House again in committee on Bill No. 2—Mr. Stacey—to amend the Representation Act, 1914, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Mr. STACEY: I have but little to add to the information given to the House when this Bill was introduced. It is simply to provide that the name of my constituency be changed. It is now known as the "Electoral District of Westminster District," a somewhat cumbersome term, which is much confused with that of the adjoining district known as New Westminster. The Bill asks that the name "Electoral District of Westminster District" be changed to "Electoral District of Fraser Valley."

Mr. CAHILL: Are my hon. friend's constituents in favour of the change?

Mr. STACEY: I am pleased to say that the change is desired by all concerned, irrespective of party affilliations or relations. "Fraser Valley" is the proper and suitable name for the constituency. I am sure that hon. members on both sides of the House who know the situation are unanimous as to the suitability of the term.

Bill reported, read the third time and passed.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the House proceeded to the consideration of the order; "Questions."

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

NEWSPAPER POSTAGE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What was the gross postal revenue derived from newspapers for the year 1918?
2. What is the estimated expenditure for the same year in so far as newspapers are concerned?
3. What is the average daily weight of newspapers carried in the mails?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. $291,539.21.
2. The department has no data on which a close estimate of the expenditure involved in handling newspapers can be made, except that newspapers make up about 65 per cent of the bulk of the mails. The total expenditure for the carriage of mails and the cost of mail bags during the fiscal year 1918 was $8,293,515.24.
3. 239,731 pounds.

NEW CARLISLE POSTMASTER.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Has a postmaster been appointed at New Carlisle, Quebec? If so, what is the name of the appointee.
2. Who were the applicants for the office, how were applications asked for, and how was the selection made?
3. What is the salary attached to this office?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes. Private Bertram Wilfrid Blois.
2. Pte. Bertram Wilfrid Blois, Sgt. Lionel Caldwell, Albert Mathew Caldwell, Lee R. Caldwell, Pte. Richard Flowers, George Milne Kempffer, James Octavius Shearer, Pte. M. Wheelhouse. When the office became vacant, the Civil Service Commission was asked to make a new appointment, and the selection of the new postmaster was made by the commission.
3. $1,410.

CARLETON MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Who is the contractor for the mail service at Carleton, Quebec, for the service between the railway station and Carleton, Carleton Centre and Point Bourque offices?
2. What is the amount paid, and what is the duration of the contract?
3. Has any change been made in the last two years in this service?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. N. LeBlanc.

2. $359 per annum under contract expiring 31st December, 1921.

3. Ex-Contractor Landry refused to continue the service unless granted an increase in his rate of payment. Tenders were invited in October, 1917, and a contract, dating from 24th January, 1918, awarded to N. LeBlanc, the lowest tenderer.

CANADA REGISTRATION ACT.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many persons were registered under the Canada Registration Act?
2. What is the total cost to date of said registration?
3. Are any claims yet unpaid?
4. What is the total amount of same?
5. When may the claimants expect payment?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. 5,245,606.

2. $631,230.89 including cost of compilation.

3. Yes.

4. About $15,000.

5. When the claimants have complied with the regulations, and submit necessary vouchers in support of their claims.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INFORMATION.

Mr. KAY:

1. What has been the total cost to the country of the Department of Public Information from its inception to the end of 1918?
2. How many employees are at present in the Department?
3. What is the present total cost of the department per month?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the operations of this department?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Total $81,414.84.

2. 25.

3. $4,400 per month exclusive of cost of printing and cables, which varies from month to month. At the present time these expenses paid by the department are running about $7,400 per month.

4. The matter is under the consideration of the Government, and an announcement will be made in due course.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What is the total cost from March 31, 1917, to March 31, 1918, of the Department of Public Information?
2. How many persons were employed in this Department on March 1, 1919?
3. How many branches of work are being undertaken by this department?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. The total cost of the Department of Public Information from its inception to March 31, 1918, was approximately $18,000.

[Mr. Marcil.]

2. 25.

3. Two branches, one comprising press publicity and related subjects; the other platform publicity and subjects related thereto.

CANADA REGISTRATION BOARD.

Mr. KAY:

1. Is the Canada Registration Board still in existence? If so, how many employees has it and what is the monthly cost to the country?
2. What was the total cost of registering the men and women of Canada in the summer of 1918?
3. What practical use has been made of the information secured by this registration?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. No, the services of the last employee were dispensed with February 12, 1919.

2. $491,900.44.

3. (a) Approximately 107,000 volunteers for agricultural work were secured, and names and addresses given to provincial authorities, who drew largely from this supply;

(b) A complete list of the names and addresses of French, Belgian and Italian citizens in Canada of military age was prepared, at the request of the Consuls-General, for recruiting purposes on completion of the conventions between these countries and Canada, which were in process of negotiation.

(c) The names and addresses of approximately 66,000 Russians in Canada were on application furnished to the Department of Justice.

(d) A complete tabulation, by ages, was made, showing all men physically fit, of every nationality; thereby providing accurate information as to available man-power for military purposes for use had the war continued and further drafts been necessary.

(e) Various other tables of important information gathered from the registration statistics showing the number of male persons, British born, British naturalized and of alien birth or naturalization, by constituencies, have been tabulated and will appear in the board's printed report.

(f) Tabulated information respecting the number of workmen available and skilled in various trades, to enable the best possible distribution of labour, would have been prepared had the Armistice not intervened, thereby rendering the expense of compiling this information unnecessary.

CANADIAN DAILY RECORD.

Mr. VIEN:

1. Is the Canadian Daily Record still published and distributed?

2. Up to the 1st of March inst., how many numbers have been published?
3. Where can the complete file of this Government publication be had?
4. Why is that Canadian Government publication not distributed to the members?
5. Why is not a complete file of this publication available in the members' reading room?
6. How much has the publication of this paper cost the public up to the 1st March, 1919?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. 658.
3. At the office of the Director of Public Information, Hope Chambers, Ottawa.
4. The Canadian Daily Record has been printed solely for the use of Canadian soldiers overseas and copies have not been distributed in Canada. Any member of Parliament may have copies regularly addressed to him on request.
5. Answered by number 4.
6. From June 1, 1917, to March 1, 1919, the cost of the Canadian Daily Record was approximately $94,000. The first number of the paper was published on January 16, 1917, but figures from that date to June, 1917, are not available at present.

MESSRS. BRODERICK AND SOWDEN.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Did Michael E. Broderick and Felix M. Sowden, of the Post Office Department, enlist for the war and go overseas?
2. Have they since returned to the Post Office Department at Ottawa?
3. Have they participated in the regular promotions which have been made in their Department?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. No.
3. Promotions in the Inside Service can only be made when vacancies occur in the higher grades and are not made at regular intervals. The officers mentioned have, however, received the regular statutory increases of salary each year since they enlisted.

DORCHESTER POST OFFICE.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the Government opened any post offices in the County of Dorchester during the year 1917?
2. If so, where and on what dates?
3. What salary does each postmaster receive?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.
2. Anvers—Township of Cranbourne, opened January 24, 1917; Drouin—Township of Standon, opened January 25, 1917; Dijon—Township of Standon, opened September 11, 1917.
3. $60 a year.

DORCHESTER MAIL SERVICE.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Did the Government make any new contracts for the conveyance of mails in the County of Dorchester during the year 1917?
2. If so, to whom were they given, and for what routes?
3. What amounts have been paid to such mail contractors?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.

2 and 3. The following statement gives names of routes, names of the several contractors, the amount paid per annum, and the date in 1917 on which new contract went into effect and from which contractor was paid: Anvers and Culdaff, R. Bolduc, $156.50, 25th January; Cadrin and St. Anselme, A. Royer, $100, 1st January; Chemin Nelf and Standon, J. Bouffard, $160, 20th September; Dijon and St. Abdon, J. Vachon, $125, 11th September; Drouin and Standon, C. Corriveau, $190, 26th January; Fir Grove and Frampton, D. Lacasse, $930, 1st April; Frampton and Springbrook, D. Lacasse, $100, 1st April; Genest and St. Bernard de Dorchester, N. Nadeau, $49.75, 1st July; Guindon and St. Prosper de Dorchester, A. Grenier, $175, 1st October; Lacasse and Standon, P. Brousseau, $96, 1st January; O'Farrell and St. Malachie, F. Pare, $200, 1st January; Poliquin and Ste. Rose de Watford, J. Lacasse, $100, 1st October; Ste. Aurelie and St. Prosper de Dorchester, A. Vachon, $550, 22nd October; St. Bernard de Dorchester Rural Route No. 2, A. Laflamme, $425, 16th July; Ste. Henedine Rural Route No. 1, A. Royer, $400, 4th June; Ste. Henedine and Railway Station, J. Labbe, $200, 1st October; St. Prosper de Dorchester Rural Route No. 1, P. Nolet, $939, 2nd May; Ste. Rose de Watford Rural Route No. 1, L. Morin, $362, 1st April.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the House reverted to Government Orders.

GOOD ROADS.

AID TO PROVINCES FOR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals) the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution, Mr. Nickle in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to provide that for the purpose of constructing and improving highways in Canada, the Governor in Council may authorize the payment out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada of the sum of

twenty million dollars during the period of five years from the first day of April, 1919; which sum shall be allotted and paid as follows: (a) eighty thousand dollars each year to the Government of each province, and (b) the remainder of such sum to the Governments of the respective provinces, in proportion to the populations of the said provinces respectively, as determined by the latest Federal census of each province; and the said payments shall be subject to the following conditions: (a) any highway for which aid is granted shall be constructed or improved, as the case may be, in accordance with the terms of an agreement to be made by the minister with the Government of the province, which agreement shall contain such provisions as to cost, description, specifications or otherwise as the Governor in Council may approve; (b) the aid to be given in any case shall be forty per cent of the amount which in the opinion of the minister is the actual, necessary and reasonable cost of the construction or improvement of such highway, as the case may be; and further that regulations may be made for giving effect to the objects and purposes of this proposed legislation, and an annual report thereon shall be laid before Parliament.

Hon. Mr. REID: This is a very important resolution. If it becomes law, it means the expenditure of a very large amount of money on a very important work. I would like to have the resolution passed and the Bill introduced, and when the Bill comes before the committee we shall, of course, have a discussion as to its merits. The resolution is important for this reason: We all know that for many years the Government have been expending large amounts of money on railways and waterways, and we feel it is now necessary to expend money on our highways in order to provide proper transportation facilities for the public. A good deal has already been done towards improving our highways, but much more must be done. A very large amount of money will have to be expended almost immediately in order to bring our highways up to the proper standard. In this connection the Government have taken into consideration the necessity of providing employment for our returned soldiers as well as for other labour throughout the Dominion that is at present calling for employment. If Parliament passes the Bill to be founded on this resolution, the Dominion Government will pay a portion of the cost of the highways, the construction of which we agree to assist. The several provinces have divided their roads into three classes, which they call respectively first class, second class and third class.

The first-class roads are the main highways which carry the greatest amount of traffic. The second-class roads are the ones leading to the market centres, which do not bear so much traffic. The third-class roads are those leading up to the other two.

The intention of the Government is to assist only in the building of the first-class roads. The second-class roads are built by the provincial government and the municipalities, and the third-class roads by the municipalities.

Practically all civilized countries have received assistance in the building of roads from their central governments. In the country to the south of us, the different states of the Union started to build roads of their own accord, but afterwards the Government at Washington came to their assistance, and now a large amount is being spent by the federal government in the building and upkeep of the main highways. There are many reasons why we should have good roads. First, I believe that good roads will be of great assistance to our rural population. They will decrease the cost of transportation from the farm to the market. To-day, at certain seasons of the year it is almost impossible for farmers living twenty, or thirty, or forty miles from any large centre, such as Ottawa, Toronto, Hamilton or Montreal, to reach the central markets by road. Good roads will enable them to take advantage of these central markets. Furthermore, the building of these roads will provide employment for a great many of our citizens, and particularly the returned soldiers, for whom employment must be found. Good roads will also facilitate passenger traffic between different parts of the country. In the United States quite a lot of passenger traffic is done on their main highways by means of the automobile. The value of land in the sections through which these roads will run will also be very greatly increased —to a degree, I believe, almost equal to the amount of money expended on the construction of the roads. Then we shall have a great many tourists coming to Canada, and they will naturally leave a great deal of money in this country, and many of them will no doubt like Canada so well that they will make their home here. Good roads will also save our rural population a great deal of money by the slower depreciation of their vehicles, and will add greatly to the convenience of country life. Practically the whole rural population of Canada at the present time have the telephone. Now, in case of sudden illness, with good roads and the telephone a physician could be summoned to any part of the country and could get there in quick time. I have travelled over a great many miles of the good roads of the United States, and the people there are unanimous in saying that the roads which

the Federal Government has constructed are one of the greatest assets of the country.

Hon. members will remember that the House of Commons passed similar legislation to this in 1912, but that it was rejected by the Senate as that Chamber did not think public opinion would approve of money being spent on highways at that time. The Bill was passed a second time by this Chamber, but was again rejected by the Senate. At the last election the Prime Minister reaffirmed the Government's policy of assisting in the construction of national highways.

We would like to have this Bill passed for the purpose of giving employment to those who are in need of it at this time. The principal reason for it is not so much to give employment as that the work is of the utmost importance and should, we think, be proceeded with in order to facilitate transportation. If hon. members can see their way clear this evening, I would like to have the resolution passed so that the Bill may be read a first time and printed. I do not wish to urge the Bill, after it has got its first reading, until hon. members have had time to consider it and thoroughly understand what it intends.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister kindly tell the Committee if the policy of the Government in regard to this matter is the same as it was when they first introduced the Bill in 1912?

Mr. J. D. REID: No, this is not exactly the same.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is the difference?

Mr. J. D. REID: The distribution of our contribution is different from what it was at that time. However, so far as that is concerned, I am willing, when it comes to the Committee, if necessary, to amend it in any way.

Mr. McKENZIE: What I really wished to ask the minister is, does the Government still adhere to the policy it adopted in 1912 as to the class of roads upon which this money is to be expended?

Mr. J. D. REID: Yes; the intention at that time was to expend money only on first-class roads, and that is the intention now.

Mr. PROULX: Are the roads classified by the officers of the Dominion Government or by officers of the province?

Mr. J. D. REID: The roads will be classified on specifications to be agreed on between the Dominion and the province. After the road has been located and specifications have been agreed upon the Dominion Government will have an inspector who will see that the road is constructed in accordance with the specification, and the Dominion Government will not agree to make expenditures except on first-class roads.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (East York): I understand that about three years ago a measure somewhat similar to this was before the House. I believe it was for the purpose of building a transcon-

10 p.m. tinental highway of a high standard, and the responsibility was to be entirely with the Dominion Government. Now you have changed your attitude somewhat by placing the responsibility of this Government upon the provincial government; that is, I understand this $20,000,000, to be spread over five years, is to be divided amongst the various provinces. Three standards of road construction are mentioned. I do not know what the specifications or standards are, but I venture to say that the standard of even No. 1 would not be sufficient for a transcontinental highway of the standard that should be built. We have a standard in the Toronto-Hamilton highway which is the best and highest of any construction in Canada, but I do not think that even that construction, if we are going to build a transcontinental highway with the increased traffic between the various centres, would be sufficient. This Government should adopt the best standard, looking to the future. They should take the responsibility, if they adopt the policy of the transcontinental highway, of the expenditure of that money. Why should we divide up this money and hand it to the provinces, whose system is one of patronage, as we know? This Government knows no patronage, and the experience with the Toronto-Hamilton highway, which was built under the provincial government, was that we got only about 60 or 65 cents on the dollar of that construction. Where did the other 35 cents go? I would say, perhaps in the way of patronage, or bad management, or lack of experience; but at any rate we did not get 100 cents on the dollar in value on that construction. Then, if that is the experience in connection with provincial work in the past, why should we hand more money over to the provinces and get only 60 cents on the dollar for the money we are going to expend? If we are going to adopt a policy of highways that means a large expenditure spread over some years, then let us have our own equipment, our own engineers, and act on our own respon-

sibility, and see that we get full value for the money spent. There will be no patronage if the Dominion Government spends this money, but under the provincial system there is unlimited patronage, and you know what that means, so far as getting value is concerned.

I think the idea of spending money to give work to the unemployed is commendable if you can really give work to the unemployed, but as I said the other day, I am afraid that this undertaking of spending $20,000,000 by this Government will not accomplish what we would like to see accomplished. It has been stated that this is to give employment to the returned soldier. I said the other night, and I say again now, that the returned soldier is not looking for pick and shovel work, he is not going to respond to the call for that kind of employment. Then if the returned soldier does not respond, whom will you call on? The next class of unemployed are the men in the large cities. There are thousands in the various cities, but will you get any response from them? The unemployed in the cities, where they have their families and homes, will not, I think, go twenty, or thirty, or fifty miles for employment. And what class of people are they? They are not labourers; they are mechanics, and perhaps clerks, men who are not used to the pick and shovel. I venture to say they will not respond to the call to that kind of work. Well, if that class does not respond, where will you draw from? It is said that we have prepared specifications and so on and are prepared to go on with the construction. If we are, we must get men; and who will respond to the call for that work. It will be the men in the villages and towns. It is surely not our intention to spend $20,000,000 to draw men from the farm when we want them to produce and to help to reduce the high cost of living. You are going to increase the high cost of living by drawing labour from the farm. The farm labourer will say: Work on the highways will mean shorter hours and a larger amount of money for me than I can earn elsewhere. He will then get $3.50 or $4.50 a day, while on the farm he will get $2 or $2.50, and he will work on the highways eight hours a day, whereas on the farm he will work ten or twelve. You are going to draw from that class of the community. We should be very careful in handling this matter and making this expenditure.

I think there is another method that might be adopted and by which we would get very much better results. Instead of saying that we are going to spend this money on highways to give work to soldiers and to the unemployed in the cities, from whom you would not get a response, spend $10,000,000 or $15,000,000, buy tractors and farm implements and say to the returned soldiers who are offering to go on the land: We will supply you with tractors, ploughs and the necessary implements to enable you to carry on your work. The Government will purchase these. They will send practical operators to run the tractors. They will break up the land and they will thus be producing and encouraging young men to take up farming. After a young man has broken up 100 acres of land and has got through his first year, the Government might say: We will sell you a tractor and the necessary implements to continue your work. I venture to say that if he is successful in the first year in producing a crop he will be in a position, with reasonable conditions, to buy these implements. Such a policy would help to increase production. On the other hand, you are not increasing production and you are drawing the producer away from a productive occupation to one that is going to be unproductive from the standpoint of increasing the food supply of the country and reducing the high cost of living. I think the subject is of such importance that the House should give it thorough consideration, should debate it from A to Z, and see whether this is the right thing to do or whether we cannot do something better than what is here proposed. Therefore, if we hand this large amount of money over to the municipalities who are not responsible to this Government, and if highways are built that are not up to the standard, the public will hold this Government accountable. That is the way the Government do things; they hand their money over to somebody else to spend for them, and they only get value representing fifty or sixty per cent. I do not believe that is good business, or that it will produce the results that hon. gentlemen have in mind.

Mr. GUSTAVE BOYER (Vaudreuil-Soulanges): I have listened with much attention to the statements made by the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals in explanation of the resolution relating to the improvement of highways, and I congratulate the Government upon this new policy. The improvement of highways throughout the different provinces is now a predominant question and I venture to say that this is a very joyful piece of news to every one

interested in the progress and welfare of this country.

I understand however by the explanations given by the hon. minister that the law only provides for the construction of roads, and that no provision is made for the construction of bridges. Being greatly interested in a project which is already quite old, namely: the construction of bridges between Ste. Anne de Bellevue, Isle Perrot and Vaudreuil, I beg to ask this honourable House to allow me to draw its attention to this most urgent improvement. It is assuredly a good practice to construct roads, but this practice will always be incomplete if no bridges are built over the rivers which have to be crossed to travel on the highways. And in order to give a better explanation to my statement, I will quote the following extract from the report of the Montreal resident engineer of the Department of Public Works, dated 1st April, 1913, on these projected bridges:

"Communication by a great highway between the Island and the city of Montreal to Ottawa and Toronto and intermediate points cannot be accomplished without the construction of these proposed bridges.

"The work in question, although not strictly a national enterprise, has surely a character of general interest and can be considered as a federal work, taking into account of the great interest engaged in the province of Quebec and Ontario."

This question of the construction of the Isle Perrot bridges is not a recent one. During the session of 1910, a delegation composed of eminent citizens of the counties of Vaudreuil and Jacques-Cartier came to Ottawa, met the then Prime Minister, the late Rt. Honourable Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and urged the construction of those bridges; the citizens of Isle Perrot specially had shown the essential importance of this means of communication with the mainland. I am in a position to say what happened on that occasion as I was at the head of the delegation. We obtained a most satisfactory answer from the Prime Minister, and the delegates returned home hopeful. Afterwards, an interview was granted to me, by the Prime Minister, who gave me reason to believe that, at the coming session (1911) —the matter would take on a more cheerful appearance. From then on, I decided to press the matter before the Government at the following session; I spoke to the then member for Jacques-Cartier, the late Hon. Mr. Monk, who was equally anxious to see that the construction of these two bridges was carried out, owing to the fact that our constituencies were adjoining and separated by the Ottawa river. The hon. member for Jacques-Cartier who became, afterwards, Minister of Public Works, promised me, with enthusiasm, his co-operation which was to be of a great help to me in Parliament, when, suddenly, Parliament prorogued.

Then the elections of September 1911 brought a change of Government. Before the following session, 1911-12, I had reason to believe, for some time at least, that hope was not lost. Seeing that Mr. Monk had been appointed Minister of Public Works, I felt sure that he would not forget the hearty co-operation that he had promised and that he would give new life to the matter, and I am bound to think that if this gentleman had lived longer, the project would be much further advanced than it is to-day.

I can safely assert these things, as, on several occasions he had given me the honour of a hearing with respect to it. Under date of the 28th August, 1912, Hon. Mr. Monk wrote as follows to the Prime Minister of Quebec asking to what extent his Government was willing to contribute towards the constructions of the two bridges:

The need has been felt long ago for a bridge connecting the Island of Montreal to Ste. Anne de Bellevue, and another between Ile Perrot and Vaudreuil, allowing continuous travelling by foot and conveyance from the great centre of Montreal to the main road leading from the Province of Ontario to Vaudreuil. The most convenient place for the construction of these two bridges appears to be near the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway bridges which cross the Ottawa River at Ste. Anne de Bellevue and Vaudreuil.

The construction of these bridges or connections would be less expensive were they laid between the two existing railway bridges at the above named localities and supported by their pillars. Estimates of railway engineers which I have obtained providing proper passage and a swing bridge above the Ottawa River at Ste. Anne would cost approximately between $200,000 and $250,000.

My aim in writing is to ascertain if your Government would contribute half the cost of this improvement so necessary to the need of the population of Montreal and outskirts. Not being a provincial one in its nature and character, I would recommend to the Federal Government the granting of a subsidy covering half the costs, provided the Provincial Government undertake an equal proportion. While the Federal Government only subsidizes interprovincial construction or other works of a national interest, it would, I think, in this instance in view of the importance of the undertaking and the general convenience resulting from it, feel favorably disposed towards this suggestion. The preparation of the estimates for the ensuing year being under way, I would respectfully request an answer at an early date.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you will readily realize, as stated by Mr. Monk, that the Government was then inclined to give the pro-

ject serious consideration. Under date of September 5, 1912, the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec replied to Mr. Monk in the following terms:

I must inform you that the Government of the Province of Quebec will be disposed to contribute to the cost of the construction of the bridge joining the Island of Montreal and Ste. Anne de Bellevue with Ile Perrot and the other bridge joining Ile Perrot to the mainland at Vaudreuil.

But we would like that the municipalities interested contribute to these works. As was done in the case of the bridge of St. Jean d'Iberville. If you will insert in your estimates the amount you mention, I am inclined to believe that we could bring the interested parties to do their share. The Government of Quebec, on the other hand, will surely do its part.

Under date September 9, 1912, Hon. Mr. Monk again laid the matter before Sir Lomer Gouin and wrote:

You state that the Government of the Province would be disposed to contribute to the cost of these works, but that the interested municipalities contribute their share, must I infer that the Government of the Province will contribute only if the interested municipalities contribute themselves. What are the municipalities interested and are they themselves disposed to contribute?

As we are at present preparing the estimates for the next fiscal year, I would like to have a definite answer regarding contribution, as if they give us the support I have mentioned in my previous letter, I personally intend to ask the Government to contribute half of the cost of those works so much needed in the public interest.

On the 14th September, 1912, the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec further assured Mr. Monk in the following words:

As regards the Government of Quebec, I must assure you that we are ready to do our fair share. Kindly insert in your estimates an amount of fifty per cent of the probable cost of those works, and I have reasons to believe that we shall persuade the interested municipalities to do their share. The construction of those bridges is too important that we should not do our utmost to carry it through.

And on the 16th September, Mr. Monk wrote the following letter to the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec which appeared to close the matter:

I have received this morning your letter of the 14th instant with regard to the proposed bridges of Ste. Anne and Vaudreuil. I thank you for having given this most important question the prompt attention given by your reply.

I would have appreciated from you a definite assurance which would have permitted me to show that the Government of the Province was disposed to do something in the matter. Meanwhile, I am satisfied of your intimation that if we contribute 50 per cent, your Government will do its share.

Under date of September 11, 1912, the members of the county council of Soulanges, assembled under the presidency of the prefect, Mr. Ovila Besner, adopted a resolution requesting the Hon. Mr. Monk to come to a conclusion with the provincial government regarding the construction of the bridges between Vaudreuil and Ste. Anne de Bellevue and crossing Ile Perrot. This resolution was signed by the following mayors: Messrs. Ovila Besner, St. Polycarpe; Jos. Menard, St. Clet; Oscar H. Besner, Coteau-du-Lac; Frenore Lalonde, St-Zotique; Elzéar Deguire, M.D., Coteau-du-Lac village; Edouard Goyer, Les Cèdres; Léon Daoust, St-Polycarpe; L. P. Delage, Coteau Station; J. F. Bissonnette, Coteau Landing; Napoleon Sauvé, Rivière Beaudette.

Under date of October 1, 1912, the then Minister of Public Works, answering to the above request, said that he had had correspondence with the Prime Minister of the province of Quebec, and had been assured by him that the provincial government would do its share, but that the interested municipalities should also contribute. He further promised his most careful consideration to the request as it called for the construction of bridges, which would be of such a general utility. On the same day when referring the petition to his deputy minister the Hon. Mr. Monk said: "In preparing your estimates for the province of Quebec, this matter should be taken into consideration." On the 7th of October of the same year, an order was given to the resident engineer of the Public Works Department, at Montreal, in connection with the said bridges, in the following terms: "Kindly make the necessary examinations and let me have a report on the work required with estimate of its cost, as soon as possible." Therefore, it is clear from this correspondence that the matter was practically decided at that time. However, the retirement of Mr. Monk came suddenly.

These steps were the preliminaries. Now, let us see what took place afterwards and what are the considerations which militate in favour of the construction of these bridges. The proceedings that I have already pointed out were purely local. They originated in the counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges. Up to that time we might have been lead to believe that the advantages derived from these proposed bridges would be solely confined to the residents of that region. I will endeavour to show that such is not the case. If the arguments in favour of the construction of these bridges are not, owing to the geographical position, such

as to justify their being called interprovincial bridges, they are certainly strong enough, having regard to the general convenience to be derived from them for the benefit of the whole of Canada, to justify the Federal Government in making the necessary provisions for their construction. The fact that the request for these bridges comes from everywhere in Ontario as well as in Quebec further supports the move advocated. On the 20th of January, 1913, a group of prominent citizens of Montreal and elsewhere held a meeting at the Windsor Hotel, Montreal, under the auspices of Interprovincial Highways and Bridges Committee, to create considerable and fruitful agitation in favour of the construction of these bridges. Among the gentlemen present I may mention, as far as I can remember, the following: C. E. Ranger, Mayor, Dorion, P.Q.; F. L. Wanklyn, Mayor of Senneville, P.Q.; Andrew J. Dawes; Eugene Tarte; Lt.-Col. A. E. Labelle, president of Chamber of Commerce; Dr. L. de L. Harwood; W. C. Murray, Vice President Dominion Commercial Travellers' Association; L. A. Sauve, Coteau; E. D. Maguire; A. Arthur Ross; H. Pilon, M.L.A., Vaudreuil; C. A. Harwood, K.C.; F. H. Anson, Chairman of Good Roads Committee and Bruno Lalonde, Mayor Ste Anne de Bellevue, and many others, as well as myself. After discussion, it was unanimously resolved:

That it is of the greatest interprovincial importance and necessity that bridges be constructed at the earliest possible date, one from Ste. Anne de Bellevue to Ile Perrot and another from Ile Perrot to Vaudreuil, so as to connect the Island of Montreal with the mainland, and establish a highway connection between Montreal and Toronto, and with that end in view that this meeting undertake at once to solicit the support of the Federal and Provincial Governments, as well as the co-operation of the municipalities and county councils situated between Toronto and Montreal.

Certified a true copy.

(Signed) A. Cholette, Chairman.
Geo. A. McNamee, Secy.

This resolution was forwarded to the Hon. Mr. Monk who acknowledged it on the following day in the same encouraging terms of his previous correspondence. On the 22nd of January, 1913, the Montreal Board of Trade passed the following resolution which was also forwarded to the Government:

Resolved that the need of bridge communication between the Island of Montreal and the roadways to west points thereof has been felt long ago:

That, because the connection of the provinces by good highways is a matter of public convenience and promotes business, the Council hereby prays the Dominion and Provincial Government to join in providing the much needed road communication between the Provinces of Quebec and Ontario by the construction of bridges across the Ottawa River at St. Anne's and Vaudreuil.

Certified a true copy.

(Signed) Geo. Hadrill, Secretary.

This period marks the beginning of a movement which has increased almost daily ever since. A large number of the members of the City Council of Montreal also brought up this question, and especially Alderman Joseph Elie and one of our colleagues in this House who is an ex-alderman of the said city, Mr. L. A. Lapointe. These two gentlemen had a resolution passed recommending the construction of the said bridges. This shows the importance that the city of Montreal attaches to this question. Several delegations to the Quebec Government composed of citizens of Montreal and of other parts of the province had the result of causing Sir Lomer Gouin and his colleagues to decide to co-operate largely in furthering this project. Other committees of citizens are actually taking steps to bring about a favourable conclusion to this enterprise which can be rightly considered as being a national undertaking. In order, Mr. Speaker, to show that the need of bridges over the Ottawa river at the points indicated is not only a local one, I shall read a resolution adopted by a number of municipal councils and boards of trade who have no particular interest in Vaudreuil or Soulanges:

Whereas a general movement in the province and in the country at large is being manifested for the improvement of roads and bridges and more facilities of communication between important localities in the province;

And whereas a strong movement has been inaugurated for the improvement of the highways and bridges between Montreal and Toronto and Montreal and Ottawa;

And whereas such highway and bridge improvements would facilitate the means of communication between the said cities and the intermediate districts;

And whereas also such highways and bridges would be of great advantage to trade and commerce in said cities, and in the rural districts lying between said cities;

And whereas it is advisable that all public bodies should concur in this movement;

And whereas especially to carry out the said project, a bridge is required to connect the Island of Montreal with the mainland at a point in the County of Vaudreuil;

Be it therefore resolved that this Council is favourable to the improvements of this great interprovincial and national road between Montreal and Ottawa and Montreal and Toronto, and that it asks the Local Government of this province and the Dominion Government to take immediate and necessary steps for the establishment of such a road between Montreal and

Toronto and Montreal and Ottawa, and further that the said Governments adopt such means as they may judge fit to give effect to the same, and also give such aid and vote such sums of money as are necessary for the establishment of said highways and bridges, including the necessary expenses for the establishment of bridges and crossings, and more especially for the establishment of a bridge to connect the island of Montreal and the mainland at a point in the county of Vaudreuil and this Council assures said Government that any efforts made in the above direction will be fully appreciated.

This resolution was unanimously passed by the following corporations: Montreal Board of Trade, city of Toronto, Cornwall Board of Trade, Prescott Board of Trade, Brockville Board of Trade, Belleville Board of Trade, Kingston Board of Trade, Dominion Commercial Travellers' Association, Chamber of Commerce, Montreal, the Motor Import Co. of Canada, Automobile Club of Canada, Ontario Motor League, township of Cornwall, town of Cornwall, municipality of Brockville, municipality of the city of Belleville, municipality of Charlottenburgh, municipality of town of Prescott, municipality of township of Osnabruck. In addition to these, this same resolution has been passed by 23 other adjoining municipalities.

These resolutions were brought to the attention of the Minister of Public Works at Ottawa on the 8th of April, 1913, by a distinguished and numerous delegation, which was organized by Mr. Geo. A. McNamee, the active and devoted secretary of the Canadian Automobile Association. It was composed of two hundred persons at least, representing the cities of Montreal, Toronto, Brockville and others, many counties, towns and parishes of the interested regions, as the counties of Vaudreuil, Soulanges, Jacques-Cartier, Glengarry, Prescott, Cornwall, etc., who came to meet the then Minister of Public Works (Hon. Robert Rogers).

Amongst the delegates composing this delegation were Lt.-Colonel W. N. Ponton, Honorary President of the Ontario Board of Trade; Thomas Church, Mayor of Toronto; Huntley R. Drummond, A. D. Dawes, of Montreal; The General A. B. Labelle, G. A. MacNamee; Controllers Macdonald and Godfrey, of the city of Montreal, representing the city council; F. L. Wanklyn, from the Executive of the Canadian Pacific Railway; W. C. Murray, Vice-President of the Commercial Travellers' Association; Eugene Tarte, of Montreal; the mayors of all the municipalities of the counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges; the following members of Parliament, Messrs. Northrup, Fripp, Proulx, Broder, McMillan (Glengarry), MacDonell (Toronto), Ethier, Sexsmith, Lafortune, Lapointe (St. Jaques), Papineau, and others. I was one of this delegation, and I remember the answer of the minister to the delegates. This answer has always been impressed in my mind. It was so typical, especially when uttered before such a distinguished and representative delegation. As far as I can remember, the answer was as follows:

We have at the present time a Bill before the Senate, providing for an expenditure of $10,000,000 for the improvement of highways. The Senate has been requested to pass this measure but are now taking objections to it. Then, it is up to you, delegates, to join together and see the honourable members of the Senate, and try to convince them of the necessity of ratifying this Bill. And, if a result is obtained, the Government will see afterwards, as to what is to be done.

We are all familiar with the tribulation which this law was subjected to. After having been passed by the Commons, it was amended by the Senate and sent back to this Chamber. The Government not desiring to accept the amendment passed by the Senate, this Bill as a result of such action, has remained a dead letter ever since. The amendment brought by the Senate to the Highway Bill was simply as to the manner of distributing the ten million dollars. It stipulated that the money voted by virtue of the Bill would be spent by each province on the pro rata of their population, such as is done each year in the distribution of subsidies to the different provinces. The opposition to the Highways Bill in the Senate at that time was fully justified, as it only asked the Government to give each province the right to improve and to construct its own roads.

As I have already stated, instructions had been given, on the 7th October, 1912, to the District Engineer of the Public Works Department to prepare plans and make an estimate of the probable cost of this bridge. The Engineer made his report to the Chief Engineer as follows:

I beg to inform you that after a careful examination and study of the matter, I came to the conclusion that the best site for the proposed bridge, at Ste. Anne de Bellevue would be between the railway bridges by connecting the piers of said bridges with sufficiently strong cross girders and proper tunnels at both ends.

This scheme would meet all the requirements of the traffic and cost some $80,000 less than an independent bridge built on piers.

In view of this, I have communicated with the officials of the C.P.R. and G.T.R. companies for permission to use the piers of their respective bridges for the proposed rural bridge.

I expect their answer in a few days and will then report to you fully on the matter.

Under the same date the District Engineer of the Public Works Department wrote to the President of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company and to the Vice-President of the Grand Trunk Railway Company the following letter:

> Being called upon by the Honourable the Minister of Public Works to prepare plans and estimates for the erection of rural bridges between Ste. Anne de Bellevue and Ile Perrot, and Ile Perrot and Vaudreuil, I beg to say that after a careful study of the matter, I came to the conclusion that a bridge at Ste. Anne de Bellevue, between the C.P.R. and G.T.R. bridges with a roadway between the two embankments leading to a subway near the C.P.R. station, as shown on the accompanying plan (blue print), is the best site. This will permit the suppression of the present level crossing near the C.P.R. station which is of great annoyance to the railway companies and dangerous for the public.
>
> To this effect will you kindly inform me if your company will have any objection into permitting the use of the piers of its bridge to place upon cross girders as shown on the plan.

Through its President, Lord Shaughnessy, the Canadian Pacific Railway Company answered in the affirmative. As for the Grand Trunk Railway Company not giving an immediate consent, it would be an easy matter for the Government to decide upon it for these objections are only based on matters of fact which can be easily settled if I can judge from the answer of Mr. Howard C. Kelly, the President of the Company. The Grand Trunk Company expects in the future to widen its road and this proposition, they say, would be prejudicial to them. On the authority of a competent engineer, this question is debatable, as the Grand Trunk Railway can always widen its road on the opposite side, and moreover they could not widen their road without widening the bridge at the same time. This will not happen for a long time and also if this decision should be arrived at it could only be widened on the opposite side of the Canadian Pacific Railway. This points out clearly that the construction of a metal span between the two bridges would in no way interfere with their plan.

In studying the report of the late resident engineer Michaud of Montréal, under date of April 1, 1912, I find that this engineer suggested two plans.

Plan No. 1—Between Ste. Anne de Bellevue and Ile Perrot—which consists of placing a metal span between the bridges of the Canadian Pacific railway and Grand Trunk railway, making use of the pillars of those bridges. Those bridges would have a length of 1,134 feet and width of 20 feet for the traffic and 4.8 feet for pedestrians. The estimated cost was $118,986.

Plan No. 2—On the same side to construct a bridge 60 feet below the Grand Trunk bridge, down stream, but parallel to this one. The length would be 1,234 feet with a width of 20 feet for traffic and 4.8 for pedestrians. The cost would be $192,000. As regards a bridge on the north shore to join Ile Perrot with Vaudreuil, the same engineer made only one plan for bridge which would be located on the south of the Grand Trunk Railway bridge. This bridge would measure 1,094 feet in length by 25 feet in width—that is, 20 feet for traffic and 4.8 feet for pedestrians. The estimated cost was $113,000.

Therefore, from the estimates of the engineers these two bridges in making use of the pillars of the Canadian Pacific Railway and Grand Trunk Railway bridges would cost $118,986 plus $113,000 or a total of $231,986. The other plan would cost $305,000 or a difference of $74,014. However, I note that on the Vaudreuil side no estimates are furnished for a bridge between the two railway lines but simply one for an independent bridge on the south side of the Grand Trunk Railway tracks. The main objection to this scheme is in the fact that the entrance and abutments of this bridge would be nearly on the same level as the railway tracks, I may state that this would not be an insuperable objection, especially if it results, as I am convinced, in reducing the cost of the bridge by half. The entrance to the Victoria bridge on the Montreal side is on a level with the railway. This would necessitate more care, that is all.

Besides the plans prepared by the engineer of the Federal Public Works Department, I believe that there are two other sets of plans prepared for private corporations. One plan, drawn by Mr. L. A. Beauchemin, engineer, of Montreal, appears to be very complete. The hydrographical survey made on that shows that the construction of this bridge would not be even a difficult undertaking. It would be built without using the railway bridges. The piers at deep water would only be eight feet above the bed of the river. The cost of these two bridges, made of concrete with a metal part on the Ste. Anne side, including the adjacent land would come to $300,000. Another sketch was made by one of the engineers of the Canadian Pacific Railway Company, and I was informed by a competent authority of that company, who is always at the head of progress, that this

passage between the two railway bridges could be done at a reasonable price.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) has before him all the estimates and plans,—but according to the new law the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) is also concerned in this question, as he has under his control the Public Highways' regulations. The main sketches are drawn and the minor ones are easily made. There is only one thing to be done by the Government now, viz.: To provide the necessary appropriations for the enterprise. According to the Good Roads resolution the Government has the right to question the mode of expending subsidies granted to the provinces. It seems to me that this is the proper time for the Government to take up this proposed construction of bridges with the Quebec Government and to arrive at an immediate solution of this long-standing problem. The Provincial Government of Quebec must contribute with the Federal Government in the construction of these bridges, but in what proportion? There is already a law authorizing the Quebec Government to make a payment of 33⅓ per cent of the cost of bridges of relative importance. Nevertheless, I understand that the Ile Perrot bridges do not come under this category, because the budget of the province of Quebec for the construction of bridges in the whole province is much smaller than the amount requested for the construction of the Ile Perrot bridges. I am positive, however, that the Quebec Government is ready to do largely its share. A very short time ago, the Hon. L. A. Taschereau, Minister of Public Works at Quebec, from his seat in the Legislature, reiterated the good intentions of the Quebec Government towards the project to Mr. A. Pharand, M.L.A. for Soulanges, Mr. H. Pilon, M.L.A. for Vaudreuil, and Mr. Henry Miles, M.L.A., Montreal-St. Lawrence, who had raised an interesting debate upon this matter. In many instances it was said that the municipalities of the counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges should contribute to the construction of those bridges. I do not think it would be fair to make such a demand upon the municipalities affected, especially when these municipalities would not be alone to benefit by those two bridges. The municipalities of the counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges, for example, should not be accused of parsimony if they ask the two Governments to pay the entire cost of those bridges, especially when each of these two counties, with a total population of only 20,000, spent nearly $1,000,000 for the construction of their roads, and their expenditure to complete this improvement will amount to $1,500,000 three years from now. I consider that this effort made towards the progress of good roads by these two counties should be considered as a very large contribution in the construction of those bridges. By the construction of those bridges, the traffic on the whole of this country will be far more considerable, and consequently, the maintenance of the roads will be more onerous. The population of my region is well disposed to make all reasonable sacrifies, but on the other hand it would be hardly fair to expect them to make too many sacrifices, especially when so many of the population of Quebec and Ontario, and others, will share the benefit. In my humble judgment it would be unjust to expect the local municipalities to bear a part of such an expenditure. The people understand that the construction of the Ile Perrot bridges can not be considered as being a question of local improvement useful only to those residing in the vicinity, and they claim it to be an enterprise of national advantage in which the two main provinces of the Dominion are interested. I submit that the Government should give due consideration to the claims of the people of my region when this matter is before them. I would not say that the municipalities of the counties of Vaudreuil and Soulanges, in order to hasten the construction of those bridges, would refuse to guarantee a certain amount of debentures, which would be payable by a sinking fund taken out of the yearly revenue of the bridges; but, in this case, these bridges would become toll bridges until full settlement of obligations. I might add that the Victoria Bridge is a toll bridge.

The cost of those bridges will amount to $300,000 or $400,000. Suppose the Federal Government pays half of it, the Quebec Government two-thirds of the balance, and the municipalities one-third. In such a case those bridges could be constructed and administered by a commission composed of one representative from each Government, one representative of each interested municipality, one representative from each of the important public bodies of the city of Montreal, and one representative from the counties affected. This commission should exist in virtue of a Statute and would be in every way responsible to both Governments. In other words, this commission would serve as a connecting link between the two Governments and as an intermediate agent between those Governments and the municipalities. But this organization would be necessary only if the Govern-

ment wants to make it an essential condition, that the municipalities are to contribute to the cost of those bridges. However, I hope that the Government will act more liberally, seeing that the construction of these bridges is so important. The Quebec Government and the Ontario Government agreed to undertake a large interprovincial road joining the four principal cities of the Dominion; Quebec, Montreal, Toronto and Ottawa. The Federal Government to-day, with its good roads policy, greatly encourage this laudable scheme. The only obstruction to the proposed interprovincial road is the bridges over the Ottawa river at Vaudreuil-Ste. Anne de Bellevue. All the public bodies, from Toronto to Montreal, Ottawa to Montreal and vice-versa, are asking for these bridges. These bridges will join the two great provinces of Canada. And who knows it, if this enterprise would not be a salutary accentuation to the noble movement of the Bonne Entente. In order to effect a speedy consummation of the Bonne Entente, one of these bridges could be christened John Haig and the other Ferdinand Foch.

Mr. J. R. WILSON (Saskatoon): I was somewhat disappointed that the minister, in introducing the resolution, apparently did not give the committee any idea as to the policy to be pursued. I should judge, although the statement has not been made, that this is a scheme of promiscuous road construction in the provinces, the money to be turned over to the provincial governments without any outline being given as to what points the roads are going to run between and as to how the work is to be done. When this country, from ocean to ocean, is making a grant of money for the purpose of building roads, such roads should be of a national character; that is, they should lead from some place to some other place. In other words, they should be interprovincial, or possibly a road should be built from coast to coast. It was at one time advocated that we should build what may be termed a national highway, possibly as a memorial to commemorate the heroism and services of our gallant soldiers in the great conflict which has just been concluded. There does not seem to be any particular need for making improvements to our roads. In any case, as a matter of principle, if this scheme is only for the purpose of constructing better roads throughout the province, that is a matter that should be attended to by the several provincial governments.

It would be another thing if we had the ambition to build a national highway from the Atlantic to the Pacific over which we could travel in an automobile. In view of these considerations and in view of the heavy expenditures which the Government has intimated will be made this year, I think it is hardly advisable to undertake an expenditure of twenty million dollars unless we can be assured of very good returns from our investment. The minister in introducing the resolution said that it would provide employment for the returned soldiers. Personally, I do not think that is the kind of employment we should offer to our returned men, but if we do wish to offer them that kind of work, the railway building to be done in the West will provide such work for the men who wish to undertake it—the building of roads is not very much different from the building of railways, so far as the nature of the work is concerned. I have made a mental calculation since the minister introduced the resolution, of how the scheme would work out in western Canada. Of this twenty million dollars to be voted, $80,000 is to be allotted to each of the provinces at the outset. That would mean an expenditure of $720,000 for the nine provinces, leaving $19,280,000 unexpended.

Mr. CARVELL: The expenditure is $80,000 per province per year.

Mr. J. R. WILSON: Perhaps I did not read the resolution closely enough. I figured that this year for the three western provinces of Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta, with a population, as near as I remember, of about 1,600,000, about a million dollars would be appropriated. What we need in western Canada to-day more than anything else is the extension of the Canadian National system of railways. This would afford needed relief to farmers who are living many miles from the railways, and would save them quite a lot of money by transporting the grain from their doors.

With regard to furnishing employment, the Minister of Public Works knows how much I have been badgering him ever since I arrived in Ottawa for a federal building in my city, and the excuse he has been giving me is that the Government cannot spend any more money in western Canada beyond what is to be spent on the railways. Now, if some of this $20,000,000 was devoted to erecting federal buildings in different cities in western Canada that are really in need of them it would furnish the

kind of employment we need for our returned soldiers. Those of our returned soldiers for whom we need employment in western Canada are the mechanics, and unless there is considerable building going on in our cities we cannot furnish them with employment. These men would not work at road building.

Summing up, it seems to me that in view of our present financial condition it would not be wise for us to undertake this expenditure on such an indefinite promiscuous scheme of road building, not knowing what parts of the country are to be served by these roads.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): I think there is a misapprehension as to the real meaning of the resolution or it has not been read closely enough by some hon. members. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. T. Foster), who is not in his seat just now, assumed two principles which do not exist at all. I will admit that from his standpoint his argument was very logical. He assumed that the Government was contributing $20,000,000 towards the building of a national highway throughout Canada. If that were true, and the Government was going to build the road, it ought not to hand the money over to the provinces, but handle it itself, just as in the case of the building of a railroad or any other public work. But that is not the intention. It may be we are wrong in not building a national highway, however, we do not propose to do that, we propose to contribute a certain amount of money during the next five years to assist in the construction of better roads in Canada than we have at the present time. Now, we cannot build every road in Canada, because that would probably take a hundred million dollars, and then we should not have covered the whole ground. But we propose to grant $20,000,000 during the next five years for the purpose of assisting in the betterment of the road systems in every province of Canada. The hon. member also contended that if the money were handed over to the provinces there would be patronage and inefficiency, and that not more than sixty or sixty-five per cent of the money would be spent on the roads, the balance being squandered amongst politicians or in graft.

Mr. CAHILL: He was thinking of Ontario.

Mr. CARVELL: I think his remarks applied to all the provinces, although I confess he made a pointed reference to the province of Ontario. There, again, my hon. friend did not properly read the resolution which we are discussing. There is no doubt things like that have happened in the past, and there might be an attempt to do the same thing under these provisions. Again, if we were proposing to pay all the costs of building any portion of a road in any part of Canada, not being a portion of the national highway, then certainly we should build it ourselves. But we are not doing that. We are proposing to contribute forty per cent of the cost of constructing a certain piece of road; and the location of that road, the specifications, its character and all the conditions must be agreed upon before a dollar is expended. There must be a contract between the federal and the provincial governments as to all these matters before anything is done.

Mr. MORPHY: I would point out that the very important word "location" does not appear in the resolution.

Mr. CARVELL: I admit it does not, but there is another word in the resolution which means the same thing. The resolution says:

> Which agreement shall contain such provisions as to cost, description, specifications or otherwise as the Governor in Council may approve.

Now you could not make a contract very well unless you knew the location.

Mr. MORPHY: That is the weakness of the resolution.

Mr. CARVELL: Perhaps it should be amended to that extent, but I assure my hon. friend the word was not left out with any deliberate intent.

We consider the words "description, specifications or otherwise" sufficient to cover it; because it would be impossible to make a contract for the construction of a road if you did not describe it.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: If no agreement is made by this Government with the government of any province, will the citizens of that province be taxed for works in the other provinces which are strictly provincial?

Mr. CARVELL: If the provinces cannot raise the money they cannot take advantage of this proposal.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: But if no agreement is made by this Government with the government of Ontario, for instance, will the citizens of Ontario be obliged to pay their share of taxation for work done in other provinces?

Mr. CARVELL: No, there is no such proposal as that. Unless the province of Ontario make a contract with this Government by which they agree to furnish 60 per cent of the cost of the roads mentioned in the agreement, they cannot get our 40 per cent, and the whole thing goes for naught as far as Ontario is concerned.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: But the other provinces will get the money if they come to an agreement with this Government?

Mr. CARVELL: They will get their share.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: And the citizens of Ontario will be taxed to pay that money?

Mr. CARVELL: Well, in so far as we take it out of the consolidated revenue funds. It goes the way of taxation.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Is it proposed that the terms shall be uniform in all provinces?

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly. But there again I am answering what perhaps I cannot answer definitely. It will be such a road as the federal Government can agree upon with each of the provinces. I do not say it will be exactly the same kind of road in all the provinces. Take my own province, for instance, I have no doubt the road will be different in the western part of New Brunswick from what it will be in eastern New Brunswick, for the simple reason that in the western part we have splendid gravel which makes a good road. In the State of Maine, in the past five years, they have built a beautiful road, of gravel. But on the eastern side of New Brunswick, where they have no gravel, they would no doubt have to use crushed stone. The construction will be the best and most economical for the part of Canada in which the road is constructed. In the western provinces, where they have no stone or gravel, I do not know what the construction will be. They will no doubt have to import their material; probably it will be broken stone or asphalt.

11 p.m.

I was saying that if we were paying all the expenses of building any one of these roads we would of course take into our own hands the construction of the road, but we do not propose to do that. We think the provinces should contribute something towards the construction of the roads because they will be the people to benefit in the end. Such being the case, either we must build the road or the province must build it. Well, I do not think we would ever get any province to hand 60 per cent of the cost to the federal Government and say, "You build our roads." Therefore, we hand the money to the provinces and allow them to do the building, but with this condition, that before a dollar can be expended a contract must be entered into between the two governments, as I have explained, for each road. There may be a half dozen roads in one contract.

Mr. McKENZIE: Was this question discussed at the provincial conference?

Mr. CARVELL: Oh, yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Take my own province. Is there a request from the province of Nova Scotia for this money?

Mr. CARVELL: I cannot remember what each representative stated, but I know there was no dissent, and it was strongly urged upon this Government that we should embark upon this policy. It was urged by all the representatives of the local governments present, and this is a direct result.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I am sure the provinces will be glad to get the money.

Mr. CARVELL: Certainly, and this is the result of their request.

Mr. FIELDING: Were the terms of the resolution discussed in the conference?

Mr. CARVELL: No, but the general principle was discussed of assisting in the construction of roads. Now, to get back to the general thread of my discourse, I pointed out that either the Federal or the Provincial Government must build the roads. There must be no divided responsibility. My hon. friend from Toronto (Mr. Foster) suggested that if the money were handed over to the province, 35 per cent would be squandered. That, however, cannot happen, for it is provided as follows in the resolution—and will be similarly provided in the Bill—

> —the aid to be given in any case shall be 40 per cent of the amount which in the opinion of the minister is the actual, necessary and reasonable cost of the construction or improvement of such highway.

The Government has appointed a gentleman who has been well known in Canada for a number of years in construction of highways—Mr. Campbell, former Deputy Minister of Railways and Canals—to have charge of this work, and he will have power to appoint engineers. There will be inspecting engineers over every road constructed in Canada, and the very moment

our engineer suspects any collusion, politics, graft, or the wasting of public money, all he has to do is to report that to the Minister of Railways and Canals, who will have the right to say whether he will allow the 40 per cent or not; and until they construct that road according to the minister's satisfaction that the money has been actually, necessarily and reasonably put into the construction, the grant will not be allowed. It is therefore impossible for anything in the way of incompetence or waste of public money to occur.

Mr. COPP: Will the expenses of the engineer come out of that 40 per cent?

Mr. CARVELL: There is nothing in the resolution, but I presume not, although all might be charged up to the cost of the road. However, if I have anything to say about it—and possibly I may have—no roads will be built unless there is a competent engineer overseeing them, and no money will be paid out until the engineer reports that the work has been properly and reasonably carried on.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Why don't you make it "fifty-fifty" like the Union Government?

Mr. CARVELL: The Union Government is "fifty-fifty" when it comes to doing business.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: Could it not be raised to fifty instead of forty?

Mr. CARVELL: Well, that is a logical question, and one for discussion. I hardly think so myself. I know it has been urged upon the Government strongly that we should contribute one-half of the cost of construction of the road. Personally, my view is that the Federal Government should not adopt the policy of road building in Canada, but that we should assist the provinces in the construction of roads. Without some assistance I do not believe we will get the roads we require.

Mr. McKENZIE: Where are you going to get the money?

Mr. CARVELL: Well, I think we can get it as well as the provinces can. It has to be raised by taxation, and we can devise a method by which we can get the money. I have a great belief in the necessity of good roads. I believe they are of the greatest importance to the prosperity of the country, but I do not believe the Federal Government should start out building highways. We have therefore laid down this principle, that we will pay forty per cent to assist the provinces in the construction of roads but to assist them in such a manner that there will be nothing that is not perfectly straight and that there will be no money wasted in the construction of these roads.

Mr. CAHILL: I want to know if the regulations will make any provision for roads in sections that are not between centres. What will govern the selection of the road that this money is to be expended upon? If the provincial government will apply for the money to build any kind or portion of a road and say that they are willing to pay sixty per cent of the cost of that road, does that mean that the Dominion Government will be willing to pay forty per cent of the cost?

Mr. CARVELL: No; I can answer that right off. The intention of this legislation is to build highway roads—roads leading from centres to centres. I cannot tell you any two points in Canada between which a road will be built or where we propose to build a road under this legislation. But we certainly do not intend to agree to the construction of roads out of this money in what we may call byways. We want this money to go to the construction of what we might call main arteries. I think I can say right off that there should be a road from Montreal to Ottawa, that there should be a road from Montreal to Toronto, and a road from here down to Prescott. Anybody can pick out places of that kind and say that it is roads of that class that must be subsidized. I have no doubt that there will be some friction between the federal and provincial authorities as to the roads which shall be built but I do not think it is impossible to overcome these difficulties. I think that ordinary business principles will prevail and that the result will be that the money will be expended upon what would be really the main arteries of commerce or highways in Canada.

Mr. I. E. ARGUE (Swift Current): Mr. Chairman, I do not very often take up the time of this House, but I think I should say something on this question of highways. We are proposing to-night to spend $20,000,000 to build highways in Canada. I notice that the hon. the Minister of Railways (Mr. Reid) mentioned Ottawa and said that it would be a good thing to have good highways around here so that farmers within 25 or 30 miles could bring their produce in to market. That will be very nice, but

I come from a district where we need more than highways. We need railways. I could take you out to places where farmers have to haul their grain from 25 to 60 miles, sleep out two nights under their wagons and spend four days on the trip in order to get their grain to market. I had a telegram to-day stating that a petition is on its way down asking for a branch line. That petition is signed by 1,632 farmers who have under cultivation 293,000 acres of land, who, in the years 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918 averaged 22 bushels to the acre and who have to haul their grain from 24½ to 42 miles to market. If we have money to spend to build highways, for the purpose of giving employment to the people in Canada, and, as the minister said, to bring people into Canada, I can tell the minister and this Government that if they do not supply some of these branch lines they will not be able to keep men in Canada who are here now, because they have stayed just about as long as they can afford to stay and haul grain that distance. We would like to have highways but we must give those settlers who have been eight or ten years in those districts some facilities for marketing their grain. The money spent on railways will give the same amount of employment to men as if spent on highways. We are expecting our returned soldiers to go out into the western country and take up homesteads; and yet in many of those districts there is not a railway within twenty-five or thirty miles of settlement.

Mr. McQUARRIE: Use motor trucks.

Mr. ARGUE: They cannot use motor trucks, because we have not the money to build the roads, and this money is not supposed to be used to build anything but main highways. I want to make these few remarks at this stage of the game, but when the Bill comes before the House I propose to have something more to say on the matter.

Mr. CARVELL: I appreciate what my hon. friend (Mr. Argue) says. I think we all realize the importance of railways. I do not know if the Estimates state the locations where we expect to build railways during the coming year, but my recollection is that $10,000,000 or $12,000,000 is going to be provided to build new lines of railways and every mile of that railway construction is west of the Great Lakes. We appreciate the need as well as my hon. friend does. If the Government had $100,000,000 to spend it could not satisfy all the demands for public works, and I do not say that offensively. The demands are so great—and they are necessarily great—that the Government must pick out what in their judgment would be the best places in which the money could be expended. I do not know whether the district represented by my hon. friend is included in the provision for branch lines or not. He may or may not have investigated it.

Mr. ARGUE: Yes I have investigated it.

Mr. CARVELL: There is something to be said further. When all the money for the construction of branch line railways is being expended in Western Canada, you cannot run away from the fact that the people in Eastern Canada have some rights as well as the people in the West. During the last three or four weeks I have listened to so many demands for public works that, while many of them may be necessary, I am still driven to the conclusion that there is a good deal of provincialism about the ordinary member of Parliament. Not a few of these requests have rather surprised me. I have had members of this House in the last three or four weeks tell me frankly that they wanted a work constructed because they wanted the money spent in their constituencies. I do not accept that doctrine at all. I believe that the Government should spend money where it is necessary, and not for the purpose of expending money in any particular constituency. I have no doubt that a railway in necessary in my hon. friend's constituency, but if we attempt to build a railway in every section of Western Canada where it is necessary I suppose we would require to have $100,000,000 or $150,000,000 in the Estimates instead of $10,000,000 or $15,000,000. The whole country must be considered to some extent in the expenditure of public money. I hope my hon. friend will appreciate the point and I think he will see the reasonableness of the position that the Government takes.

Mr. BOYCE: I think the hon. the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) is to be congratulated on this move for the improvement of roads. We have heard some speakers say that the money should not be expended if it is going to be spent for a purpose other than the building of highways. It is for the Government to take care that the money shall be properly spent. We have heard hon. gentlemen from the cities tell us that we do not want the roads but that we would have been better off if we had some public buildings in our cities. I was very broad-minded when I came into

the House a year or so ago, but I am beginning to get a little bit narrow. I have heard gentlemen from the West say that if we do not give them free trade they are going to get out and go somewhere else; that if we do not give them good roads they are going to get out and go somewhere else, and that if they do not get the earth and all that is on it they are going to get out. The hon. gentleman (Mr. Argue) is perfectly right in keeping up the end of his country as well as he possibly can but he tells you about the thousands of acres of land that they have under cultivation, the thousands of settlers they have and the 22 bushels of wheat that they are raising to the acre.

If we could raise 22 bushels of wheat to the acre in Ontario we would build the highways ourselves, and the railroads also. There is no doubt we want the railroads, but we want the highways as well. In Ontario we have for the last sixty years puddled through the mud and made roads as best we could. During the last ten years, however, our counties have spent a large amount of money in improving a great number of roads, and within the last year or two the Provincial Government has taken in hand the task of putting the roads in a still greater state of efficiency. I am pleased to see that the Dominion Government is going to bring in a Bill to assist in the improvement of highways. It does not make any difference which Government does it, as long as we get the improved roads. If you want to ascertain the value of a district just drive through it, and if the schools and the roads are good, undoubtedly you have a good country and a progressive people. I trust no hon. gentleman in this House will raise any obstacle to the voting of this $20,000,000 for the improvement of our roads. As far as Ontario is concerned, we do not wish for anything more than our fair share of that expenditure. I do trust, however, that the money will be expended in the improvement of roads, and that great care will be exercised in connection with it. I think perhaps that before entering upon it, it might be well to have a conference with representatives from our province and ascertain exactly what it is proposed to do. I know that in Ontario a survey has been made with very great care, and it is a very reliable one. If that survey is carried out it will be a great benefit to the province and to the country generally. We in Ontario have never made any demands upon the Government. As the late Sir John A. Macdonald said, on one occasion, the farmers never got anything. I suppose that was because they did not ask for it. We are very glad that we did not have to speak for this expenditure, and that the Bill to be brought in is going to assist so much in the improvement of our roads. Motor cars are now in very common use, and with the improvement of the roads this is going to greatly reduce the cost of production. With good roads and modern methods of transportation, products from the rural district will be brought more expeditiously to our cities and distributed in a far better manner than ever before. I repeat that I trust no objection will be made to the voting of this money and its expenditure in a judicious manner for the general benefit of the country.

Mr. J. D. REID: I am very glad that this discussion has taken place, and that we have had the views of a number of hon. gentlemen. As the hour is getting late I will move that the committee rise and report progress, so that we can take the matter up again at some other date.

Motion agreed to.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.20 p.m.

Monday, March 24, 1919.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

AUDITOR GENERAL'S REPORT.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The member for Guysborough (Mr. J. H. Sinclair) asked me the other day when the report of the Auditor General would be available for presentation to the House. I have a letter from the Auditor General to this effect:

I am informed by the Superintendent of Printing that Volume II of the annual report of this office will be ready for presentation on Wednesday and Volume 1 on Friday of this week.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

PROVINCIAL SUBSIDY.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

What rate of provincial subsidy per head of the population was paid to each of the provinces of Canada respectively in 1918?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Subsidy payable per head of population under the British North America Act, is eighty cents.

LETTER POSTAGE RATE.

*Mr. FRIPP:

1. Is the Government aware that the two-cent letter postage rate, and the one-cent "drop" letter postage rate, are to be restored in the United Stated on July 1, next?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to adopt similar letter rates for Canada this year?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Yes.

2. Announcements respecting taxation are made only in the Budget Speech.

MATAPEDIA AQUEDUCT.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Is the Government aware that the aqueduct from which drinking water is drawn for the village and railway station at Matapedia, Quebec, is in a very unsatisfactory condition and that the water is very unsanitary?

2. Has the Government been asked to see that this state of affairs is investigated and remedied?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.

2. Yes. Some months ago complaint was made by the agent at Matapedia about water coming from our reservoir. The reservoir was completely drained out and nothing was found to hurt the water. Complaints were still made, and a sample of the water was sent to the Canadian Inspection and Testing Laboratory at Montreal for analysis. The report stated the water was suitable for boiler and drinking purposes. The second complaint was made by John A. Ryan, one of the eight parties forming the Matapedia Water Supply Company, to whom we supply water at the rate of $60 per annum. That company now owe us one year's rental. No further action is being taken in regard to this reservoir.

PROTECTION OF CANADIAN COASTS.

Mr. MAYRAND:

1. At any time during the war did the Government of Canada make any requests for the despatch of the Japanese fleet to the west coast of Canada?

2. At any time during the war did the Government of Canada make any requests for the presence of the Australian fleet on the east coast of Canada?

3. At any time during the war did the Government of Canada make any requests to Great Britain or the United States for naval vessels to assist in protecting the shores of Canada?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. No.

2. No.

3. See reply to inquiry of the ministry by Mr. Mayrand re assistance in naval defence of Canada by United States.

Mr. MAYRAND:

1. During the war did the Canadian Government make any requests asking the United States Government to assist in the protection of the Canadian coasts?

2. Did the Canadian Government request the British Government to ask the United States Government to assist in the protection of Canadian coasts?

3. Did the United States Government at any time during the war assist in the naval protection of Canada?

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN:

1. The Canadian Government made no request asking the United States Government to assist in the protection of the Canadian coast. A joint conference between Canadian, Imperial and United States naval officers convened by the Commander in Chief, N.A. & W.I. Station on the 22nd April, 1918, recommended that the United States navy should take over the coastal patrol, sea patrol, protection of traffic and offensive action against enemy submarines as far east as the 65th meridian (Lockeport, N.S.) including the outer part of the bay of Fundy. This proposal was approved by the Canadian and other Governments concerned and carried out. This was done with a view to the United States having an outlying base for patrols covering the approaches to their posts in Maine. At the same time it was proposed that the United States navy should lend personnel and machines for the Canadian Naval Air Service until such time as Canada could train men and provide machines. This proposal was also approved by the Governments concerned and adopted.

2. The Canadian Government did not request the British Government to ask the United States Government to assist in the protection of the Canadian coasts. On 3rd January, 1918, the Admiralty stated that they were approaching the United States naval authorities with a view to their providing six destroyers. This was referred to at the joint conference held in Washington in April, 1918, when the United States Navy Department informed the British naval officers that destroyers could not be provided, but that two torpedo boats and six submarine chasers would be sent to Halifax.

3. The United States navy lent two torpedo boats and six submarine chasers for duty with the Canadian naval patrol on the Atlantic coast in 1918. They also lent some sea planes and personnel for the same purpose. Other United States vessels also assisted in the patrol of the seas adjacent to Canada, protecting their own fishing interests, etc.

C. G. S. CANADA.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Has the Steamer Canada been employed in the work of the Naval Department since the outbreak of the war?

2. What have the refit repairs to the Canada cost each year since the outbreak of war?
3. In what condition is the Canada at present as regards efficiency for long steaming periods?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. 1914, nil; 1915-16, $14,435.63; 1916-17, $13,283.12; 1917-18, $30,572.53; 1918-19, $6,-122.12.

3. This vessel is able to carry out long steaming periods at moderate speeds, but she is at present due for refit and cannot carry out long steaming periods at maximum speed.

CANADIAN TRAWLERS.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. How many Canadian trawlers were in the service of the Canadian Naval Department during the period of the war?
2. Were any of these trawlers built by the Polson Iron Works of Toronto?
3. If so, how many?
4. How much did each trawler cost?
5. What are their names?
6. What has been the refit cost of each of these trawlers built by the Polson Iron Works?
7. Have they at all times been ready for patrol service?
8. If not, what was the cause of the laying up during the summer of 1918?
9. Can a copy of the log of each trawler be obtained showing the number of hours these vessels did at sea?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Twelve.

2. Yes.

3. Six.

4. $176,194.65.

5. Messines, Ypres, Vimy, St. Julien, St. Eloi, Festubert.

6. Cost of refits: Festubert, $3,987.92; Messines, $5,373.83; St. Eloi, $3,987.70; St. Julien, $3,960.34; Vimy, $3,869.95; Ypres, $5,705.58.

7. No.

8. Certain repairs were necessary to these vessels, the carrying out of which was protracted, due to the scarcity of labour prevailing at that time.

The repairs were due in part to the disaster of December 6, 1917.

As soon as repairs were completed the vessels were brought forward for service.

9. Yes.

S.S. PRINCE GEORGE.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Did the Navy Department charter the Steamer Prince George in 1914?
2. If so, from whom?
3. What rate per month?
4. For what purpose was this steamer used?
5. How long was she in possession of the department?
6. What was the total cost to the department for charter, refitting, repairs and all other expenses during the time said ship was in the service of the department?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes, August 8, 1914.

2. Grand Trunk Pacific Railway.

3. $500 per day.

4. Hospital ship on Pacific coast.

5. August 8th to September 23rd, 1914.

6. Charter, $23,500; refit repairs, $5,467.15: other expenses, $18,602.37. Total, $47,569.52.

SS. LOTTIE RUSSELL.

Mr. DUFF:

1. On what date was the steamer Lottie Russell chartered from Chas. Brinster & Sons, of Halifax?
2. How much has been paid for the use of the vessel to date of return to owners?
3. On what date was she returned to owners?
4. What service was she employed at?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. July 7th, 1915.

2. Total hire to 7th February, 1919, $14,800.

3. February 17th, 1919.

4. Gate vessel at Halifax.

SS. TUNA.

Mr. DUFF:

1. On what date was the steamer Tuna acquired by the Government?
2. What was the purchase price?
3. What did the refits and repairs cost from the date of her commissioning to the date she was sold?
4. To whom was she sold?
5. What was her sale price?
6. Did the Government own the Tuna at the date of her sale?
7. If so, on what date did the Government issue a cheque in payment?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1, 2 and 7. The vessel was donated by J. K. L. Ross to the Canadian Government and was taken over by the Naval Service Department on the 24th September, 1914.

3. $44,885.

4. C. Brinster & Sons, Ltd.

5. It was sold as a hulk after machinery and fitting had been removed for $800.

6. Yes.

NAVAL SERVICE PAY ADJUSTMENTS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Are there any claims for pay or adjustments for pay for officers and men who have served in the Canadian Naval Service before the Navy Department at the present time?
2. If so, how many?
3. Is it the intention of the department to settle these claims?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Nineteen.
3. These cases will be settled as soon as necessary pay documents are received and checked up, and accounts balanced.

H.M.C.S. STADACONA.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Was the H.M.C.S. Stadacona purchased by the Government during the period of the war?
2. If so, from whom?
3. What was was the price paid?
4. Was the said steamer employed in connection with the Naval Service work?
5. What have the refit repairs to said steamer cost each year since being purchased by the Government?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. J. H. Ladew.
3. $70,000.
4. Yes.
5. Refittings.. .. ..$39,025 14
   1915-16.. .. .. 7,529 57
   1916-17.. .. .. 11,262 57
   1917-18.. .. .. 17,844 01
   1918-19.. .. .. 7,465 67

H.M.C.S. MILDRED McCOLL.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Was the H.M.C.S. Mildred McColl purchased by the Government during the period of the war?
2. If so, from whom?
3. What was the price paid?
4. Was the vessel employed in connection with the Naval Service work?
5. What have the refit repairs to the said vessel cost each year?
6. What duties did this vessel perform during 1917 and 1918?
7. For what length of time has this vessel been in dockyard hands since being purchased?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Canadian Sardine Co.
3. $4,000.
4. Yes.
5. 1916-17.. .. ..$762 87
   1917-18.. .. .. 721 27
6. Despatch boat in Halifax Harbour.
7. Vessel under repairs from September 4th, 1918, to December 14th, 1918. Delayed waiting new parts for engine.

Mr. LOUIS KOHN.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Has Mr. Louis Kohn of Winnipeg been appointed Secretary of an Economic Commission being sent to Siberia?
2. If so, what salary is he receiving?
3. What travelling expenses will be allowed him?
4. What are his qualifications for this position?
5. Is the Government aware that Mr. Kohn is a Russian?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. $300 a month.
3. Actual expenses while engaged on Government work.
4. He is intimately acquainted with conditions in Russia and Canada, speaks and writes English well, is well versed in French, German and various Slav languages, and bears high recommendations for ability and efficiency.
5. Mr. Kohn is of Russian birth, but has been a naturalized Canadian citizen since 1910.

LT.-COL. ALFRED THOMPSON, M.P.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. What remuneration or salary, outside of Sessional indemnity and travelling expenses connected therewith, did Lieutenant-Colonel Alfred Thompson, M.P. for Yukon, receive from the Government for services rendered in connection with the work of the Military Hospital Commission, or in any other capacity, during the fiscal years 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?
2. What were the total amounts paid him for expenses during the years 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918 other than his travelling expenses as a member to and from the Yukon?
3. What were the amounts of money paid him for his travelling expenses as a Member of Parliament to and from the Yukon for the years 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. As Medical Superintendent of the Military Hospitals Commission he was in receipt of pay of rank as Lieutenant-Colonel, $7.50 per diem from March 27, 1916, the date of his appointment. His duties with the Military Hospitals Commission terminated on March 31, 1918, on which date he was in receipt of pay at the rate of $7.70 per diem, amount of subsistence allowance having been increased as from November, 1917. The total amount paid to this officer by the Military Hospitals Commission was $5,542.70.
2. For travelling expenses incurred as Medical Superintendent of the Military Hospitals Commission $1,522.06.
3. 1912, $750; 1914, $630; 1915, $420; 1916, $630; 1917, $630; 1918, $675.

NAVAL SERVICE RECRUITING.

Mr. D'ANJOU:

1. At the outbreak of hostilities did the Government receive requests asking permission to recruit ratings for the Canadian Naval Service?
2. If so, from whom were these requests received?
3. Did the Department grant the requests?
4. If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. H. C. Wetmore; Wm. Sunley Riley; A. R. Dable; A. Angstrom.

3. No.

4. The department was able to obtain the services of a sufficient number of trained men to man H.M.C. ships then in the Canadian Naval Service without availing itself of the offers of these gentlemen.

ONTARIO AND QUEBEC COLONIZATION.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Is it the intention of the Government, during the present period of reconstruction, to promote colonization in those parts of Northern Ontario and Quebec through which the Transcontinental Railway is extended?

2. In this connection, could not the colonists or settlers be given travelling rates at one cent per mile, or even free transportation in the case of delegates who organize groups of intending settlers from the older districts of Canada?

3. Could not the Government also arrange to have settlers' effects, farm and forest products transported at such a reasonable rate as would stimulate production and clearance of land?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. The Government will co-operate in every way possible with the Provincial Governments concerned to secure the end referred to.

2 and 3. These questions involve matters of policy worthy of consideration. Any decision reached would have to be made applicable to all parts of Canada. The matter will receive early attention.

TRANSFERS OF CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS OFFICIALS FROM MONCTON.

Mr. COPP:

How many officials formerly attached to the Head Office of the Canadian Government Railways at Moncton, N.B., have been transferred to the city of Toronto, the city of Montreal, or elsewhere, for service on the Canadian National Railways?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. C. A. Hayes, formerly General Manager Eastern Lines, Canadian Government Railways, Headquarters at Moncton; now promoted to the position of Vice-President in charge of Traffic all Lines, Canadian National Railways, Headquarters at Toronto.

H. H. Melanson, formerly Passenger Traffic Manager, Canadian Government Railways, Headquarters, Moncton; now promoted to the position of Passenger Traffic Manager, all lines, Canadian National Railways, Toronto.

R. F. McLeod, formerly Assistant General Passenger Agent, Canadian Government Railways, Headquarters, Moncton; now promoted to the position of Assistant to Passenger Traffic Manager, Canadian National Railways, in charge of Tariff Bureau, Montreal.

W. L. Crighton, formerly Advertising Agent, Canadian Government Railways, Moncton; now promoted to General Advertising Agent, all lines, Canadian National Railways, Toronto.

G. E. Smart, formerly Master Car Builder, Canadian Government Railways, Moncton; now promoted to General Master Car Builder, all lines, Canadian National Railways, Toronto.

H. F. Alward, formerly General Claims Agent and Solicitor, Canadian Government Railways, Moncton; now promoted to General Solicitor, Canadian National Railways, Montreal.

THE CANADIAN OFFICIAL RECORD.

* Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. When was the Canadian Official Record established?

2. What is the total weekly edition in (a) English and (b) French?

3. What has been the cost of this publication to date?

4. Is the Government aware that there have been repeated protests by Canadian newspapers against the issue of the Record as being of no value whatever to the Canadian people?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. October 1st, 1918.

2. (a) English, 20,308; (b) French, 5,424.

3. $18,747.54.

4. The Government is aware that there have been certain newspaper criticisms, but these criticisms are small in comparison with the strong endorsation the Canadian Official Record has received from newspapers and other sources.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

What is the weekly expenditure in connection with the publication known as the Canadian Official Record, including salaries of employees, printing and all other incidental expenses?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Printing, $810; salaries, etc., $140.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS—MANAGERS.

Mr. COPP:

1. Who are the General Managers of the Canadian National Railways, and over what line or lines of railway, or portions thereof, have said managers jurisdiction, respectively?

2. What salaries are being paid to said managers respectively?

3. Where do said managers have their headquarters?

4. Is Mr. C. A. Hayes employed by the Canadian National Railways? If so, what position does he occupy? What is his salary?

5. What was his occupation immediately prior to his appointment to present position and what was his salary?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Mr. A. E. Warren and Mr. F. P. Brady. Mr. Warren's jurisdiction extends from O'Brien west on the Transcontinental and all lines Canadian Northern Railway west of Port Arthur. Mr. Brady's jurisdiction extends over all lines of Canadian Northern Railway east of Port Arthur and east of O'Brien on the Transcontinental and over the former Canadian Government Railways.

2. Mr. Warren's salary is $10,000 per annum and Mr. Brady's is $12,000 per annum.

3. Mr. Warren's headquarters are at Winnipeg, and Mr. Brady's headquarters are at Montreal.

4. Mr. C. A. Hayes is employed by Canadian National Railways as Vice-President in charge of traffic; his salary is $12,000 per annum.

5. Mr. Hayes was General Manager of Canadian Government Railways, Eastern Lines; his salary was $12,000 per annum.

TAXES ON ARTICLES OF LUXURY.

Mr. DESAULNIERS:

1. What is the gross amount received by the Government in connection with taxes upon articles of luxury, in the Island of Montreal, at present date?

2. What have been the total salary disbursements, commissions, or other expenditures, made by the Government in connection with the collection of said taxes?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1.

Automobiles	$167,408 77
Jewellery	66,065 42
Musical rolls and records	55,483 46
Playing cards	27,489 53
Mechanical pianos and organs	3,199 33
Gramophones and talking machines	8,219 74
Moving pictures films	14,512 10
	$342,378 35

2. Information not available as the regular staff of excise officers have supervized the collection of these taxes in addition to their other duties.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Mr. DUFF:

1. What has been the total cost to date for the administration of the Military Service Act?

2. How much has been paid to military police for wages and expenses?

3. How many persons have they apprehended?

4. Were the military police paid so much per day for their services? If so, what amount per day did each policeman receive?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. To January 31st, 1919, $3,661,417.20.

By the Department of Militia and Defence.

1. $1,711,675.73.

2. 850 all ranks, at an average pay of $2.25 a day for 12 months; approximately $700,000.

3. Apprehended under Military Service Act, 27,459.

4. The Military Police employed in connection with the Military Service Act were paid pay of their ranks plus $1 per diem extra duty pay.

Mr. TOBIN:

How many men of military age were registered under the Military Service Act, 1917, in each of the nine provinces of Canada?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

Province.	Class 1.	Draft 1 Defaulters on stn'gth.	19 Class.	Americans.	Total.
Alta.	28,076	550	4,228	8,087	40,941
B. C.	18,169	870	2,630	4,395	26,064
Man.	22,515	1,206	4,544	1,954	30,219
N. B.	16,902	1,020	4,403	258	22,583
N. S.	25,616	1,087	4,702	300	31,705
Ont.	124,965	2,781	28,711	6,119	162,576
P. E. I.	4,501	67	1,095	50	5,713
Que.	115,602	1,806	22,656	4,599	144,663
Sask.	45,536	657	5,932	6,310	58,435
Totals	401,882	10,044	78,901	32,072	522,899

EUCLID HALL, TORONTO.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. Is it a fact that paralytic military patients are kept in Euclid Hall, Toronto? If so, how many?

2. How many patients are above the ground floor?

3. What facilities, if any, are provided in case of fire for removing these patients who are unable to walk?

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. Yes. Twenty-one.

2. Twenty-one on first floor, above the ground floor.

3. Two double stairways and one elevator, six stretchers, five orderlies and one physician constantly in attendance; eight nurses on duty during the day time and two nurses on duty at night.

SESSIONAL INDEMNITY.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Is it the intention of the Government to make advances to the members of the House of Commons on account of their indemnity at the rate of $10 per day payable at the end of each month as in former years?

2. If so, why are the required attendance forms not placed in the parliamentary Post Office as heretofore?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government is not aware of any change in the practice

which has prevailed with regard to the matter referred to in this question.

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INFORMATION.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Who is in charge of the Department of Public Information?
2. How much did the said Department cost during the year 1918?
3. What is the total outlay in connection with the publication of the Official Record to date?
4. Who is the editor, and what salary does he draw per annum?
5. With reference to the fact that a speech delivered by the Hon. Minister of Immigration and Colonization at Toronto on January 10, 1919, was published in the Canadian Official Record, are the columns of the above named journal open for the publication of a speech by a member of the Opposition?
6. Is it the intention of the Government to continue the publication of the Canadian Official Record? If so, how long?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. M. E. Nichols, Director; Dr. Geo. H. Locke, Associate Director.
2. Approximately $79,000
3 To March 1, 1919, $21,980.
4. The Official Record is under the direction of the Director of Public Information. The News Editor is Mr. Roland Hill, salary $200 per month.
5. The address of the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, as also certain other addresses, were published in the official record in order to give the public information as to the plans and procedure adopted by the Government in carrying out the work of demobilization, repatriation and land settlement. It is not the intention to publish further addresses by members of the Government.
6. The matter is under the consideration of the Government.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT RAILWAYS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Are the locomotives, material, buildings, stations, sheds for cars, locomotive trucks, workshops, and elevators of the Intercolonial Railway insured against fire?
2. If so, for what amount, in what companies, and by whom was the said insurance placed?
3. What is the amount of earnings of traffic, passenger, merchandise, Royal Mail, express, and other earnings?
4. What are the gross earnings of the Intercolonial Railway?
4. What are the gross earnings of the Government Railways for the last three years?
6. What was the cost of exploitation of the Intercolonial Railway traction wagons, keeping the upkeep of the roadbed, station, etc.?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No.
2. Answered by No. 1.

[Sir Thomas White.]

3. Intercolonial Railway for the fiscal year ending March 31, 1918, $18,758,186.41.
4. See answer to No. 3.
5. Gross earnings of Government Railways for fiscal year, 1915-16, $18,427,908.66; 1916-17, $23,539,758.61; 1917-18, $27,240,956.87.
6. Cost of maintenance of equipment, way and structures is as follows, for the fiscal year 1917-18; maintenance of equipment, $3,660,110.34; maintenance of way and structures, $3,996,415.23.

MR. J. K. L. LAFLAMME.

*Mr CASGRAIN:

1. Is Mr. J. K. L. Laflamme still private secretary to the Postmaster General, the Honourable P. E. Blondin? If not, why were his services dispensed with?
2. Does he occupy any position in the Government service at the present time? If so, what position and what is his salary?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Not presently. His temporary transfer has been requested by the Department of Public Information as editor of the French edition of the Canadian Official Record.
2. Chief clerk,1-B, of Post Office Department at $2,800.

CIVIL SERVICE EXAMINATION PAPERS.

*Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Are the examination papers for the Civil Service Commission printed in their own offices?
2. Who is in charge of the printing plant of the Commission?
3. By whom, and upon whose recommendation was the Commission's confidential printer appointed?
4. Who was Secretary of State when the appointment was made?
5. Who previously held the position of confidential printer to the Commission and why was he removed from office?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes.
2. John Joseph McCann.
3. By the Governor in Council under the provisions of Section 21 Civil Service Amendment Act, 1908, on the recommendation of the Civil Service Commission.
4. Hon. Charles Murphy.
5. Mr. Chas. Hudson was sent by the King's Printer to install the printing plant and his services were loaned for the printing of the papers for the examinations held in the months of March and May, 1909. When a permanent appointment became necessary Mr. McCann was selected and appointed to the position.

"TI-NOIR" DESJARDINS.

*Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. Has the Order of the House issued for the production of a copy of all correspondence

and documents exchanged between the Minister of Justice and his department and their representative in Montreal, in connection with obtaining the release on bail, and arranging bail in security for one Charles, alias Ti-Noir Desjardins, been complied with?

2. If not, why?

3. Is it the intention of the Government to deposit before the House these documents at an early date this session?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The order referred to in this question was laid on the table of the House a few days ago.

ADMIRAL SIR JOHN JELLICOE.

Mr. BELAND:

1. Has the Canadian Government been informed of the early visit of Admiral Sir John Jellicoe to this country?

2. If so, is the visit official?

3. Whether official or unofficial, will one of the objects be the question of the Naval Defence, Canadian or Imperial?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Yes.

SALE OF TRAWLERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Were the seven trawlers reported to have been recently sold in Halifax the property of the Government or of any department thereof?

2. If so, to whom were they sold?

3. What was the price obtained?

4. Were tenders asked for by public advertisement?

5. Were they sold to the lowest tenderer?

6. What was the initial cost of these vessels?

7. How much was expended in repairing these vessels while owned by the department?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1 and 2. Seven vessels owned by the Department of the Naval Service and known as P.V. Nos. 1 to 7 were recently sold to Msesrs. Hayes & Anderton, 50 Broad St., New York, N.Y.

3. $40,000 each for 6, $30,000 for 1; total $270,000.

4. Yes.

5. No. As the offers received were too low they were rejected. By negotiations the department obtained the above quoted prices from the firm indicated who were one of the original tenderers.

6. $704,955.51.

7. $134,917.22 for alterations to fit them for service conditions. $64,359.60, repairs.

DEEP BROOK POST OFFICE EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What is the name of the postmaster at Deep Brook, Annapolis County, N.S.?

2. What is the name of the assistant postmaster, and if there is more than one assistant, what is the name of each?

3. Have all the parties acting as assistants been duly appointed, and have they complied with the post office regulations?

4. Have any of the following parties been sworn as assistants, namely: George Litmars, Miss Adams, Henry Sales, Vera Litmars, Harry Vroom?

5. If so, what are names of such as have been duly appointed and sworn?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. James R. Ditmars.

2. The Post Office Department does not appoint assistant postmasters, except in the case of city post offices, and has, therefore, no record of the names of assistant postmasters in rural post offices, such employees being appointed by the postmasters themselves, and paid by them.

3, 4 and 5. Answered by No. 2.

CHINESE STUDENTS.

Mr. STEVENS:

1. How many Chinese students have been given free entry to Canada through the ports of the Pacific Coast during the years 1917,1918?

2. What is the definition of a student under the regulations of the Immigration Act?

3. Has the Government been advised, or is it aware that large numbers of Chinese are entering Canada as students who are not bona fide students?

4. Has the Government recently received any requests from representatives of the Chinese Government in Canada or from other sources to enter into such arrangement with the Chinese Government as will result in voluntarily restricting Chinese emigation to Canada?

Hon. Mr. CALDER:

1. 1917, one; 1918, three.

2. The definition of "student" under the Chinese Immigration Act is as follows: "Students coming to Canada for the purpose of securing a higher education in any Canadian college or university or other educational institution approved by the minister."

3. It has recently come to the notice of the Government that a number of Chinese, who entered Canada within recent months, declaring themselves to be students, are not now attending school. These Chinese were not admitted as exempt from the head tax, but paid the head tax, declaring at the same time that they would attend school in Canada.

4. No.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What has been the number of homestead entries made each year in Canada since 1896?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

Departmental Year ending:

December 31, 1896	1,857
,, 31, 1897	2,384
,, 31, 1898	4,848
,, 31, 1899	6,689
June 30, 1900	7,426
,, 30, 1901	8,167
,, 30, 1902	14,673
,, 30, 1903	31,383
,, 30, 1904	26,073
,, 30, 1905	30,819
,, 30, 1906	41,869
Nine months ended March 31, 1907	21,647
Year ended March 31, 1908	30,424
,, ,, 31, 1909	39,081
,, ,, 31, 1910	41,568
,, ,, 31, 1911	44,479
,, ,, 31, 1912	39,151
,, ,, 31, 1913	33,699
,, ,, 31, 1914	31,829
,, ,, 31, 1915	24,088
,, ,, 31, 1916	17,030
,, ,, 31, 1917	11,199
,, ,, 31, 1918	8,319
Balance of Calendar Year 1918	3,521
First two months of 1919	417

NEWSPRINT INQUIRY.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What has been the cost to the Government to date of the paper inquiry conducted by Mr. R. A. Pringle, K.C.?
2. What has been the result of the said paper inquiry?
3. What benefit has the country derived therefrom?
4. What benefit did the publishers derive therefrom?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. Total amount paid to March 12, $75,945.26.
2. Regulated supply and price of paper.
3. The benefit of the continuance of many newspapers which would otherwise have been obliged to suspend publication; the war news service rendered by the said newspapers and their aid in sustaining and stimulating the spirit of the people during the war.
4. Answered by No. 3.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. PROULX:

1. What members of the Government have had their speeches or addresses printed and published at public cost since 1st August, 1914?
2. How much has been expended by the Government for the printing, publication and distribution of these speeches and addresses?

[Mr. J. H. Sinclair.]

Mr. VIEN:

1. What is the staff and the personnel employed at Quebec, Que., for the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment?
2. What are their respective names, domiciles and salaries?
3. Which of them are returned soldiers, and what service did they perform in the Canadian Expeditionary Force?
4. How many demands were made by returned soldiers at Quebec in connection with their civil re-establishment, giving: (a) Name of claimant; (b) His place of origin; (c) The nature and date of his demand; (d) The adjudication in each case, and date?

Mr. PEDLOW:

1. What are the duties of the Department of Public Information?
2. What publication does it issue?
3. What is the annual cost of the department?
4. What are the names of the men employed, their former occupations and present salaries?
5. How many newspaper men are employed by the said department?

Mr. BOURASSA:

1. What is the total amount of the damages caused by accidents which have occurred on the Intercolonial Railway, between Moncton and Lévis, since the 1st November, 1918, to residents' and Government property, respectively?
2. Were any lives lost as a result of such accidents? If so, how many?

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What is the total amount paid by the Canadian Government for the rental of offices and other space, in the Cities of Montreal, Ottawa, and Quebec, as well as in all the different provinces of the Dominion, to put in force the Military Service Act?
2. What are the names of the proprietors or landlords from whom the said offices or places were leased?
3. What are the names of the lawyers who attended to and helped The Honourable Mr. Justice Duff, in Ottawa, in the disposal of the appeals made under the Military Service Act, last year, and how much were they paid?

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. What amount was paid to the Ottawa Journal and Ottawa Journal-Press for Government printing, advertising and job work from 1896 to 1911, inclusive?
2. What amounts were paid to the Ottawa Journal and Ottawa Journal-Press for Government printing, advertising and job work in each of the years 1912, 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917 and 1918?

Mr. PROULX:

1. What were the total expenses in connection with the Victory Loan campaign of 1918 in Prince Edward County, Ontario.
2. How many clerks were employed in connection with the said campaign in the said county?
3. What amount was paid to each, and of such amount, how much was for salary and how much for travelling expenses?

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the names of the one hundred and thirty-three persons who were prosecuted

during the years 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919, for having been found in possession of, or for selling, adulterated maple sugar?

2. What were the amounts of the fines in each case?

Mr. BOYER:

1. What are the names of the one hundred and twenty-seven persons who were prosecuted during the years 1913, 1914, 1915, 1916, 1917, 1918 and 1919, for having been found in possession of, or for selling, adulterated maple syrup?

2. What were the amounts of the fines in each case?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

For a return giving the name and rank of all military officers receiving pay in Military District No. 6, on December 31, 1918, also setting forth the rate of pay in each case, and the total amount paid during 1918, including allowances of every description, also the number of days leave of absence in each case during the year 1918.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all telegrams, letters, correspondence, petitions and other documents in any way referring to the appointment of a postmaster at Port Hawkesbury, during the years 1918 and 1919.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

For a copy of all telegrams, letters, order papers or other correspondence in any way connected with the discharge of cargoes of the vessels, J. M. Rafuse and W. F. Davidson, in the year 1918, in New York Harbour.

MOTIONS FOR PRODUCTION OF PAPERS.

On the Notice of Motion.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a copy of the papers and correspondence exchanged between the Governor General of Canada, the Government of Canada or any of its members or Departments, with the Officers Commanding the Canadian Militia overseas and the British authorities concerning the war, its conduct, its termination and also concerning the sending of the Canadian troops overseas within the last four years.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I hope the hon. member, in whose name this Notice of Motion stands, will be good enough to withdraw it. The Government does not regard it to be in the public interest that the information called for should be brought down.

Notice of Motion dropped.

On the Notice of Motion:

Mr. CASGRAIN:

For a return showing the number of commutations of sentences accorded by the Department of Justice to prisoners condemned to be hanged, where the crimes were committed, and the sentence imposed after commutation, within the last four years, showing in what cases the report of the Judge sitting at the trial was favourable to the accused.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The words of the proposed motion from the word "showing" in the fourth line down to the end, and reading as follows—

Showing in what cases the report of the judge sitting at the trial was favourable to the accused.

—should, in deference to the practice of this House, be omitted. It has never been the practice, nor do I think it is in the public interest, that the confidential reports of judges in capital cases, or, indeed, in any cases, should be brought down. With that amendment I have no objection to the motion passing.

Mr. CASGRAIN moved:

For a return showing the number of commutations of sentences accorded by the Department of Justice to prisoners condemned to be hanged, where the crimes were committed, and the sentence imposed after commutation, within the last four years.

Motion agreed to.

ALIEN ENEMIES—TREATMENT OF SOLDIERS.

Mr. H. S. CLEMENTS (Comox-Alberni) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the policy of the Government in relation to the internment of alien enemies, deportation of undesirable persons and the treatment of soldiers be clearly defined.

He said: Did I not consider this resolution to be of very great importance to the Dominion at large, I would not take up the time of the House in discussing it. I consider the resolution of such importance that I feel that this Government ought to take immediate and no uncertain action in the matter Before discussing the alien situation, I wish to make it perfectly clear that I am not referring to any man of alien birth who is naturalized, so long as he remains true to the institutions and laws of this country. So far as interned aliens in this Dominion are concerned, I am not in a position to state just what the policy of the Government will be, but I say unhesitatingly that every alien enemy who was interned during the war is to-day just as much an enemy as he was during the war, and I demand of this Government that each and every interned alien in this Dominion should be deported at the earliest opportunity. It is not necessary to wait for palatial ships in order that these aliens may be

deported. Cattle ships are good enough for them, and I believe there are enough of such ships to deport the alien enemies at the earliest moment possible.

We have, in this Dominion, another class of aliens, and I regret to say that that class, pro rata according to our population, is probably more numerous in the fair province of British Columbia from which I come than in any other province. We have in this country naturalized aliens who were naturalized for a purpose, naturalized not to become true Canadian citizens and to respect the laws and institutions of this country, but for their own personal profit and to obtain, under that naturalization, advantages which belong first to the returned soldiers and secondly to true Canadian citizens. I shall have much more to say along that line in a moment or two.

The Immigration Department, in the past, especially during the regime of our friends opposite, from the time they came into power until 1911, seemed to have the desire to populate this country with classes of people from whose presence we in Canada are suffering to-day. Immigrants from the Balkan States—the riff-raff of Europe—were paid and assisted to come to this country. Such a class of immigrants should never have been brought into Canada. Our great trouble in the Dominion to-day is not with the true Canadian citizens; it is with the alien who is probably, as I mentioned before, naturalized for a purpose. He is in this country as an agitator, to stir up strife. He has no regard for true liberty, nor has he any regard for Canada. The trouble in the province from which I come is with men of the I.W.W. and the Bolshevisk type.

Instead of working for the splendid wages they could receive and becoming decent citizens, they are causing trouble and dissension and promoting strikes throughout the province of British Columbia, and in this connection I must censure the Immigration Department for its administration during the past two years. Every hon. gentleman knows that the bars have been let down against skilled and unskilled labour coming into the province of British Columbia. We had at one time all the labour we thought we needed in the province, but when war broke out practically every man in the province who was physically fit went to the front and did his duty. It was not necessary to conscript a single man, because they all went without a murmur to fight for you and me. The result was that labour became scarce in the province. At the same time, labour was urgently needed to get out the spruce timber which was required in the construction of aeroplanes for winning this war. British Columbia produces more spruce than possibly any other part of this Dominion, and there was consequently an urgent call for labour. The bars were let down, and there followed an influx of labour of the undesirable type I have mentioned. Most of these people are within the borders of the province of British Columbia to-day, to the regret of every citizen of that province, and I hope, of every citizen of this Dominion. Drastic action is required and I trust that in future the officials of the Immigration Department will closely scrutinize every individual allowed to enter this country, in order to determine as far as they can whether he will make a good type of citizen. Rather than have undesirables such as I have mentioned coming into this country, we can all afford to live the balance of our lives in Canada without allowing the entrance of another immigrant.

There is another matter I wish to mention. I commend the Government for passing an Order in Council recently compelling every person naturalized in this country to affix his photograph to his naturalization papers; but the Government did not go far enough. I strongly urge the Government to make the Order in Council retroactive, so that every foreigner throughout this Dominion shall be obliged to have his photograph attached to his naturalization papers. We in the province of British Columbia know that many of these foreigners look alike, and it is hard to distinguish one from another, and some such step as I have suggested is necessary for the protection of true Canadian citizens. Why do I say that? Well, it does not take one of these foreigners very long to accumulate a little stock of money sufficient to keep him in comfort in his native land, and many men who were naturalized before this recent order with regard to photographs go back home and hand their naturalization papers to some pal, who takes his name and comes out to Canada. The privileges of Canadian citizenship are being usurped very often in that way, and I sincerely trust that the minister will favourably consider my suggestion, which I feel it would be in the interests of this Dominion, and especially of the province of British Columbia, to adopt.

As a Canadian, I wish to offer a few suggestions—and I care not what others may say, except that I hope they may agree with me—with regard to the Franchise Act. The present Act must be amended to a very considerable degree, and amended, first,

along educational lines. I say that every one of the thousands of people of the sort I have mentioned who were naturalized for a specific purpose, and were just as disloyal during the war as the Kaiser himself, ought not to be allowed to vote. They ought not to be allowed even civil rights in this country. Hon. members who come from the large centres such as Vancouver or Winnipeg or Toronto may not agree with me, but the situation in those centres is very different. Those cities are properly policed, and this undesirable element of our population is not allowed to preach its seditious doctrines, but in the rural disricts, and for hundreds of miles along the coast of British Columbia, sedition is openly preached: I am sure none of my fellow-members from that province will deny that, and I say it is a disgrace to this country. It is impossible to police these sections of the country, and I think now is an opportune time for taking a census of these undesirables. I care not how it is done. The true Canadian citizen, regardless of his political faith, past or present, would be able to give information as to the number of these undesirables in his own little district, and the census could be taken at a very small cost to the country. It is a disgrace that these people should be allowed to exercise the franchise in this country and usurp the privileges of Canadian citizens.

I come to the returned soldiers' problem for a moment. I am well aware that there are many honourable gentlemen in this House who have been to the front and have acquitted themselves with credit and glory to Canada and who are more capable of discussing this subject than possibly I am, but as I see the situation, the problem is not by any means as serious as many in the country regard it. I think, however, that it deserves the greatest possible attention from every government, whether federal or provincial. The returned soldier is entitled to everything that can be done to make his position comfortable, and I sincerely hope that the Government of Canada, as well as that of every province, will do everything in their power on behalf of these brave men. I fully appreciate what this Government is endeavouring to do for the returned soldiers, and in respect to the legislation which has been enacted, and which will be enacted, this Government deserves a great deal of credit. Undoubtedly there will be individual cases that will not have received the attention they merit, and I trust that such cases will be very carefully considered. In discussing this question with hundreds of returned soldiers from the district which I have the honour to represent, I have discovered that the great majority of them will be perfectly reasonable and sane in their demands. They will not expect this Government to keep them and father them for all time, but what they do expect is a square deal. When patronage was within the scope of the individual member, and when my recommendation might have counted for something, from the outbreak of the war and prior to the abolition of patronage I never recommended any man but a returned soldier, and so long as I live I shall maintain the same attitude towards those who have returned from the front, always having, of course, efficiency and proper service in view. Now, this Dominion brought into the country some 300,000 to 375,000 immigrants per year prior to the outbreak of the war. If the Federal Government and the provincial governments do their duty by the soldiers in placing them in positions, they can absorb a very great portion of the returned men. But as I view the situation, it rests a great deal with the employers of the country. I think that every employer in Canada, whether he employs two thousand men or ten, ought to be patriotic enough to engage a certain pro rata number returned men and I feel the matter has only to be brought to their attention to be favourably considered. There are many large plants, especially in the territory I represent—mining and paper plants—which employ a vast amount of labour. There is a certain percentage of these plants which at present could hardly be manned by true Canadian citizens because foreign labour is essential to their operation. Now, I want to give credit to the aliens who were working in these plants. They realized their position, did their work well, and caused no trouble whatever. But there are thousands upon thousands of other aliens, naturalized in many cases, who are employed throughout the Dominion, and who ought not to receive consideration at the hands of any employer. I could mention plants in which there are employed anywhere from 200 to 500 men, and I venture to say that not 10 per cent of these men can speak English. Would you, Mr. Speaker, ask the returned men to accept employment in such places where sedition is rife? That is a condition of affairs that must receive attention, and I hope that this Government will realize that the alien problem is one of the most serious questions that confront the public of Canada to -day, and if it is not grappled with

a strong hand I see trouble ahead. There are many other problems concerning the returned soldier that I feel are not receiving the consideration they ought to receive. I notice the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Stevens) and others have resolutions on the Order Paper which will introduce a discussion of some of the questions that I would like very much to see discussed.

One question that ought to be dealt with and dealt with immediately, is the technical education of the men who enlisted from the ages of sixteen and upwards who have returned to this country, and who had not the opportunity of completing their education before leaving for the war. Many of them were studying for various professions, and the continuation of their studies I regard as a serious question which the Government should take into consideration with promptitude. I entirely concur in the resolution which was adopted by the War Veterans of Vancouver recently. I do not think it is necessary to read the resolution, which I feel to be in the interests of the Dominion and of returned soldiers. However, I fully endorse the views expressed in that resolution.

Mr. McKENZIE: What is it? It will be interesting to know what the resolution contains.

Mr. CLEMENTS: It reads:

Declaring that the Oriental was a detriment to Canada, members of the G.W.V.A. last night passed a resolution asking the Government to prevent further immigration of this class for a period of two years. Strong protests were lodged against immigration of Chinese as students. The meeting further went on record with a resolution that foreigners who served with the Canadian Expeditionary Forces overseas be given full citizenship in the Dominion.

Now I come to a question the responsibility of which I feel myself, and I urge honestly, in so far as I am personally concerned, that every individual in this Dominion, man, woman or child, is entitled to the privileges under which he was born. I recall what was done by the Fathers of Confederation. Although the bargain that was made at that time was for the purpose of promoting the best interests of this Dominion, I claimed that some of the arrangements in connection with that bargain are not working to the best advantage of the whole country. What I desire and what I hope every individual member of this House desires, is not only unison of thought but unity amongst the people of the different provinces. I claim that the spread is getting greater and greater since this Confederation pact was consummated. That spread is becoming wider and wider each day. I hope I am not tramping on the corns of any individual member of this House in the observations which I am making in regard to this question. There is not an atom of bigotry within my soul. Every man is entitled to his privileges whether they have to do with his church or otherwise. Whether the people of the eastern provinces agree with me or not, I say that the individual who cannot foresee what the western provinces desire and demand is not very far seeing. What I advocate from my own personal point of view, as being necessary to bring about unison among the people of this country is a non-sectarian national school system from one end of this Dominion to the other.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): Mr. Speaker, the resolution moved by the hon. member for Comox-Alberni (Mr. Clements) reads:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient that the policy of the Government in relation to the internment of alien enemies, deportation of undesirable persons and the treatment of soldiers be clearly defined.

The subject covered by the resolution is wider than can possibly be answered properly by the minister of any single department because it refers to internment on the one hand and the deportation of undesirables whether interned or not, apparently, and in the second place, and lastly, to the subject of the treatment of soldiers in general, presumably meaning returned soldiers.

The very interesting address which the hon. gentleman has delivered covers even a wider range than that of the resolution and indeed, in the main has a bearing upon the general question of immigration into this country and the revision of our immigration laws. I shall make no reference in the few remarks I shall offer to that phase of the subject inasmuch as immigration has not been under the Department of the Interior since I took charge. But while referring to the first subject raised by the resolution I shall say a very few words in regard to the last.

The policy of the Government in regard to internment of course dates back to the opening of the war. At that time the internment took place on a very considerable scale of persons of alien enemy origin who were interned, not in every case because they were showing evidence of hostility or were in any sense undesirable or misbehaving themselves at that time, but because under the conditions that obtained when war was precipitated, they were out

of work and in that state were a menace to the community. There were a number of course who were interned by reason of hostility shown.

As the years progressed the conditions of unemployment that obtained at the opening of the war were very much mitigated and indeed the pendulum swung to the other **extreme until there** became a need in Canada for more labour and for a larger source of labour supply than the country under these conditions afforded. That being the case, a very considerable pressure was brought to bear to provide for the release of aliens who were interned on account of their being out of work and who had shown during internment no evidence whatever of hostility to the country and no reason to lead us to believe that they would not behave themselves as good citizens if they were released from internment or restraint. A careful examination was carried on as to all those who were the subjects of our internment operations and the greatest care was exercised that none of those interned were allowed to take work except where work was already provided, where labour could not otherwise be obtained and where the men to be released had shown evidence that there would be no cause to regret their being given freedom from internment and restraint. On the 19th December last I asked for a report from Sir William Otter, who had charge of internment work, as to the number in the various camps in Canada, their nationalities, the properties held by them, in so far as we could tell, and also as to certain other particulars covered by the request. The report made by Sir William Otter at that time showed that there were under internment altogether 2,222 men.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will the minister tell the date of the report?

Mr. MEIGHEN: The 19th December. It must be remembered in this connection that the activities of the department in relation to alien enemies were not confined really to those interned. The department took a register, in so far as it could be taken throughout the Dominion, which register increased in completeness as time went on until we believed we had practically a record of all the alien enemies in the country. A close watch was kept, and is kept, of their occupations, and activities, and they are all pretty well followed. But, as to internment alone, the report shows a total of 2,222 distributed as follows:

Camp.	No.
Munson	63
Vernon	388
Kapuskasing	1007
Amherst	764
	2,222

Of these 1,700 were Germans, thus emphasizing the fact that the great majority of those interned merely because they were a menace from the fact that they were unemployed, were of the Austrian labour class. There were 1,700 Germans unreleased on that date, 489 Austrians, 11 Turks, 7 Bulgarians, and 15 of miscellaneous origin.

Of the 1,700 Germans, however, 800 were sent here from the West Indies, and were held by us subject to the final disposition of the British Government.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They would be classed as prisoners of war I presume?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I do not think there is any different designation applicable to them than would be applicable to the other 900 of them. They were interned and were in that sense prisoners of war, and in that sense only. Of these 900 there was reason to believe that about 80 per cent of them could be classed as hostile or otherwise dangerous or undesirable. That is to say, in so far as the closest observation of the internment officers could possibly bring them to a conclusion, and that observation of course was assisted by reports, voluntary and otherwise, obtained with regard to these men from various sources in the Dominion.

As to Austrians, there was certain of them, but very few, as to whom there was reason to believe that they were of the dangerous or undesirable class, and this remark would apply to a larger proportion of the very small number who belonged to other nationalities. So summing the situation up, the reports of the officers of the Department seem to lead to this conclusion: that the great body, virtually all, of the Germans interned at that time could be classed as hostile, dangerous, or for one reason or other undesirable (54 of them were insane), and as to the Austrians a much smaller proportion could be so classed.

The question, however, in immediate issue is as to what should be done, and what the policy of the Government has been and is with regard to those men. At the time that report was received I submitted a recommendation to Council, which recommendation was accepted, and I think I cannot do better, in order to give a specific and defi-

nite answer to the resolution of the hon. member, than to read it:

"The undersigned has the honour to submit a copy of a report of the 19th ultimo from the Director of Internment Operations giving particulars with regard to interned prisoners of war, from which it would appear
4 p.m. that there are at the various camps throughout Canada in all 2,222, of whom 1,700 are Germans, the remaining 522 being of Austrian and other enemy nationalities, practically all of the labouring class. It appearing moreover that the 1,700 Germans, 800 were transferred from the West Indies, and are held at the request of His Majesty's Government."

I would draw the attention of the House in a special manner to that report, because we kept constantly in touch with the British authorities in order to ascertain to what extent we could secure the deportation of these undesirable alien enemies to their native land.

By Colonial Office despatch of 14th ultimo it is stated that repatriation by way of Great Britain is now possible to a number not exceeding one hundred adult male enemy aliens from the Dominion, and that in the case of each person full particulars should be telegraphed to ensure proper arrangements as soon as possible.

The undersigned considers it desirable that all enemy interned prisoners who may be regarded as dangerous, hostile or undesirable should be repatriated with the least possible delay, and he therefore recommends that it be provided under the authority of the War Measures Act, 1914, that the Minister of Justice shall be authorized to direct the immediate expulsion, removal or deportation from Canada for the purposes of their repatriation of all such interned aliens of enemy nationality as he may consider dangerous, hostile or undesirable persons to reside in Canada, and that a direction by the Minister of Justice under his hand shall be sufficient authority for the purpose aforesaid.

Moreover the undersigned recommends that inquiry be made of His Majesty's Government for the purpose of obtaining directions as to what disposition is to be made of the 800 who were transferred from the West Indies.

As to the property of interned prisoners in Canada, the undersigned recommends that this shall remain subject to the regulations and powers conferred as heretofore, the restitution or ultimate disposition thereof depending upon the conclusion and stipulations of peace, but that in cases where there is money of the prisoners in the hands of the Director of Internment Operations he be authorized to pay thereout to each of such prisoners upon deportation a sum not exceeding $75 as a provision for travelling expenses.

That is to say, their expenses to be covered from their own money.

That was a statement of policy in direct response to the resolution as passed at that date following the report from Sir William Otter, Director of Internment Operations. I may say in this connection that the question of admission of alien enemies to enemy countries, as well indeed to a lesser degree the question of transportation from Canada to Europe, and from European ports to the enemy countries is a subject necessarily under the deliberations of and subject to the disposition of the Peace Conference. The conference, by a press despatch (which I think is correct) of the 22nd of February last, gave answer to the request of the German Embassy that they would not consider at that time its request to permit the return of any of the enemy prisoners of war, the intention being that until peace is finally settled, and possibly longer, the Entente Powers will not take the risk of in any way whatever adding to the manpower of the Central Powers. Consequently, the question of the admission into the enemy countries of interned aliens is necessarily subject wholly for the time being to the decision of the Peace Conference itself, and that being the case the Government of this country can only act when the decision of the Peace Conference is communicated to it. That answer applies wholly and most directly to the resolution that is now before the House. But subject to that overpowering and commanding factor in the situation, our policy is to deport with the least possible delay all alien enemies who have shown themselves undesirable, dangerous or hostile.

The question of transportation comes in as well with relation to alien enemies; and that is the subject of the resolution. The resolution, mark you, bears not at all on aliens, however undesirable, from countries other than enemy countries. But the question of transportation with regard to alien enemies is necessarily a secondary question to the question of repatriation itself, which latter question is under the jurisdiction for the time being of the Entente Powers as collectively represented at the Peace Conference. But in so far as transportation goes, our communications from the British authorities are to this effect: that such is the condition of railway transport in Central and Eastern Europe that even were alien enemies now to be admitted to repatriation to the Central Powers, their transportation could not be secured under present conditions. The Dutch Government has taken the ground that any who land at their ports must be such that they can be transported thence within three days or their landing will not be permitted.

That being the case, the British Government take the ground that they cannot admit into England at this time any substantial number of aliens for repatriation into

Europe. Of course, they could admit only a limited number,—as, indeed, they have advised us in the despatch referred to—of enemies for repatriation in Austria and Germany. As intimated in the recommendation which I read, they advised us a short time ago that they had made arrangements whereby one hundred could be transported via Great Britain to the land of their birth. Immediately that number was secured of the most undesirable, as we deemed them, and they were sent over for repatriation.

Steps have been taken with some success to secure the transportation and admission to their home land of a number of aliens, not alien enemies. At the same time, the number is very limited, and can only be secured, I believe, through the ports of the United States. But as regards alien enemies, the primary factors in the problem—indeed, the controlling factors—have been clearly stated to the House, and I know that every member will understand that the policy of the Government can be carried out only in so far as permitted by those two controlling factors.

The resolution then goes on to deal with the question of the deportation of undesirables generally.

Mr. EDWARDS: What is the attitude of the British Government and of the Government of the United States in regard to interned alien enemies?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Does the hon. gentleman mean as to deportation?

Mr. EDWARDS: Yes.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The policy of those two countries is just the same as ours. Of course, the rights of interned alien enemies are subject to our obligations under international law. We give them such rights as international law provides for them; we do not go beyond that.

The question of the deportation of undesirables generally, aside from the matter of internment, is, of course, one that should be dealt with by the Minister of Immigration and Colonization, as well, indeed, as the general subject of immigration dealt with in the speech of the member for Comox-Alberni. As to the treatment of soldiers, that subject is necessarily under the administrative control of several departments of government. The department over which I preside has to do with the treatment of soldiers only to the extent of the provisions of land settlement privileges for them. I do not think the hon. gentleman or the House would expect me to deal at this time with the policy of the administration in the matter of land settlement. A soldier land settlement Bill will be introduced at the earliest possible moment, and ample opportunity will be given for discussion. The review which I shall be able to give at that time will show that in providing land settlement opportunities for soldiers Canada is in advance of all the Allied countries, not only in the extent of the individual provision made, but also in the extent to which the actual administration of that provision has been worked out. I believe we are further ahead to-day than any of the belligerent powers that were embraced within the entente in making this provision. We have not, generally speaking, gone beyond provision for land settlement and vocational training in the way of offering remuneration—subject, of course, to the war gratuity—to our soldiers overseas. The same can be said of every country in the world. But in providing civil advantages for the returned men, I think that in each of the three activites to which I refer—vocational training, land settlement and war gratuity—we are in advance of other countries and it is the policy of the Government to maintain any lead we may have in that regard. If Canada differs from any other nation in her methods of providing for the returned men, she differs by being more generous than any other nation in this respect. The subject is so wide, and must necessarily be dealt with by the House as the several topics come before it for discussion later, that I would not be justified in detaining the House longer at this time. I think that the policy of the Administration with regard to the treatment of interned aliens and their deportation is now fairly well known. As to the passing of this resolution, I have no opinion to offer; I suppose it does not alter the situation whether it passes or whether it does not. It is only right, however, as suggested by the member for Comox-Alberni in his resolution, that the policy of the Government should be fully disclosed to the House.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Mr. Speaker, I desire to add only a few words to what has been said by the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen), because I feel that my doing so at this time will have a tendency to shorten the debate.

In my judgment, the criticism that has been levelled against the immigration policy pursued in this country during the last fifty years is well founded. Canada is to-day paying the penalty which she deserves to pay for what has taken place in

the past. Within the course of a very few days I shall bring down a Bill amending our immigration law, and we shall then have full opportunity of considering this matter in all its bearings. I think therefore, that the discussion of it might very well be deferred until that measure is before the House.

The hon. gentleman (Mr. Clements) made reference to the admission to Canada of undesirables during the course of the past two or three years. Probably some mistakes have been made in that direction as well, but having regard to the conditions that have existed in Canada during the past two or three years, there is probably some excuse for that. From one end of Canada to the other the cry was for more labour in order that we might carry on our war work. In every field—in farm production, in the manufacture of munitions, in shipbuilding, in all the work that was being carried on in Canada—there was a tremendous shortage of labour. If, therefore, a few people came in who should not have come, probably there was some justification for it. Those phases of the general question can very well be discussed when the Immigration Amending Bill is under discussion.

The Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) has referred to the difficulties that exist at the present time in regard to deportation. All that he has said as regards the deportation of the interned alien enemy applies with equal force to all others in this country who, we think, should be deported to their own countries. There are very great difficulties in the way. The fact is not that the Government does not desire to take action, but that conditions in Europe are, at present, such that it is most difficult indeed. We have in our internment camps over 2,000 interned dangerous enemy aliens, and the only word we can get from the British authorities overseas is that they are able to provide for the admission of 100 of those who are to be sent to their own countries. Until such time as we are able to make arrangements whereby those 2,000 or so alien enemies may be sent back to their own countries, hon. members can understand the difficult position we are in so far as other aliens are concerned.

There are in Canada some thousands of foreign-born people who are anxious to return to their own countries. They are not enemy aliens, but other aliens; many of them are friendly aliens who are, for various reasons, anxious to get back to their homes. If we could only find means for sending them back we would have in a short time a tremendous exodus from this country. But, I think every hon. member will realize the conditions that exist to-day in Central Europe, particularly in Austria-Hungary, Poland and Russia. Those countries are practically paralyzed; their transportation facilities are out of operation; famine is staring them in the face; they have no stable government; there is no constituted authority within them with which to enter into negotiations; their ports are not open. As the Acting Minister of Justice has said, the only port through which some of these people might be sent back to their own country is Rotterdam in Holland, and the Dutch authorities have notified the British authorities that unless they have absolute assurance that these people can proceed in so many days after they land at Rotterdam, they will not be allowed to land at all. At one time we thought we might have some Russians sent to Odessa, but for several reasons we have not been able to use that port. I understand the French troops at Odessa have recently been withdrawn. In addition to what I have stated, general food conditions existing throughout many countries in Europe are such as to cause the Governments responsible for conditions there to say: We simply cannot take those people back; we have not food to put into their mouths. And they ask us: Cannot you make some arrangements whereby they may be fed until conditions here become at least partially normal? I do not think I need point out to the House that conditions are such in Europe generally as to make a solution of this problem an exceedingly difficult one. I do not know that anything further can be said at present as regards the general problem. There is no doubt that, so far as alien enemies generally throughout Canada are concerned, any man who is dangerous, who has been hostile, who has shown himself hostile, who has indicated in some way that he is not desirous of becoming a proper Canadian citizen, has no right to remain in this country. Steps should be taken just as soon as possible to cause him to leave this country, but until we are able to get over these practical difficulties, I can see no solution of the problem.

As the Acting Minister of Justice has intimated, there is another phase of the problem. The whole matter is now a subject of discussion at the Peace Conference, and until such time as the Peace Conference have come to a decision as to what

they think should be done in connection with this and other allied questions, it would probably be a little premature on our part to take hasty action. The wise course to pursue, so far as this whole problem is concerned, is to delay final action until we know what conclusions are reached by the Peace Conference. I just wish to assure the House that at a comparatively early date, a full opportunity will be given to discuss the whole question of our immigration policy for the future, as I expect to be able to bring the Bill down within the course of a few days.

Mr. CLEMENTS: I have no desire to bring this matter to a vote, but for the benefit of the House and the country, I desire to amend the statement I made as to the Dominion taking care of 375,000 immigrants each year, the riff-raff of the earth. It was my intention to say that a small proportion of this immigration was the riff-raff to which I referred.

The only other observation I desire to make is to commend the Government upon the policy which I understand they are about to pursue, namely, of distributing the Royal Northwest Mounted Police throughout the province of British Columbia. That is one of the best things the Government could possibly do. The presence of those men is very much needed in British Columbia. It is needless for me to say anything about them, except that they are the finest body of military police to be found in the world. Those men should not be placed in the centres of population. I trust the policy of the Government will be to distribute those red coats throughout the length and breadth of British Columbia, in the fishing centres and so on. If that is done, I feel sure that we shall have no trouble from agitators and others.

Motion withdrawn.

GARDEN VILLAGES FOR SOLDIERS.

Mr. H. M. MOWAT (Parkdale) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to assist disabled and other soldiers to meet the future with confidence, and with that end, that the Dominion should erect a village in the neighbourhood of a city, in each province, to afford them residences and workshops, where they may engage in the production of goods not hitherto made in Canada, as well as objects of art and literature, so as to afford a permanent source of income in addition to their pensions, and that such communities shall be self-supporting after the initial outlay and consist of homes, not barracks or hospitals; that the occupants shall have an option to purchase; that all buildings shall be architecturally sanitary and beautified, and supplied with electric power; and these homes be also available for widows and orphans of soldiers commensurate with their pensions and means.

He said, Mr. Speaker, this motion brings to the attention of the House the very interesting and, one may fairly say, fascinating subject of the garden city or industrial centre, and the importance of Canada's not being behind the Mother Country or Australia or the United States in the advance that is being made in this great project. I first became interested in the question of garden cities or industrial areas at the time of the visit to Canada in 1910 of Mr. Henry Vivian, then a member of the British Parliament, and I dare say many other hon. members who met him could not have failed to take an immediate interest in the work in which he was then engaged and which has become so fruitful in the Mother Country. As yet, in Canada this project has not been approached from a governmental standpoint. There are, however, large industries which have erected, or are erecting, settlements for the comfort of their men. In Australia, near Sydney, there is the village of Daseyville, of 336 acres; in England, the village of Bourneville (Cadbury Bros.), and Port Sunlight (Lever Bros.), both of these latter being industrial sites. Then there is Letchworth, which has now 30,000 inhabitants; Hampstead; Well Hall near Woolwich; Eastriggs; and Gretna, which since its decline as a marriage centre has risen to be a very important place. In the United States, the Government has voted $110,000,000 for assisting in the erection of industrial towns, and these are in the course of development at Yorkship and Bethlehem in New Jersey, and at Norfolk and Bridgeport in Connecticut. In Canada, at Hawkesbury, not far from here, and at Kipawa at the foot of Lake Timiskaming, the Riordans are laying out village settlements for their workmen, to which we look forward with great hope and confidence that they will improve conditions at those places; because, if there is one thing more than another which has impressed itself upon large employers of labour, it is that the contentment of the men and their efficiency depend very much upon good housing accommodation. At Brantford, there have also been erected within the last year a great many houses in connection with a housing scheme there.

There is this to be said about industrial villages erected by large manufacturing concerns: Some Labour union men object to them on the ground that they anchor men to a certain place and diminish their freedom to strike should a strike be deemed

necessary. They claim that it puts the men under a certain amount of obligation to the employer. Whether that is so or not, has scarcely been determined in actual practice; we hope, however, that it is not so, but in any case it is no part of the idea which I am discussing. This scheme of erecting villages in each of the provinces as a beginning, whether they are a success or not, has very little to do with the housing scheme mentioned in the speech from the Throne and which will shortly be before the House, because the Government's housing scheme does not contemplate the erection of new villages in certain communities, but rather the improvement of certain parts of our towns. Consequently, it has not the features which I think should be approved of and put into practice by this House, for instead of reconstructing an anomaly of a settlement, clumsily erected in the beginning and grown without any regard to design or moral considerations, we should try what we can do in virgin soil to improve the condition of the people. In America this distinction was pointed out very recently at a meeting of the American National Housing Association by a prominent New York architect, who said:

"We are not here to prepare the plans and specifications for repairing our ill-begotten cities and our sordid industrial areas, nor to frame compromises, nor to perpetuate fallacies. We are here for the purpose of formulating a statement embodying no less than an ideal with respect to the physical conditions under which men live, to indicate the nature of the problem confronting us in attempting to realize that ideal, and to discuss in broad outlines that policy which will make it possible for every man, woman and child of the nation to live in an environment which will neither stifle nor crush their spirit and make them impotent to render national service in times of war or in times of peace."

So the idea underlying this motion is not to improve or reconstruct, but to start out on a new project untrammelled by former mistakes. Since this motion has been on the Order Paper I have had dozens of letters from the provinces approving of the idea, for there are many in this country who, although we do not hear much of them because they do not like to get into public print, keep themselves informed of current ideas throughout the world, and it is only when a motion like this comes up that they are heard from. In addition to receiving many communications from private individuals, on the whole approving the idea most heartily, I have also received an expression of opinion from that important body of men, the Great War Veterans' Association, who favour the idea. I do not know of any particular resolution—I have not invited any—but the president of one of the principal branches of that association wrote to me enclosing a copy of a resolution passed by the executive of the Great War Veterans' Association for the city of Toronto, which I think it would perhaps be well to read:

Whereas, the housing situation in Toronto and the large cities is such that satisfactory accommodation at a reasonable cost is nearly impossible to obtain, and that the returned soldiers are feeling the effect of this most severely in their efforts to adjust themselves to civilian life.

And whereas, the housing situation after the war will be rendered still more acute by the return of large numbers of our soldiers and also a large influx of ex-Imperial soldiers.

And whereas, those returning from England have seen the great and obvious advantages derived from citizen's gardening the allotments, almost universally allotted to tenants, where they can produce a large proportion of their vegetables.

And whereas, many returned soldiers (a large number disabled), are eager for an opportunity to produce part of their own supplies and to benefit by the work in the open.

And whereas, considerable time is required for the provision of housing accommodation and arranging for garden allotments and supplying transportation facilities.

Therefore, be it resolved, that in the opinion of the York County Executive of the Great War Veterans' Association, the Dominion, Provincial and Municipal Governments should at once seriously consider how the housing problem for returned soldiers can be solved.

As a rider to this resolution, a statement was made that at that meeting that the Veterans did not approve of these communities being confined to returned soldiers only. I myself do not think that they should be. It is true that the motion on the Order Paper does mention them as the persons chiefly to be held in mind, but apparently there is a difference of opinion among the soldiers on this matter. There are soldiers who, by reason of their disablement, have a certain degree of shyness and indisposition to enter society, and who prefer to meet with those who have been afflicted as they themselves have been. But these matters can easily be adjusted in different places. I simply mention the fact to show that I would not argue here that these communities should be confined to returned soldiers. I think it is very well for those who are able to pay the prices of these houses, and who are of like mind, that is, who enter with the intention of making a new community and of being themselves part of a new movement for the betterment of the people. I think these people, and even civilians, should very well

have a chance to obtain their settlements. Now, if, generally speaking, my idea was to do something for the benefit of the returned man, it was because last session we voted some $3,000,000 for the obtaining of land for farm settlement, and as the allotment of money for this purpose has now been considerably increased, I have no doubt the vote this year will be very much larger, and while it is of great importance that we should encourage in every way the settlement of soldiers upon the land that they may produce and make Canada the great agricultural country she is bound to be, yet there are others of the soldiers who are not minded to go upon the farms. It is for the purpose of doing something for these that I introduce this motion for the consideration of the House. Many men who have returned and who are expert in mechanics of one sort or another, or in trades, have been partially injured, not only in limb, but in spirit. Many of them have never been on farms and would not face the dangers and rigours of farm life. In fact, some of them would shrink, and their wives and families too would shrink, from moving out of the environment in which they have always lived, to remote distances, not knowing what the future would be. It is for such men as these that I now plead; so that we will be only dealing fairly with all classes of returned men when we help the mechanic and tradesman, as the motion says, to "look forward to the future with confidence," because that is one of the greatest things before his mind which will induce him to become a well man in the future. It is the lack of confidence and the nervousness as to what his future is to be that is retarding the recovery of many a man to-day. Therefore, these communities should be erected not far away from cities, so that they would be suburbs in a way—not too near to make it too expensive to acquire the land, nor afterwards to keep up the town, nor on the other hand too far away to take the men and their families away from the pleasures of the city, the lecture, concert, or moving picture, or any other purpose for which they may wish to come into the city, one of the great objects being that they may not feel lonely or isolated in the places that may be chosen. It is only by keeping that idea in mind at the very initiation of this plan that you will probably make it entirely popular; though I think that once it is adopted it will be popular from the start. The villages should be near radial lines of railway, so that the time taken in getting to the city should not be great, and so that the men who are injured in limb would not have any difficulty in going back and forth. The land, say, six, seven, eight or ten miles from a city, or from most cities, is agricultural land and can be acquired at agricultural prices. I know a farm near the city of Toronto of 300 acres which can be acquired at $75 an acre. I have not gone any further in my investigation, but I imagine that a whole farm of about 500 acres in a beautiful situation near a river, undulating and of good soil could be got at $100 an acre. Well, that is not a forbidding proposal in the way of an establishment. Then if that can be done in Toronto, I suppose it can be done in eight other cities in the Dominion.

I omitted to mention the fact, which is apparent to me anyway, that there is a strong desire on the part of returned men for domesticity. The returned man has been through four years of hell, of misery, and he has been away from his people all that time. If he is not married he wants to become married at once. He wants to become domestic, to bring up a family, and not to be subject to the anxieties which would beset him in a city like Toronto at any rate, as mentioned in the resolution of the Great War Veterans, where he has nothing to look forward to but a few rooms in an apartment house. That strong feeling of domesticity that is pervading the ranks of returned men should, I think, be satisfied by a generous Government, so that the men would know soon how they could be housed, and not only housed for the time being, but given a permanent and a definite home. Then what is to be the life of the man and his family in the industrial suburb? My idea would be that at least 150 houses, or say 200 houses, should be erected in each community, to start with; and if those were taken up, as I am sure they would be very readily, and if there were a family of five on an average in each house, you would have a village community of 1,000 people. Most of these men would be in receipt of a pension, of a greater or less amount; but if they knew that they could supplement that pension by engaging in trades which could be properly conducted in their own homes, or in their own localities, think what an incentive it would be to these men to adopt and try to carry out such a scheme as this! In the old days there were very few factories, or establishments, or works, the reason being that all power was hand power. But now, when power is concen-

trated and is electric or steam, labour must of course concentrate in one place, and that is the reason for the great works that exist. But that calls for the labour of man and the irksome journey from his home to the works, sometimes several miles on a trolley car, and that in the end will seriously interfere with the partially disabled man in keeping his job. Now, there is at present a strong feeling of gratitude to the men, a strong feeling of loyalty to them, and also the fear that if they are discriminated against, such discrimination will be unpopular. But is it certain that this feeling will always prevail? Industry is a hard taskmistress and certain profits must be made. I have a fear that in a few years the man who has only one arm or one leg, while he is taken on at the factory now, will gradually be looked upon askance by the foreman who is expected to produce certain results and in the end some means will be found for letting him out when the war idea and the war gratitude are over. I wish to avoid that. I want to settle men in positions where they can make a good living for themselves personally without fear in the future of harshness or unreasonableness from the shop foreman.

Now that electrical energy is so widely diffused, there is no reason why men should not have at their own homes electrical power for lathes and other machinery for doing the work which they are accustomed to or which they have been taught by the Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment Department. There are many of these things which could be done that would supplement a man's income to such an extent that he would have no fear for the future. I am told, although I have no personal knowledge upon the subject, that some of the best and most costly articles in Europe are made in the homes of people. I know there are some who dispute that fact and say that they are not equal to factory made goods but I am told otherwise and that owing to individual and personal care in the production of certain articles a value is imparted to them over and above that of any manufactured article. However that may be, I look to it that they will have the advantage of electrical energy from the city or the power works and that under these circumstances a worker will be placed hereafter in an absolutely independent position. I am convinced that this will so content him and his family that they will enter so into the idea that in the long run it will be greatly to the advantage of the country, and that the experiment will be speedily imitated by commercial concerns and co-operative societies that do not require the assistance of the Government.

[Mr. Mowat.]

The trouble is that the returned man has no capital. We have recognized that in regard to farm employment. The man, I say, has no capital and there is no demand that he should be given capital in money. But, if you endow him with a house, well constructed, where he can do his daily work and manufacture the thing which comes best to his hand, you will be doing him a service of immense value. There are many things that can be done in the home and which do not require part work upon them. I have thought, in drawing this resolution, that it would be best to confine the idea to the manufacture of things that had formerly not been manufactured in Canada. I had in mind stationery, pencils, erasers, and a lot of things like that which are used in writing, which are sold in stationery shops, and which, before the war, we got from Austria. All this kind of work could be done by our men. There is also the industry of toy-making. I am told that this has become an immense industry in the United States and Canada. This industry, which was formerly monopolized by Germany has been taken up by the people of these two countries and there is no mechanical toy or contrivance attractive to children which cannot be turned out in Canada. These things can be done in the home as well as in the factory and a man could get the help of his family in connection with certain parts of the manufacture. All this will tend to make the man a happy, contented man. I am told that there is a great variety of things that can also be made in the homes, as they are in Germany, namely:

Mechanical toys, fans, paperknives, glass-cutting, diamond cutters, enamel jewellery, art metal work, brush and broom making, poultry, gardening, harness, bookbinding, lens grinding, novelty making, sewing machine work, pottery, basket (wicker), furniture, upholstering for motor cars, surgical shoemaking, bench carpentry, strawberry culture.

The idea of market gardens, especially to us who live in Toronto is a very important one on account of the extraordinary profits that have been made by those market gardeners who live near the city and who have added at least ten times to the value of their property. Twenty years ago you could get a market garden of ten acres for between $1,000 and $2,000, which at the present time you cannot buy for $100,000, the profit from market gardening is so great.

The town should be laid out so that the man could do his market garden with every facility. My idea would be not to have the

market gardens near the particular house but that they should be in allotment at the other end of the settlement. I would advocate the erection of four houses of good construction, sanitary, architecturally beautiful, not put up like shacks, but well put up by competent architects and built to last, with good wookwork, and located every fifty or one hundred yards. If you had four of these to the acre that would give one-quarter of an acre to each house. One-quarter of an acre outside of the ground occupied by the house would give an ordinary garden plot for a flower garden and perhaps a small quantity of vegetables. Of course, that is not the market garden, but there is no reason why a man should not have sufficient ground in his own back yard for a strawberry patch and a poultry run. A great deal of money is to be got out of the poultry business if a man thoroughly understands the business; if he does not he is in a bad way.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: What would be the value of the house to be occupied by each man?

Mr. MOWAT: To put up a house of that kind should cost $3,000 at the present time. If prices were to drop it would be less. You cannot build a six-roomed house for less than $3,000 to give a living room, dining room, kitchen, or kitchenette downstairs, and three bedrooms, one for the husband and wife, one for the male and one for the female children together with a small bathroom upstairs. That is the limit of a six-roomed house with the accommodations I have mentioned, at the present time, according to what I am told by competent builders and architects. If a man wishes to have his workshop in connection with his home, there is no reason why he should not build against his house an addition so that it might be heated properly by a central stove in winter and thus enable him to carry on his work. This might be done without destroying the architectural beauty of the house and I am told that this addition could be made to-day for $500.

Then if the Government did not feel like financing the scheme at the present time—and I quite see difficulties in the way—I think it should be looked forward to as a thing bound to come in the near future. I am convinced that if bonds were issued covering a proposition of this character, the patriotism of the citizens would easily provide for the necessary money.

Therefore we have undoubtedly got to face an expenditure on, say, 200 houses at $3,000 apiece, or $600,000 odd; add to that the cost of the land $50,000, and add another $50,000 for the construction of sewers and of two or three trunk roadways upon the site. That represents an expenditure of at least $700,000 to be provided for each city; not much, one would say, in view of the expenditure which we have made on other things. This would all be paid back to the Government by instalments or by the amortization plan. The direction of this scheme, it seems to me, will require some consideration. I would say that from the very beginning this must not be considered as a philanthrophic movement at all. If it is philanthrophy, if it is something doled out to a man, no self-respecting man is going to take it. He is only going to enter into it as a businesss proposition, and the only obligation he will be under to anybody will be to repay in time the cost of the house, or such sufficient rent as will reimburse the Government for its expenditure.

Therefore there must be no paternalism about the management of the community; nobody need be under the direction of any other person; but at the same time there must be precaution taken in the construction, and then to an extent in the management, in order to preserve the community life of the village, because women of different kinds will form these communities. Women vary in their housekeeping; some women will keep their houses in good shape and their porches and grounds will always be neat looking, while other women unfortunately, perhaps through indifferent health or other reasons, will become slatternly. That means if there are too many of the latter class the community will not be as popular as it should be, and there must be some guiding direction to see that the people are kept up to their manifest community duty.

5 p.m.

At the same time the municipal government of the town should be left to the men themselves, so that we would have returned soldiers occupying positions in the council of each town. We would have the councillors elected by popular vote of the people themselves, and if there was anything in the management of the town which was not approved of, then the remedy would be in the hands of the people themselves. They could put those men out at the next election and put in men who were more amenable to public opinion.

I think the directors should be about five in order to make it a convenient and workable body. Two of them should be first-class architects, two should be returned soldiers—who by preference should be business men—and the fifth member should be

Mr. Thomas Adams, the Town-improvement Advisor to the Commission of Conservation. In Mr. Adams we have a valuable asset to Canada. He was the secretary, I think, of the town—now the city of Letchworth in England—built on these lines, to enable the suburbanite to reach London, his industrial centre, within a few minutes. This town increased to such an extent that while it cost in the neighbourhood of $1,200,000 to build, in the course of only four years there was an increment of $800,000 in the value of the properties by reason of the demand for those comfortable houses built amid such pleasant surroundings.

Now, if there is to be that increment in the value of the villages which we propose to erect in Canada—at least, I hope we will erect them—it seems to me that all that increment should go to the men themseleves who take upon themselves the chance at the beginning, either by way of reduced rentals or reduced purchase money, and that those who come later and enjoy the enterprise of the pioneers should help pay for that enterprise. The responsibility of running each village must be left to the inhabitants themselves. I think that responsibility is going to be accepted by the returned soldiers. The men who captured town after town in France and Belgium are not going to be behindhand in running towns of their own when they come back to Canada. We will find just as much municipal ability, just as much foresight, and just as much thrift among the returned soldiers who may be the inhabitants of these villages as we will find anywhere else in the Dominion.

Will these communities be permanent, or is this only a fancy idea that we have, and will it be worth while trying? In my opinion it will be worth while trying and these communities will be permanent, because the domestic motive behind the scheme will keep the men attached to the homes which they are going to establish, especially as they will not be the ordinary hum-drum homes of the conventional city or town, but they will be something entirely new, something which will appeal to the aesthetic side of a man's nature and make him proud of his home and loath to leave the community, because it is going to be his own handiwork.

In addition to what I have said as to building, we are going to make the women so well satisfied with this kind of community that they are going to be an anchorage there. As it is now in cities the women are in a constant state of anxiety about the motor car menace to their children. There are no yards or gardens for the children to play in and naturally they go and play on the streets. In the city of Toronto I venture to say that once a week there is a poor little tot of four or five years of age run down by a motor car, no matter how careful the driver may be. The consequence is that woman are in a constant state of anxiety while their children are out. But here we can construct all these homes facing on public squares where the children can go and play free from any vehicular menace, for there will be no necessity for roads at all through these villages. In every plan I have seen there is a landscape arrangement by which there are only one or two, or at most three, public highways, which need not be used at all by the people for foot travel, but are confined to vehicles. The consequence of this arrangement is that the motor car menace is abolished and the contentment of the mothers is assured.

This subject has interested me for some years and I have read a good many books relating to it, and if any hon. member wishes to have a reference to these in order to go into it more fully, I would recommend him to read the books of Mr. Sennitt, an English author, who is a principal writer on the subject, and Professor H. W. Mawson's work entitled "An Imperial Obligation;" that is, the duty of the State to partially disabled soldiers. The book was published last year and the preface to it is well worth reading, because it is by Sir Douglas Haig, and he says: Sir Douglas Haig, right in the middle of the war, had time to write this preface:

> The amelioration of the lot of those of our countrymen on whom the war has placed the dreadful burden of life-long disablement is not only the most worthy to which it is possible to bend our energies, but one which should receive our immediate attention if we are to be ready for the emergency before it becomes overwhelming.

Professor Mawson, in furthering the idea which I have tried to set forth in a sketchy way, says this on page 22:

> There should be a central collecting and distributing and buying and selling centre where materials can be procured wholesale and the finished goods marketed under expert management.

To some of the suggested industries and activities which he mentioned ,he would add agriculture and shop-keeping, market-gardening and flower culture, clock repairing, job printing, shoe repairing, tailoring, telephone operating, typing, model dairy, laundry, village square, post office, bank, insurance office, amusement and public hall, moving picture house, community house for

bachelors, baseball and lacrosse ground, park, churches, poultry runs. It is, of course, of vast importance that those who are not versed in the intricacies of commercial life should have some one to advise them with regard to their purchases of raw material and the marketing of their goods. If a man has to sell his own goods he is taken away from his work and into a sphere of activity with which he is not familiar, while an expert in the rise and fall of prices and in the marketing of goods would be able to tell him where he could sell his products to the best advantage.

There is also Thomas Adams' own book on the subject, and "The Housing Problem in War and Peace," of the American Institute of Architects (1918), Ebenezer Howard's "Garden City of the Future," and "Proceedings of the Garden Cities and Town Planning Association."

I think that until the community is well on its feet, the committee of direction would not be an expensive one. I know from conversations with them, that the architects who would act would charge moderate prices, and I am sure that the two returned soldiers on the committee would not exact a large remuneration. We have Mr. Thomas Adams already with us, so that the expenditure for some years to come need not be terrifying to any Cabinet minister.

So that if we establish these model towns, one in each province, to begin with, near some large city, we shall be doing something distinctly to the advantage of the country and definitely beneficial to the returned man. I am told—perhaps other hon. gentlemen in the House can discuss this better than I can—that a man suffering from shell shock—which, I understand, is simply a collapse of nerves, due more to the general life at the front than to any particular shell shock—can best recover his normal health by being in such a community as this, living on the land, engaging in light labour, having no worries. Through the establishment of such a community we could restore to good health many men who have been injured in mind, though not in limb.

In the carrying out of this idea I can see a picture of a clean and well constructed town. I can see a creation of beautiful small homes and holdings, modern in its architectural and sanitary features, beautiful in its lines, wholesome in its life and happy in its amusements. I can see communities where none will be for the party but all for the state, whose inhabitants will give a noticeable example to less favoured regions and cause them to set up of their own accord similar municipalities aspiring to similar achievements. I can see communities which will be under no obligation but that of the liquidation of a temporary loan extended by a generous and thankful country—whose gratitude can never be shown by money alone—with a view to assisting to some extent out of their resources those who saved them from disaster.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Mr. Speaker, I am sure the House will agree that the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mowat) has brought to our attention an exceedingly interesting subject. I understand that he does not intend to press the resolution to a vote; that he desires merely to have a general discussion of the subjects he has introduced. I do not intend to follow him in all his arguments. He has undoubtedly given the matter considerable thought and study; personally, I have gained a good deal of information from his address. I wish merely to touch on a few of the points to which he has referred.

In my opinion the whole question of town planning in this country has received too little attention; as a matter of fact, it has received no attention at all. Our towns and villages and cities have sprung up in any old way; we have some very sorry examples of towns and cities throughout the Dominion. If something along this line had been started fifty or a hundred years ago, Canada would be very much better off. The problem is one that should receive the attention of all governments in Canada, federal, provincial and municipal, that may be interested in it.

The hon. gentleman referred to Mr. Adams, who came here from the Old Country. I have known of him and have met him occasionally. I am quite certain that if his services could be utilized in connection with our town planning and even with the extension of our municipalities, they would be very valuable indeed. Just in passing, it occurs to me that the work of town planning is a matter in which our provinces, rather than the federal authorities, should take a more particular interest. If I am not mistaken, it comes completely within the jurisdiction of the provinces.

The hon. gentleman referred to the desirability of establishing model villages for our returned men. In dealing with that question we must first consider the chief aim in solving the problem of repatriation. We have had considerable discussion in the House with regard to that problem, and, judging from the opinions expressed here,

I think the idea prevails that the very best thing we can do for the returned man is to place him in a position at the earliest possible time in which he will be self-reliant. In the discussions that we have had, time and again expressions like these have been used: "Leave the returned soldier alone and he will take care of himself;" "the returned soldier does not require any coddling;" "all the returned soldier wants is to get back into civil life." Expressions of that kind were used by many members of the House, and I am inclined to think that is the prevailing opinion among the returned men themselves. What they want is an opportunity to secure employment. They wish to have an opportunity to get back into their ordinary place in the civil life of the community. If that be true, then we must do everything that lies in our power to see that that end is secured with the least possible delay and trouble.

The resolution suggests that one village of a particular class, of which the details are given—and the hon. gentleman (Mr. Mowat) has this afternoon amplified his suggestion—should be established in every province. Let me ask if the House thinks, even if we decided upon a policy of establishing villages, that would meet the situation in a practical way. That is, if the Federal Government is going to provide homes, workshops, employment, under certain conditions, is there not just a possibility that every one of those men would say that if you do this for him, or if you do it for one, every other one is entitled to it? Would there not be a tendency upon the part of all to lean upon the State for this purpose? I am merely mentioning that in order that the House may take it into consideration. We have rather adopted the other line of action, that is, of endeavouring in every possible way to make the man self-reliant at the earliest possible date. The question of expenditure naturally comes in. What it would amount to, I do not know. The chances are that if we ever embarked upon a policy of this kind, we would never be able to confine it to a village; it would spread until we would be forced to provide for a very large number of villages of this class.

Just a word with regard to the community idea. I think the hon. gentleman has given voice to the opinion that a good many of the returned men are opposed to a close community composed only of themselves. I think that is true. I have discussed the problem with a great many, particularly in connection with farming, and I am pretty certain that the consensus of opinion amongst those in Canada who have made a close study of the question as to whether communities of this nature composed entirely of returned men would be desirable, seems to be that communities of that nature should not be established, particularly in connection with farms. The hon. gentleman seems to be of the opinion that if villages of this class were established, they should not be confined to returned men alone, but that others should be permitted to live in them. That, however, is a question that might very well be considered by the House.

As regards market gardening, the Soldiers' Settlement Board have that now under consideration. They are making a study in Ontario, Quebec, the lower provinces, and British Columbia, with a view to ascertaining the extent to which a policy of that kind can be adopted, and they have made considerable progress. That would appeal to all returned men who desire to go in for that class of work, but more particularly, I think, to the disabled man, the man who is not in a position to carry on his ordinary avocation. I understand it is expected that a final report will be received at an early date from those who are making that study, and it is possible that the Minister of Interior (Mr. Meighen) may soon have some observations to make to the House.

We must all recognize that while the great body of men who are coming back again will, in a very short time, be absorbed into the civil life of the community, and while the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment is taking care of and providing employment for disabled men—and I understand some 2,000 of them have already been placed back into the civil life of the community—there is certain to be a number of men who will require special care and treatment. Just what that number will be cannot, at the present time, be predicted. I refer to men who, on account of their condition, either physical or mental, will not be able to follow their usual employment, or who, after being retrained for employment, will not be able to continue in that employment. Some provision will have to be made for them, and an enquiry is at present under way to ascertain the extent of that problem and the manner in which it will have to be taken care of by the Government. We all remember that after the Civil War in the United States, there were a great many men who had to be taken care of perman-

ently by the State, not in institutions, but in homes which were provided for them. It is likely that we shall have, in the near future, to do something of that nature in Canada. I desire to assure the House that the whole subject is at present under consideration, and undoubtedly before very long some provision will have to be made for that class.

The subject introduced to the House by the hon. member (Mr. Mowat) is an exceedingly interesting one. I am sure he realizes that it is a matter that should not be pressed at the present time. The Government should have the fullest opportunity to consider the matter in its various details, and I am sure hon. members will desire very full light on this question before committing themselves to it.

Mr. MOWAT: The minister says that the Government will give this subject full consideration; and as I have no doubt that when the House is in Supply on the Estimates of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, the matter can be discussed again, I have no objection to the motion being withdrawn.

Motion withdrawn.

PROPOSED PROHIBITION ON IMMIGRATION.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver Centre) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Immigration laws of Canada shall be so amended as to absolutely prohibit, for a period of 20 years, entry into Canada of all persons of enemy origin who, during the period of the war (a) have been interned in Canada; (b) have been interned in any country being one of the allies of Canada; (c) left Canada shortly before or after the outbreak of war; or (d) have been guilty of conduct, whether in Canada or any other place, which has in any way jeopardized the peace, safety or well-being of Canada or of the British Empire or of her allies.

He said, Mr. Speaker, as this resolution speaks pretty well for itself, I do not intend to discuss it at any great length. There are, however, a few points which I wish to emphasize in connection with it. In the first place, we have heard demands from all over Canada, in great number and great variety, as to the treatment of alien enemies within our boundaries. I therefore realize that any comprehensive resolution on this subject would involve a great deal of discussion, and perhaps justifiable opposition on the part of some. In drafting this resolution I have therefore limited it to certain classes of aliens. First,I have limited it to aliens who have been interned in Canada. It is assumed that a person interned has been interned for cause; that it was desirable during the period of the war that he should be restrained in the interest of the safety and the well-being of Canada. That being the case, if such a person is deported or leaves Canada at the conclusion of the war I contend that he should be kept out of this country for a substantial period. In my resolution I have set a period of twenty years, but that might be changed; in any case, they should be restrained from re-entering this country for a certain length of time.

In the second place, the resolution deals with those who have been interned in any country being one of the allies of Canada. I wish particularly to draw the attention of the House to this, and it would be well for the Government and for the Minister of Immigration to take particular notice of this condition—there have been interned in the United States during the war a large number of troublesome, dangerous Huns. The propaganda they have carried on and their violent outbreaks, destroying millions of dollars' worth of property, are well known to all. When these men are released on the signing of peace a great many of them will undoubtedly take advantage of their liberty to come to Canada, if allowed to do so. In other words, they will find life in the United States too unpleasant for them, because the Americans are almost extreme in many of their views on this question, and will deliberately make life unpleasant for them. Pressure will be brought to bear to such an extent that many of these people will try to come to Canada. These people should be very carefully watched; that is a duty which the Government owes to the country and to itself.

In the third place, the resolution deals with those who left Canada shortly before or after the outbreak of the war. This class also requires our attention. I have in mind a number of this class who lived in Vancouver and were known to be violently pro-German and engaged in espionage for the German Government. There was nothing against them, so far as the Canadian law is concerned, and many of them left the country just before the outbreak of the war. When times quieten down these people will want to come back to Canada, but they should not be allowed to do so, and any of this class now in Canada should be deported.

Lastly, the resolution deal with those who have been guilty of conduct, whether in Canada or any other place, which has in any way jeopardized the peace, safety or well-being of Canada or of the British Em-

pire or of her Allies. The names of these men should be tabulated as international intriguers. Switzerland, Sweden, Norway, Denmark, and Holland are full of them. A black list, so to speak, should be prepared of all these men, and they should be barred from Canada. Just at this point let me draw this to the attention of the minister and of the Government: Perhaps the most effective system of espionage on the part of the German Government was carried on through travelling theatrical companies and German bands. These would give entertainments in different cities, but at the same time would be gathering the information that was desired by their Government. This, of course, is well known to the Government. I say that all these people should be debarred from entering Canada for a great many years.

Hon. Mr. CALDER: From the wording of the latter part of the resolution, I would take it to mean that all persons of enemy nationality are to be excluded. If I am wrong, my hon. friend will correct me.

Mr. STEVENS: There might be some objection to phrasing it in the very broad and plain language pointed to by the minister. So far as I am concerned, I would undoubtedly like to go that length. I realize, however, that many would not care to go so far. My particular object is to keep out of Canada persons who are beyond all question undesirable and a menace to the state. I have received a number of resolutions and letters and memorials on this subject from all parts of Canada, which shows that the public is prepared for some definite action along this line by the Government.

I have just a few words to say in a general way on this subject. We have in the past, and I was very glad to hear the Minister of Immigration express the same opinion, been too generous with our citizenship and the privilege of immigration into Canada. I blame no one in particular for this, because I think it was the sentiment and ideals of the country as a whole, that were to blame. We felt we had a great country, and we wanted to see it settled, with the result that we welcomed almost any one to Canada. Not only that, but we extended the privilege of citizenship to these people. In future I think a great deal more care should be exercised, and it can only be exercised by taking action along the line indicated in this resolution. It is all very well for us here in the House of Commons to talk in general terms about immigration, but action is necessary, and I was very glad to hear the minister say that a Bill will shortly be brought down dealing with immigration. I particularly urge him to consider, in drafting that Bill, the points raised in my resolution. We must not debase our citizenship to the level of the foreigner—using that term in a broad and generous sense—who may come to our country. In other words, immigration should be so restricted that we shall be able to assimilate the immigrant and bring him up to our standard of citizenship, rather than have him debase our own.

I wish to say a word on the question of the possibility of a peaceable invasion of Canada by Germans and persons of alien enemy origin. I notice in one of the latest issues of the London Graphic an article by a well known writer, Henri Bazin. This writer has given the question a great deal of study. The article was written a short time ago in a German town in which he was located with the military forces. In it he describes the entry of a military policeman and a little incident that occurred, and proceeds:

> The same old doctrine of Delbrik law will eaze its way into allied lands in days to come; that is, the doctrine that a German remains always a German, whether he be naturalized or not; that he must group with his fellow countrymen in foreign lands, maintain individual and collective relation with the mother country, and always serve her first.

Now, I think we have had our lesson on the attitude of the German, particularly the German of the present time, the world over. Wherever he has gone, as a merchant or as a settler, he has taken with him his German ideals and his German conception of what his duty as a citizen should be, and sought to superimpose them upon the country to which he came, rather than to adjust himself to the new conditions under which he found himself. This writer points out—and I wish to emphasize it as my own humble opinion at the same time—that a determined attempt will be made by the German people to start exactly where they were a few years ago when the war broke out, and to carry on the same class of propaganda and the same policy of spreading German influence and of attempting to impose German civilization upon the world, just as they did before the war. I think they will endeavour to do the very same thing again in exactly the same manner, and it behooves us to be alive to this danger. Furthermore, I think this country would be derelict in its duty to itself and to posterity if it did not put up the bars, and do everything within its power to arrest that propaganda and that doctrine. The Hun to-day is unrepentant. We need to

get that fact firmly imbedded in our minds. We talk about being victors and sometimes we speak as though the whole danger were entirely at an end, and that we should shake hands with the Hun and go on as before. But, Sir, if we read the press reports aright and study the situation from the attitude assumed by the Hun to-day, we must be convinced of this fact, that he is an unrepentant enemy of Britain and of this Dominion, and that his hatred of Britain and the British race is deeper and more bitter and determined to-day than ever before the war; and underneath his hatred is the grim determination to do his utmost in the future to undermine and destroy British influence and British civilization from the face of the earth. He is still a Hun exactly as he was before 1914.

I do not intend to detain the House for any length of time, but I ask the Government to give this matter their most earnest attention. I do not want to be put off—if the minister will permit me to put it frankly —with the statement "we will give it consideration;" but I would like the Government to consider that at this time they have a duty towards the country and towards posterity. It is all very well to say, "We will pass regulations and we will see that our officers are properly instructed;" but my experience is this, Sir,—and I have watched the immigration problem very closely for many years—that regulations are very elastic. What I desire is, to see the policy of the country clearly defined in the statutes, so that there may be no possible mistake either to persons seeking to enter the country, or to citizens at large. It would be far better, in my opinion, to put into the Bill which is to be brought down in a few days, as we are told, a clear declaration that we are going to keep out of this country a certain type of enemy aliens. Let us put that beyond all question. I quite agree that regulations should be made regarding matters that might be considered temporarily desirable; but so far as this question is concerned, I think it should be a well laid down, publicly declared policy and determination of the Government, speaking for the country, in its attitude towards these people. And my resolution, as I pointed out before, is such that no person can possibly question successfully our right to shut out this class of aliens. In conclusion, I would ask the minister and the Government to give these facts their serious consideration and close attention, and to incorporate them in a statutory way in the Bill to be brought down.

Hon. J. A. CALDER: So far as I am personally concerned, I am very glad indeed to have had this discussion this afternoon, and to have learned the views of the hon. gentleman who has just spoken. He has brought to our attention a matter in which the people throughout the country generally are very much interested at the present time. There is considerable agitation in connection with the whole subject, and it is a subject that must be dealt with by this Parliament before it rises. As the resolution stands, however, I doubt very much if it would be advisable to accept it, because it is exceedingly sweeping in its character. It will be remembered that I asked the hon. gentleman whether or not it was intended that the resolution should apply to all residents of enemy countries. Well, if it does, and the resolution were approved and made law as Parliament would be expected to make it, we might have a very difficult and complex situation. The resolution proposes, for example, that we should absolutely exclude all persons of enemy nationality who caused us trouble during the past four and a half years.

Mr. STEVENS: The resolution says: "All who have been guilty of conduct, whether in Canada or in any other place, which has in any way jeopardized the peace, safety, and well-being of Canada." I do not think it could be very much clearer.

Mr. CALDER: I have probably taken a rather technical view of the language; but, as I read it, I understood it to mean that the three, or four, or five million people we have been fighting during the last four and a half years have certainly done something to jeopardize the peace, safety and well-being of this country and our people, and consequently I read the resolution to mean that the hon. member proposed that we should establish a law in this country that would absolutely exclude any person coming from any of these countries. I understand, however, he does not mean that, but rather that it is intended to exclude only those—whether they have lived in their own country or elsewhere—who have conspired against the peace and orderly Government of this country. With that explanation we may very well make some provision in so far as that class is concerned. But the whole problem, as the House can understand, is a very difficult one to deal with in so far as European immigration is concerned, because undoubtedly this will be made the subject of very considerable discussion at the Peace Con-

ference, and conclusions will be reached to which we will be parties; and until such time as we know what decisions are arrived at, it is most difficult for us to deal with the question. Some of those who were our enemies yesterday are looked upon as our allies to-day. Take the Bohemians: The new Czecho-Slovak State was established in the city of Washington, and the Czecho-Slovaks in Russia to-day are not regarded as our enemies but our allies. They are sitting in conference with the Prime Minister of this country in Paris to-day. The same is true to a large extent of the Poles, and to a certain extent of the Ukranians. So that these matters will be taken into consideration when we come to frame the policy that will govern the question as to the right or the advisability of admitting certain classes of people to the citizenship of the country.

Undoubtedly later on this Parliament will have to decide the main principles that will have to underlie any immigration policy to be adopted. In my judgment there should be no question that Canada should exercise much greater precaution in the future in admitting people to our citizenship, and see to it that our law is framed with that end in view.

To the suggestion that we should make provision to exclude those interned either in Canada or outside of Canada, I do not think any serious objection can be taken. If there are people who are hostile, dangerous and plotting against this country, there is every reason why we should exclude them. There might be some difficulty in ascertaining who they are and in administering the law afterwards, but if we can ascertain who they are and where they reside we should prevent them from entering Canada. Any person who has plotted against our Government or our country, or who has done anything to injure Canada during the period of the war, should not be permitted to become a citizen of Canada, and it is our duty to prevent them from doing so. I can assure my hon. friend (Mr. Stevens) that the subject matter of this resolution will receive further consideration on the part of the Government and that an effort will be made to meet the situation as disclosed by making proper provision in the law.

Mr. STEVENS: Just one word in reply.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: It is my duty, before the hon. member exercises his right to close the debate, to ask if any other hon. member wishes to speak on this subject.

[Mr. Calder.]

Mr. STEVENS: The minister speaks with a little degree of unconcern regarding the possible immigration into this country of numbers of Jugo-Slavs, Ukranians, Poles and others. I think the country would not receive a suggestion of that kind with any degree of confidence or satisfaction. On the other hand, he must remember that the first duty of the country at this time is to reinstate our men in the civil life from which they have been ruthlessly torn away and their places taken by the very people that I have mentioned.

Mr. CALDER: I do not wish the hon. gentleman to infer that I was suggesting that we should encourage these people to come to Canada. As a matter of fact, it is only within the last week or two that we have published an Order in Council under the Immigration law absolutely prohibiting people from all these countries, Germany, Austria, Turkey, and Bulgaria, from entering Canada. That Order in Council was passed some two weeks ago for the reason that on account of conditions existing at the present time we deemed it undesirable that any of these people should be allowed to come in from any of these countries.

Mr. STEVENS: That is decidedly encouraging to know that the minister and I are very close together on this question. The only thing I desire is that you should make the prohibition statutory. I would suggest that it would be far better for the Government and for Canada to err a little in the direction of shutting out some of these others even at the risk of technically doing them an injury. We could rectify that by amending the legislation if necessary. In other words, let us get into our heads that it would be desirable to stop for the time being all immigration into Canada except that coming direct from our immediate Allies. I think the country would welcome that. If the minister would agree with a proposal such as that I would be very glad to allow the idea more particularly expressed in my resolution to remain over and to be considered at some future time. But if he does not wish to do that then, without any hesitation I say, let us shut out every man of enemy alien origin that we can possibly shut out. I am serious about this; I do not want the minister to think that I have brought this resolution up for the entertainment of the House. I have not done so. I have brought it up in the hope that the Government would take it up seriously—not take it " into consideration." I abominate those words because

the way in which the private member is shuffled off by them is well known to us all. This is more serious than the Government actually realize. The feeling of the people is very serious. We have 5,000 soldiers in Vancouver, according to the president of the returned soldiers' association. It is true they are being paid by the Militia Department but that is not what they want. They do not want to be walking around town from month to month with their hands in their pockets. They want jobs; they want to get work. It is very galling to these men to see others holding jobs bringing them $5 to $7 a day who, if they are not actually Huns, are in close touch with them.

Mr. CALDER: I want to make it clear to the House that during the period of the war, for four and a half years, we have prevented any person of alien enemy nationality from coming into Canada. We were working closely in touch with the United States immigration authorities with the result that we kept our own alien enemies in our own country and they kept theirs in their country. My hon. friend's resolution deals with alien enemies or persons of alien enemy nationality but during the period of the war none of that class has entered Canada. Only recently, on account of the conditions existing, we put through an Order in Council, not under the War Measures Act but under the Immigration Act, excluding all persons from enemy countries. Any conditions existing in Canada at the present time do not result from the admission of people of alien enemy nationality during the last four and a half years.

Mr. STEVENS: I was not responsible for introducing the question of the Jugo-Slavs. However, I will simply conclude by urging very strongly upon the minister and the Government to give effect to the spirit at least of this resolution in relation to immigration.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Do I understand that the hon. gentleman wishes to withdraw the resolution?

Mr. STEVENS: If the Government desires me to withdraw it I shall do so but I see no object in withdrawing it.

Mr. CALDER: I think the resolution in any event would have to be amended. It proposes to make a provision in the law which should apply without change for twenty years. But, you could not bind any future Parliament. It seems to me that as legislation is to be brought down we should have an opportunity of carefully considering this provision in order to see whether it should be embodied in our new law, and under these circumstances I would ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw the resolution.

Mr. McKENZIE: In dealing with this exclusion question, we realize that during war time we can exclude as much, and as absolutely, as we like. Has the minister considered what our jurisdiction is as a colonial Parliament to deal with absolute exclusion after peace is signed? Does he think we have power to legislate to the extent of the absolute exclusion of people from any country?

Mr. CALDER: I am not certain as to the extent by which we are bound by treaty. I have not looked into that matter but we may be tied up through treaties. On the other hand there is a provision in our immigration law under which by Order in Council we may exclude any race or nationality, or people of any occupation. That provision stands in our law. There may be treaties which stand in the way of our excluding certain nationalities, without getting into very serious trouble if we attempted to do so.

Mr. MURPHY: Does the hon. gentleman refer to treaties to which Canada was not a party?

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: I must remind hon. gentlemen that the House is not in committee.

Motion withdrawn.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

CANADA'S CLAIM TO WAR INDEMNITY.

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, this country is entitled to an indemnity as a belligerent nation and that instructions should be given to Sir Robert Borden, Prime Minister of this country, to take such steps as he will deem advisable to claim from Germany an indemnity corresponding to the amount disbursed by Canada in the pursuit of this war, and that, in any case, Sir Robert Borden should be instructed to claim from the British Government such amount to be paid out of the indemnity which the British Government might receive from Germany, and that the whole question should be submitted through the proper channels to the Peace Conference now sitting in Paris.

He said: Mr. Speaker, the most important question in the minds of the people at the

present moment is whether Canada will obtain a war indemnity, either from Germany, directly or indirectly out of the indemnity paid to England by Germany, or possibly directly from England. The people are anxious to know what the Government have done in this respect. I am glad to see the acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) in his place; I hope he will reassure the people with regard to this important matter.

The first question we ask ourselves is: Are we entitled to this indemnity? To this we get an answer by turning to the beginning of the war with a view to impressing upon our minds who were the assailants; whether we were the offensive party, or the defensive; whether we were forced into the war against our will. It has been said and repeated often by the Prime Minister and other members of the Cabinet that the first line of defence of Canada in the war was that of the trenches in Flanders and France and that we had to take part in the conflict to defend our liberty, our freedom and our property. For my part, I have many times advocated that Canada should participate in the war to an extent consistent with her condition and her means. I thought that if perchance the Allies had been vanquished and the Germans had been victorious, our freedom and our liberty would have been jeopardized and we would have been penalized by the German people. I considered, therefore, that rather than wait and have before us the possibility of the victory of the Germans, with all the necessary consequences to ourselves, it was preferable that we should defend ourselves now, that we should protect our freedom, our rights and our liberties. It is in all the codes, civil and criminal, that a citizen has the right to take the necessary steps, even if forcible ones, to defend and protect his property. Since the beginning of the world it has been a part of the law, either unwritten or statutory, of all countries that a nation has a right to defend itself and to take whatever steps may be necessary to uphold its liberties and its freedom. If, therefore, we were forced to participate in the war, we have the right, and it is our duty, to claim from Germany indemnification of our material loss. There is another way of considering this question. It has been said that when England is at war we are at war. I believe in that constitutional principle; our status as a colony puts us in such a position that when England is at war, we are at war;—when the whole is at war the part is at war.

[Mr. DuTremblay.]

We may look at the matter of a war indemnity for Canada from two points of view. If we were obliged to enter the war in order to defend ourselves, then Germany should pay us an indemnity. On the other hand, if we took part in the war to help England, England should indemnify us. To me, it is a question of simple justice and equity.

I have said that we should obtain such an indemnity directly or indirectly from what England may obtain. We all know that France will obtain certain advantages following the conclusion of peace. There is no doubt that she will receive Alsace and Lorraine, the two provinces towards which she has looked for fifty years. There is no doubt that the Treaty of Commerce of 1870 under which Germany was treated as the best customer of France, will be denounced. England will certainly receive great advantages. The German navy will disappear. It has cost England a lot of money to build up and maintain a navy of sufficient strength to meet the peril of the German naval policy and the general enterprise of Germany in that direction. This peril now disappears for England. England will receive many advantages in trade and commerce; possibly she will annex some territory.

The same thing might be said of other countries, such as Italy and Australia, that took part in this war on the side of the Allies; but this country neither needs nor asks any annexation or gain of territory. What we desire is to be indemnified for the money which we have spent and the material losses which Canada has suffered in connection with this war. It would mean a great deal for this country to receive an indemnity. To-day we owe about $2,000,000,000, and we nearly went into bankruptcy on account of this war. We have spent on the war about $1,500,000,000, which is a tremendous debt for a population of eight or nine million people. According to a statement made by a member of the Cabinet, we shall be called upon to pay out about $300,000,000 a year to cover interest payments, pensions for our soldiers, and other charges. Since the outbreak of the war we have been taxed in all directions. A heavy burden is to-day upon our people, upon their incomes, upon their profits. A stamp tax has been imposed upon cheques, notes, etc. The tariff has been very largely increased. All this is due to the war. This terrible burden upon the country will remain not only for this generation, but for generations to come. It is, therefore, the duty of the Govern-

ment to do their utmost to obtain an indemnity for Canada. This Government must have done something in that direction— it would have been criminal negligence on their part if they had not taken some steps in the matter. But until now the people of Canada are not informed as to what has been done. We were not told in the speech from the Throne that some announcement as to what steps were being taken to secure an indemnity would be made by the Government. Nothing has yet been heard of the matter, although it is probably the most important question with which this Parliament has to deal during this session.

The people of Canada are anxious, indeed, I may say nervous, in regard to this question, because we read some time ago a declaration by the Prime Minister that this country would not insist upon obtaining an indemnity, that what Canada had done in this war was done gratuitously. Indeed, we read in an important paper, the Globe, if I mistake not, a declaration that when Belgium and France received indemnities, this country would probably receive nothing. I am sorry that such statements should be made by the Prime Minister, and I am sure, if he is correctly reported as stating that Canada would not insist on receiving an indemnity, he does not voice the opinion of the people of this country.

Some days ago, the federal authorities in Australia took action to support their Prime Minister, Right Hon. Mr. Hughes, in France, in his endeavours to obtain an indemnity for that country. This question is not new; it has been in the minds of the people since the beginning of this war; and the Prime Minister himself announced at the outbreak of the war, that we were forced to go into it, but that Germany would pay the cost of it. Those are not his exact words, but that is substantially what he said.

The object of this resolution is to let it be known to our representatives, and especially to the representatives of other countries in France, that the people of Canada desire and, indeed, unreservedly demand, that an indemnity be paid to this country. I trust that our interests in this matter will not be sacrificed, that they will not be exchanged for titles or marks of distinction, that they will not be exchanged for a mess of pottage. I trust the Government will take this question in hand at once, because the future of Canada depends to a large extent on the securing of an indemnity. That is perhaps the only way to re-establish in this country the necessary stability in financial and other matters. This is not a question of politics, it is a matter concerning the benefit of the country at large. I hope, therefore, the Acting Prime Minister will give an assurance to this country that the necessary steps have been taken, and that we shall receive from Germany, through the proper channel, or, if necessary, from England, the indemnity to which Canada is entitled.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, with much of what my hon. friend has said upon the matter of this resolution which deals with a most important subject, I can say that I am in agreement. My hon. friend has truly stated that the cause of the war was German ambition and lust of dominion. If there is anything clear to the world, it is that. It is not open to doubt in the mind of any one to-day that it was within the German intention to conquer the world—I do not say to conquer the world at once and in the war which she had in contemplation in 1914. Her immediate purpose was evidently to strike down France and to crush Russia. Having over-run Belgium and with Holland at her mercy, having defeated France and Russia, Germany would have been supreme in Europe, would have extended her frontiers to the Straits of Dover and the English Channel, would have seized the French seaports, naval stations, and navy, would have exacted an immense indemnity from both Russia and France, and then would have bided her time—one, two, three, four, five or more years—preparatory to her next spring, which would have been against Great Britain and the world. It is not open to doubt that the rulers of Germany and their military advisers had in mind the unparalleled conception of conquering the world. When the war broke out I confess I had hesitation in believing that the German people were behind their rulers in their schemes of world aggrandizement, but as time went on it became clear to me, as I think it became clear to all, that the German people really were behind their rulers and military authorities, were possessed with the lust of dominion, and hoped by the strategy I have outlined ultimately to impose their will upon the entire world. As the war went on, it became apparent to all that it was not a European problem, but a world problem, and that I think accounts for the fact that almost from the beginning neutral opinion ranged itself on the side of the Allies. The neutral nations felt that their interest lay there; they were moved by fear of German ambition, and more than that, I am happy to say, they were moved

by the moral issue involved; because from the beginning it was apparent that the issue lay between right and wrong, and ultimately the right was bound to prevail, as it did.

The war is the greatest by far in the history of the world, with a greater outpouring of blood and treasure than was ever before dreamt of by mankind, and after four years of struggle, in which half the human race was engaged, in which millions of men laid down their lives, in which money was poured out on a scale that no financier would have thought possible at the beginning of the war, after the most terrible experiences, disasters and tribulations to mankind, the war by the efforts of the Allies was finally brought to a victorious conclusion, and Germany and her associates were crushed. It would seem to follow quite logically that Germany, having taken the sword and pursued the ambitious designs which she did, having attacked nations that did not desire or even suspect war and that had no policy of aggrandizement to follow, the consequences of the defeat of Germany should be indemnity by Germany to the extent that she is able, and not only able now but having regard to the future, to those nations which have suffered by her attempted world dominion and have been put to the enormous cost that they have in bringing her to her knees. So that, personally, I agree with my hon. friend that there is every reason why Germany, to the extent that she is able actually and potentially, should be made to pay the Allies reparation for the losses sustained by their nationals through her illegal warfare, and indemnity against their war expenditure. I am frank to say to my hon. friend that I have very grave doubts whether Germany actually and potentially would be able to pay in full the colossal expenditures which have been incurred by the Allies in defeating her and those nations with which she was associated, and which also should be made to pay to the extent of their ability. But I lay down the proposition that she should be made to pay, and those in league with her should be made to pay, to the extent that they are able, and no consideration of mercy should enter. It should be a cold, economic calculation as to what Germany, Austria-Hungary and Turkey can pay, and then, in my view, they should be made to pay it. That is one of the questions under consideration at the Peace Conference in Paris. I understand that a committee has been appointed whose duties it is to make careful inquiries and ascertain what Germany and her allies are able to pay not only at the present time but over a course of years; in other words, what would be the maximum exaction which could be demanded from Germany to meet the losses of the Allies to their nationals through the unlawful warfare of Germany and to indemnify the Allies against the enormous war expenditures, including, of course, existing war debts which have been incurred by the nations which have been opposed to her. My hon. friend can rest assured that the claims of Canada have not been overlooked. Sir Robert Borden has been furnished some time since by the Government here with a full statement of Canada's war expenditure (including pensions) and of the losses which have been sustained by citizens of Canada during the war; I refer particularly, but not exclusively, to the losses which have been sustained by owners of craft on our Atlantic coast which were destroyed by German submarine warfare. The representatives of Canada at the Peace Conference have complete information and Canada's statement of claim, I can assure my hon. friend, will be full and comprehensive.

I saw the item to which my hon. friend referred in one of the newspapers. I am satisfied that it must be based only on rumours, and that it has no substantial, official basis. Nothing has come to me from the Prime Minister which would indicate that the claims of Canada will not be pressed, as the claims of the other Allies, for satisfaction to the extent that they can be satisfied in the settlement with Germany. My hon. friend has stated that Canada was brought into the war against her will. If I did not misunderstand him, he meant that Canada had no desire to go to war; that we were a peaceful and peace-loving people. We went to war not only because Great Britain but every part of the Empire was threatened; not only the Empire and every part of it, but civilization itself. And no nation that had a sense of honour could remain out of the war after its issues were truly known. When Great Britain entered the war in 1914 Canada became ipso facto at war. Our coasts became subject to attack. We are part of the British Empire, and, as my hon. friend said, when Great Britain went to war, Canada legally and constitutionally became at war with Germany.

We did not enter the war only for the purpose of helping Great Britain. I believe that Canada would have gone into the war for that purpose; but Canada went into this war from a profound conviction

that the cause of the Allies was just. And Great Britain having entered the war, Canada at once intimated—as all parts of the Empire similarly intimated—that we would send our forces forward. Great Britain was threatened; the Empire was threatened; Canada was threatened; and this House of Parliament in August, 1914, without a dissenting voice, concurred in the proposal of the Government, that we should use all our available forces for the prosecution of the war. My hon. friend (Mr. DuTremblay) seemed to suggest that Great Britain had rather leaned upon Canada in the war, and that we might have some right to claim from her some special consideration because we had gone in to help her. If I understand my hon. friend rightly with regard to that, I do not agree with him; and I should like to point out to him and to the House, that of all the nations that have been in this war—and I do not overlook the supreme effort of France—of all the nations, the very shield and buckler, as I said in the debate on the Address, of allied defence against Germany have been the Army and Navy of Great Britain, and her inexhaustible resources of money which she poured out without stint until the war was won. The British Navy alone did not win the war; but the war could not have been won without the British Navy. We have made great sacrifices; but I ask my hon. friend, if he can find time to do so, to consider the sacrifices which Great Britain has made in this war. I ask him to take the population of Great Britain and consider the number of men that she sent to the front, and the number she had on the seas. I ask him to look into the question of her expenditures of money per head of population and compare them with ours, or with those of any other nation, and he will be prouder—I know he is proud to-day—he will be prouder than ever before that he is a citizen of the Empire that has at its head a nation such as Great Britain. Now, my hon. friend has spoken of indemnity. He no doubt means, by that, re-imbursement for the expenditures which have been made by Canada as a nation through her Government in the conduct of this war.

There is another phase of the matter; I believe it is usually called reparation. The situation in Europe is that Belgium was overrun in violation of national law and the rights guaranteed her by the treaty to which Germany was a signatory; Belgium was made a victim of unlawful warfare and her people suffered terribly. Her towns and cities were destroyed, her countryside was ravaged, the property of her citizens was stolen from them and sent to Germany, and many of their industrial plants destroyed, or removed. The same may be said with regard to the northern part of France. The French people also suffered terribly during the German occupation. Apart from the suffering inflicted upon them personally by the Germans and the atrocities to which they were subjected, the money loss was enormous in the villages and towns and cities which were destroyed. The same will apply to other countries (including of course Great Britain) where the nationals have suffered special loss by reason of the unlawful warfare of the Germans. Claims will be put forward by the respective nations for reparation as distinguished from indemnity. Whether such reparation will be made a first charge upon the amount which Germany and her allies will pay, I am not prepared to say; but I should think it probable. That however is a matter for the Peace Conference to determine. I have pointed out that Canada also has a claim for reparation owing to the damage done to property of our nationals through unlawful methods of warfare, and that claim has been put forward and will be pressed.

Now, with regard to my hon. friend's resolution, it is I think inadvisable that this Parliament should put itself on record as the resolution proposes; and therefore, I hope my hon. friend if he agrees with what I say, will withdraw his resolution. The representatives of the various nations, consisting of the ablest statesmen in the world, are giving consideration to this, among other questions, in the settlement which is under consideration at Paris to-day. It is the most momentous conference in the history of the world. It is concerned with the question of the recasting of boundaries, the grouping of nationalities, the determination of modes of government, the amounts, as I have stated, which Germany and her allies can pay to the nations which opposed and defeated her. All these questions are now under consideration at that Peace Conference. It would, I think, be embarrassing—I had almost said improper,—for any Parliament whose representatives are there to pass a resolution, necessarily without the full knowledge which those representatives have, and which might have the effect of fettering or binding them in respect to their decisions. I think this Parliament may well rest assured that the deliberations at the Peace Conference are in very able hands and that

the interests of the several nations of the Allies represented there will not in any way suffer.

I should have looked the matter up had I thought this resolution was coming on this evening, but I recall that the British Prime Minister, the right hon. Mr. Lloyd George, or the right hon. Mr. Bonar Law, leader in the House of Commons, stated some time ago that it was inadvisable for any Parliament within the Empire to place itself upon record as to what the representatives at the Peace Conference should or should not do. Therefore, my view is that it would be inadvisable that this Parliament, on the necessarily imperfect information that we have as to the precise situation which exists in Paris, and in Europe, should endorse a resolution of this kind although generally in sympathy with its purport. The wording of the latter part of the resolution is not quite clear. My hon. friend asks:

> That in any case Sir Robert Borden should be instructed to claim from the British Government such amount to be paid out of the indemnity which the British Government might receive from Germany.

I am quite sure that the same principle will be applied to all parts of the Empire; that is to say, that if a certain principle is adopted in regard to reparation for losses sustained by nationals, Canada will be on exactly the same footing as Great Britain in regard to it. I am quite sure also that in the event of Germany being able to pay an indemnity, Canada will be placed in the same position as Great Britain and the other Allies in regard to that question. The principle will be the same. I do not know whether my hon. friend means by the wording of his resolution to claim that if Great Britain gets anything Canada should receive from Great Britain the full amount of her war expenditure. I hardly think he means that. But I can assure him that as far as reparation and indemnity are concerned, the same principle will apply to Canada, Great Britain and other parts of the Empire, and that therefore we shall have no cause whatever to complain.

My hon. friend has called attention to the fact that Canada is not likely to obtain any territorial acquisitions, that France will and that Britain may. My hon. friend has no doubt followed the reports of the Peace Conference. In so far as they disclose what has taken place up to the present time, it would appear that what is known as the mandatory system will be adopted. I am not able to speak authoritatively in regard to that because I think it would be a mistake to anticipate conclusions of the Peace Conference, but if a mandatory system is adopted, no doubt the mandatory nation will hold whatever territories are acquired by it in trust for the Allies, or for civilization itself.

About ten days before the lamented death of the late leader of the Opposition, I discussed with him this mandatory system. It was not very clear to either of us precisely what is meant but he spoke of Great Britain's possession of Egypt and the many and beneficent advantages that had flowed to Egypt from British possession and administration. He spoke with the utmost admiration of Great Britain's justice in dealing with people such as those of Egypt, and he said that if the mandatory system that was being proposed at the Peace Conference would be similar to that under which Great Britain had ruled Egypt, he would feel very easy about it indeed. My hon. friend knows that where Great Britain is administering countries that are not yet self-governing the freest opportunities are afforded the nations of the world for the purposes of trade and otherwise. I think it would be a mistake to assume that if Great Britain, or any other part of the British Empire, should become the mandatory over territory taken from Germany, there will be any direct monetary advantage to Great Britain in that. Great Britain has assumed many burdens in the way of administration and, as my hon. friend knows, her territorial acquisitions have not always represented gain. I feel sure that, in regard to any territory which Great Britain may acquire, there will be an equal advantage to all parts of the Empire in its acquisition. Perhaps I had better not say "equal," but relative advantage; we shall be practically on the same footing and therefore I think it would not be advisable for Canada to set up any special claim by reason of not acquiring any territories if Great Britain or any other part of the Empire should become the mandatory of any territory taken from Germany.

On the whole, I think, in conclusion and by way of recapitulation, that I can assure my hon. friend that the claims of Canada, both for reparation and indemnity are in good hands in Paris and that they have been put forward and will be pressed like those of the other parts of the Empire and of our Allies. I am sure that in regard to Canada Great Britain will desire, as she always has, to act in this matter, as in all others, with the most scrupulous sense of justice and even of generosity.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Whatever conclusion this House may reach in connection with the resolution brought before us this evening by the hon. member for Laurier and Outremont (Mr. DuTremblay), I am sure that we ought to be very thankful to him for preparing and submitting it to the House. First, because he has given us very good reasons in support of it, and has made clear the motives that moved him in bringing this very important question before the House and the country. And second, because the House has had the even greater advantage—I may say without any disparagement of him—of a declaration from the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) upon this most important question.

We have had from the Acting Prime Minister in splendid detail the history of the war in connection with the question, and the various stages through which it has gone, not only as concerning ourselves, but as concerning the various countries implicated in this tremendous war, and we have had the advantage of getting the views of the hon. gentleman on it. Let me tell you, Sir, and the Government, that whatever notions they may have had themselves—and I use the word "notions" advisedly—or whatever opinions they may have had on this question, the country was not at all well informed as to the Government's attitude.

It is a well known fact, Mr. Speaker, that perhaps ten months ago the Globe and other leading papers in this country giving their support and influence to the Government, spoke strongly in favour of, and gave direct reasons why there should be, an indemnity. Among their reasons they stated that Germany herself had established the precedent in exacting enormous tributes from cities brought under her sway during the progress of the war. It was reported that the authorities of some of the great cities which had to capitulate to Germany had the proposition put up to them either to pay enormous amounts of money, or in the alternative the mayor and the clergymen and the leading citizens were to be brought to slaughter. That precedent having been established as the Germans were over-running Belgium and northern France, it was used as an argument, and I think a very strong argument, in favour of the proposition that Germany herself would have to pay a large indemnity when we came to settle our accounts with her. More than that, if we go back to Germany's war with France in 1870, we find that both in money and in land she exacted the pound of flesh. So that, so far as precedent is concerned, there is no ground for complaint from Germany at all, as more than any other nation she has herself established that precedent for the exaction and payment of war indemnities.

Then the question would be largely, if not altogether, whether Germany and her Allies are able to pay the indemnity to meet the expenses of the war. It is difficult to say at this stage what Germany can pay. One thing we can say is this, that while France, Belgium, Roumania and other countries have been devastated, nothing was hurt or displaced in Germany, nor was there much devastation in Austria, nor very much in Turkey, as far as I am aware. They are ready to start anew, their factories and their farms are intact, and all their facilities for general advancement are very well equipped now, and they were very well equipped before the war. On the contrary we are left in the state of devastation in which Germany was able to place us. Consequently I think we must not receive with too much credit any representations that Germany may make as to her inability to pay an indemnity.

The leader of the House (Sir Thomas White) spoke about my hon. friend from Laurier-Outremont, stating that we should get an indemnity from England. That is, he understood my hon. friend to say that we went in to help England, and that therefore, whether there was an indemnity or not, England should pay us. I think if he will read the resolution he will find exactly what my hon. friend from Laurier-Outremont meant, for it is given in the resolution itself. He simply meant that if England gets a lump sum indemnity we should get a share. That is what the resolution says. But my good friend from Laurier-Outremont is not as handy in expressing himself in the English language as is the leader of the House. Therefore he made a slip, and instead of putting it as he did in his written resolution, where he had the time to think it over and write it down, he said that England should give us a straight payment for the services we had rendered. I can assure the House and the hon. the leader, having discussed this resolution with my friend from Laurier-Outremont, that the latter was not what he had in his mind and there was no intention whatever of claiming compensation from England for any service this country has rendered, for he made it abundantly clear, when he stated we were at war as well as Great Britain, that it was our own

9 p.m.

war, that the battle line in France and in Flanders was the first line of defence of Canada, and that therefore any contributions we gave to that line of defence of our own country. That, of course, was what the hon. member thought and expressed, and I am sure that the Government and the hon. gentlemen of this House will so understand it.

The Acting Prime Minister said that Germany made unlawful war on Belgium. There is no doubt in the world about that. Belgium had a right to suppose that Germany would abide by her solemn treaty; so had France; so had Great Britain; so had every other nation in the world. They had a right to suppose that they had only to make certain defences against Germany at certain places and that Germany would not attempt in an unlawful way to make war on France. Consequently it was ab initio, as we say in the law, an illegal war, started illegally and continued illegally throughout.

When a thing starts illegally, as this war started, it is seldom if ever brought back to a legal basis. Therefore this war was just as much illegal, just as much in violation of treaties, just as much without justification so far as we are concerned as it was so far as any other country was concerned. True, it struck Belgium first. True, Belgium suffered more than any other nation. But the action was just as illegal to us as it was to Belgium or to any other country; consequently in international law our claim for reparation, for indemnity, is just as strong against Germany as is the claim of Belgium or of France.

It is almost impossible to calculate our loss, even in ships, in property, in material things; but in the lives that were lost and in the misery and sorrow brought to our people, it is unthinkable. These losses, of life as well as of material things, the pensions which we shall cheerfully pay to relatives of those who were killed and to others who have been deprived of the means of supporting themselves—these are legitimate claims that should be taken into consideration in determining the amount that we should receive from Germany or her Allied countries as a result of this war. If the war had not been brought on, our men would not have been maimed, and crippled, and killed. Our men have been maimed, and crippled, and killed, widows and orphans have been left on our hands, through the rascality and the brutality of Germany in instituting an unreasonable and unjust war, and she should be held to know the result and significance of her act. Germany started this war without justification, and she is just as responsible for her act as is the man who throws a stone through his neighbour's window for his act. He may not have intended to kill the man inside or destroy valuable things in the house; he may have thought that there was nobody in the house at all. But he will be held to have known that he was going to kill a man; he will be held to have known that he was going to destroy property; and when he comes before a tribunal to make good the loss he cannot plead that he did not know what was going to happen. Properly, legally, logically, even humanely speaking, therefore, we can hold Germany responsible for the consequences of her act. If Germany and Austria and their allies are, or will be within the next two hundred years, in a position to pay this indemnity, arrangements should be made to have them pay it.

I do not quite agree with the Acting Prime Minister that it is a mistake to discuss this matter in this Parliament. I agree that it is not, perhaps, well to pass a resolution in hard and fast terms, or to say to the Prime Minister or the representatives of this country at the Peace Conference that such and such are our hard and fast views. But the representatives of Canada will find their hands strengthened by the stand that this House will take, not necessarily in the form of a resolution, but in the form of expression of opinion by the Acting Prime Minister and members of the Government and by members of the House. Our representatives can then go before the Conference, not with a formal resolution of this House of Commons, not with an Act of Parliament, but with an official representative expression of opinion of the House of Commons of Canada, and say: "This must not be ignored." It is a good thing, therefore, for members of this House to have an opportunity of expressing their views on this question.

I am thankful to the Acting Prime Minister for the excellent address that he made and for having made his views and the views of the Government absolutely clear. I feel confident that the discussion which has taken place and may further take place on this subject will neither be detrimental to the country, nor weaken the hands of the representatives of Canada at the Conference. On the contrary, it will furnish them with a strong, sound argument representative of the views of the Canadian people and of this House of Commons. I

have no doubt that my good friend from Laurier-Outremont will comply with the suggestion of the Acting Prime Minister, after such discussion takes place as hon. gentlemen may desire, by withdrawing his resolution.

Mr. DuTREMBLAY: In view of the interesting declaration of the Acting Prime Minister, who seems to agree very largely with my views on this question, I shall be pleased to agree with his suggestion that I withdraw my resolution.

Resolution withdrawn.

RELIGIOUS CONSCIENTIOUS OBJECTORS.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Rouville) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, amnesty should now be granted to religious conscientious objectors to Military Service.

He said: Mr. Speaker, I do not think it is necessary for me to speak at any great length on this resolution. I believe that it expresses clearly the sentiments of those who have any regard for liberty of conscience, a principle which has always been honoured in all countries forming part of the British Empire.

The adoption of this resolution would affect not very many people. I have not the figures, but I am under the impression that only a few dozen people were sent to jail because of their conscientious objections to the Military Service Act. My reason for bringing this matter before the House is involved in a personal reminiscence.

It was my good fortune to see my late lamented leader on the Tuesday before he died, and he reminded me that one of the matters which he intended to bring before the House was this very question of an amnesty for conscientious objectors. He had received many letters from various parts of the country, and to a circular letter addressed by Mr. George Wait to every member and senator, the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier sent this reply:

Ottawa, December 14, 1918.

George Wait, Esq.,

Dear Sir,—I am in receipt of your favour enclosing circular letter addressed to every member of the Dominion Senate and the Dominion House of Commons. The matter therein set forth ought to excite deep sympathy and I consider it to be our duty to take it up as soon as the session opens. In the meantime, I will be much obliged for any details with which you can supply me.

I can, in all truthfulness, state to the House that it was the intention of the late lamented Sir Wilfrid Laurier to bring this matter before this House and to appeal to the mercy of the Government on behalf of conscientious objectors. It is true that, according to our Military Service Act, those who, owing to the tenets of their church or their creed, could not conscientiously undertake military service, were exempted; but as you are aware, Sir, there was no clause which would apply to the conscientious objector not belonging to a special church, like, for instance, the Society of Friends, or the Plymouth Brethren. Therefore, many in this country who did not belong to any of those churches had to present themselves before the military boards. I am not, of course, speaking of the defaulters, or those who did not appear, who did not obey the law. But many conscientious objectors appeared before the military boards and there argued their conscientious objections. The military boards were, however, unable to grant their claim for exemption, and I am informed —at least this circular conveys the information—that those conscientious objectors were sent to jail and even to the penitentiary. As a British subject, as a Canadian, I beseech the Government to be merciful. The great war is over, and to all those who had conscientious objections to military service, I claim that the Government should grant an amnesty. We should only be following a noble precedent. In England conscientious objectors were exempted. In the United States conscientious objectors were exempted. It is a fact that when the question came up in the British House of Commons the conscientious objectors had for an advocate no other than Lord Hugh Cecil himself. He spoke against a resolution for the disfranchisement of conscientious objectors:

Lord Hugh Cecil, on the other side, said that the State could not go into the reasonableness of an opinion. Complete liberty of opinion must be allowed in the interest of truth. He held that view not simply because of his respect for the religious opinions of other people, but because of his own religious convictions also. It was an indisputable part of Christian belief that if a person sincerely thought a thing was wrong, then it was wrong to him. He was entirely out of sympathy with the conscientious objectors, but if they thought it would be doing a wrong thing to fight in the war, he did not want his country to descend to the wickedness of forcing people to do what they thought was wrong, or of punishing them because they refused to do what they thought was wrong.

Lord Cecil boldly denied that the safety of the State was the supreme law. Carried to its logical conclusion, that doctrine would justify the sinking of the Lusitania, or the bombing of women and children. Not the State, but the Divine law was supreme.

State worship is undoubtedly the poison which has affected Germany. "My country, right or

wrong " is a popular version of the doctrine that the State has a right to insist upon implicit obedience, but is itself above the law and above morality. By firmly resisting this doctrine, British statesmen are doing more for the cause of liberty than would be gained by forcing a small body of conscientious objectors into the army, or by penalising them for refusing to serve.

Thus, in England the military boards took cognizance of applications made by conscientious objectors. Of course, conscientious objectors were assigned to non-combatant duties. I have here a series of trades to which they were assigned during the war. For instance, conscientious objectors could be utilized in agriculture, forestry, transport, education, public utilities, gas works, fire brigades, munition works, mills, timber yards, oil mills, flour mills, etc. Section 3, subsection 2, of the English Military Service Act, 1915, reads:

A certificate of exemption may be absolute, conditional, or temporary as the local tribunal think best suited to the case, and also in the case of an application on conscientious grounds, may take the form of an exemption from combatant service only, or may be conditional on the applicant being engaged in some work which, in the opinion of the tribunal, is of national importance.

I have here a facsimile of one of those certificates granted by the military boards in England. I will read it to the House:

This is to certify that ———— residing at ————a Christadelphian and a recognized conscientious objector to military service, will not be called upon to join the army provided he is engaged in work of national importance such as agriculture, forestry, mining, transport, education, public utility, or such other work as may be approved of by the Committee on work of National Importance, 26 Abingdon Street, Westminster; and that he notifies in writing that he is so engaged, on the first of every month to the undersigned, at the undermentioned address.

If the holder of this certificate cease to be engaged on work such as stated above this certificate will not be valid, and he will then be called up for Military Service.

Then follows the signature of the officer. In view of the example of Great Britain, I appeal to the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) and to the Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie) to be merciful in these cases. There are very few of them, I understand; let us say that there were fifty or a hundred people in this country who on conscientious grounds were opposed to military service, but who nevertheless boldly and in all sincerity presented themselves before the tribunals. It seems to me that it is not good or wise policy to let these conscientious objectors languish in jail any longer. I have received many letters on this subject from different parts of the country, and I say that the least we can do, now that the war is over, and having before us the precedent of Great Britain and the United States, is to act generously. Consider the obnoxious effects that will be produced on these young men by confinement in the penitentiaries! I will say no more. The House will believe me, I hope, when I say that I am sincere in my advocacy of the cause of religious liberty. I am a British subject, and I take pride in my British citizenship. It has always been the pride and honour of Great Britain to lead the world in the matter of religious and civil freedom, and it is on that broad principle of tolerance and of freedom in matters religious that I appeal to the Government to be merciful to these honest and sincere young men, law-abiding citizens in every other respect, who did not default but presented themselves boldly before the tribunals and stated their objections. I leave the case in the hands of the Acting Prime Minister, and hope that he will be generous and British in his treatment of these young men.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General): The question which my hon. friend has just presented to the House is one of some complexity, and of a good deal of difficulty. The law of Canada upon the subject is to be found in section 11 of the Military Service Act, which provides for certain exemptions. Paragraph (f) of section 11 provides:

That he conscientiously objects to the undertaking of combatant service and is prohibited from so doing by the tenets and articles of faith, in effect on the 6th day of July, 1917, of any organized religious denomination existing and well recognized in Canada at such date, and to which he in good faith belongs; and if any of the grounds of such application be established a certificate of exemption shall be granted to such man.

You will note, Mr. Speaker, that there is a wide difference between our statute and that passed by the Imperial Parliament in 1916. I do not know what the reason for the difference is, but certainly it was the opinion of this Parliament that exemption should only be granted upon the terms prescribed in our own statute. Now two things had to unite before a person in Canada could be entitled to exemption on the ground of being a conscientious objector, and those two things were, (1) that the applicant conscientiously objected, and, (2) that he was prohibited from engaging in combatant service by the tenents and articles of faith in effect on the 6th day of July, 1917, of any organized religious denomination existing and well recognized in Canada. That is our law. If the applicant objected, and his faith prohibited him from

entering combatant service, he had a right to exemption, and exemption was granted on those grounds by the tribunals from one end of Canada to the other. But the difficulty arose in this way. There were a number of the younger generation who had not formally become members of some of the lesser religious bodies throughout Canada, but who had become adherents of one of those bodies. When the applicant applied for exemption he was asked if he was a member of the faith to which he expressed his adherence, and on the rules of the church being produced these men were found strictly speaking not to be members. These cases were taken to appeal and were definitely settled by the Central Appeal Judge, in accordance with the terms of the Act, that a man must be in actual membership of the particular creed or faith on the 17th of October, 1917, which was the date of the first meeting of the various registration boards; and a man not actually and formally a member on that date was not entitled to exemption under the section I have read. I think the decision of the Hon. Justice Duff was absolutely correct and within the meaning of the enactment. We have no conditional exemption such as they have in England. Parliament in its wisdom did not see fit to adopt the British Act. Consequently, a large number of young men in Canada who believed that they were adherents of the various religious faiths which objected to combatant service found that they were not entitled to exemption under the Act, and some very severe sentences were imposed, a great many of them being for as high as ten years in the penitentiary.

There were two classes of conscientious objectors: Those who failed to report at all, some of them thinking that as they belonged to various objecting faiths it was unnecessary for them to report; and those who reported, joined some military unit, and then refused to obey some military command, or to don His Majesty's uniform. These latter, technically, were charged with refusing to obey a lawful command, but their refusal in many cases was based upon a real conscientious objection. Those who had failed entirely to report were merely defaulters or deserters under the Military Service Act. There were no more than "a few dozen" of these cases. My recollection is that there were, all told, 152 conscientious objectors in confinement undergoing sentence.

The sentences varied from two to ten years. Many of these cases had been dealt with by the military authorities, and in these the sentence was almost uniformly ten years. However, these sentences can all be reviewed by the Governor General in Council, and they were all reviewed; and all of the extremely long sentences were reduced to two years. At the conclusion of the armistice, or, to be more accurate, about the first day of February last, the Government appointed a special committee, of which I had the honour to be Chairman, and I had associated with me the Judge Advocate General, representing the Militia Department, and Mr. Newcombe, Deputy Minister of Justice, representing the Military Service Board. The question of the sentences which had been imposed upon conscientious objectors, and also upon other military defaulters, was referred to us. After a great deal of consideration of these two classes of cases, the Committee reported that, in its judgment, conscientious objectors who were bona fide objectors and not slackers should be liberated after they had served six months, notwithstanding that many of the sentences were ten years. Up to the present time between 70 and 80 of 152 have been liberated. Twenty cases are now under consideration and, I think, will be disposed of during the present week; and the balance will be disposed of within from two to five weeks, because I think they will all then have served the full six months which is the minimum penalty according to the report of the Committee—which report, I may say, was approved by the Governement. We investigated each case to see whether the man was in reality a bona fide conscientious objector, or was more or less of a slacker. We had cases, for instance, where men claimed to be conscientious objectors, and would not engage in combatant service, but were quite willing to make munitions and earn from eight to ten dollars a day. I do not think that clemency should be extended to such men. For the purpose of gaining information in regard to each particular case, we used the services of the parole officers throughout Canada, the reports of trial magistrates, and in some cases the recommendations of hon. members of this House. If the report shews that a man has been a well behaved citizen, is really and virtually a member of the faith to which he claims adherence, and has been of good conduct in the community to which he belongs, we unhesitatingly accept that, and at the end of the six months' term release him. I think that, comparing our action in this matter with that of the United States, our terms have been extremely lenient. Sentences were imposed in the United States of imprisonment for twenty and thirty years, and in many cases

for life. However, since the armistice the authorities there have undertaken a personal investigation of each case. In many of the cases they have ordered liberation; in many others they have refused it. I think about 75 per cent have been granted their freedom, while about 25 per cent have been held to be more or less slackers. Of the 152 cases in Canada, I may say that very few have so far turned out upon investigation to be really slackers. I believe a very large proportion of them are bona fide conscientious objectors. I think that the six months' penalty, which has been resolved on as a minimum, is a moderate one, and it would hardly be fair to grant a general amnesty at the present moment, as eighty who have been already released have been penalized to the extent of six months' servitude or more. However, at the end of the six-month period in these cases, our jails and penitentiaries will be quite free of these unfortunate prisoners. I do not know if my hon. friend desires to press his motion. I think my explanation may be sufficient for his purpose.

Mr. LEMIEUX: In view of the explanation of my hon. friend, I think, perhaps, my motion might be dispensed with. It is unfortunate that we did not, in the excitement attending the discussion of the Military Service Act, frame a clause which would have been consonant with the British Act—a much more liberal one than ours. At all events, the clause was inserted in the Act and the military boards had to act accordingly. I am rather pleased at the statement of my hon. friend that only 152 cases were dealt with by the military boards, because in my opinion it is conclusive evidence that there have not been, throughout this wide Dominion, any undue claims made by so-called conscientious objectors. There were no sham or fraudulent objections, and I believe that the 152 men who boldly presented themselves and sincerely pressed their objection to military service did so in absolute good faith. I think, Mr. Speaker, that in future, if the Military Service Act needs to be amended, a clause might be inserted like that in the law of Great Britain. One of the many contributions to war correspondence which I read lately mentioned the fact that the Quakers in England served in the war not as combatants, but served in the desolated regions of France and Belgium, helping to restore the cities, the villages and the hamlets. The article I read was most interesting. The writer stated that the Quakers, who have an antipathy to participation in war in any form, were ready to do their duty by the state in a non-combatant capacity. I therefore urge upon the Government that if any amendment is thought necessary at any time, our law should conform as nearly as possible to the British law. With the hope that my hon. friend will extend his clemency to the unfortunate conscientious objectors, I will withdraw my motion.

Motion withdrawn.

THIRD READINGS.

Bill No. 5, to authorize a further extension of time for the completion of the Saint John and Quebec Railway between Gagetown and Westfield.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

Bill No. 9, to authorize the Reclamation of Dominion Lands by Drainage.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

Bill No. 17, respecting the Units of Electrical Measure.—Hon. A. K. Maclean.

GOOD ROADS.

AID TO PROVINCES FOR HIGHWAY CONSTRUCTION.

House again in committee on a certain proposed resolution to provide for the constructing and improving of highways in Canada.—Hon. Mr. Reid—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Might I suggest to the hon. Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) that, before this matter is finally disposed of, he should give the House some idea, if he can, of the nature of the agreement which is to be entered into with the provincial governments. I think that if there be any difficulty in regard to the matter it will arise in that respect. Provision is made that an agreement shall be entered into between the Dominion and the local governments but we have no information in detail as to what that agreement shall be. I quite understand that we cannot expect all the details, but if the hon. gentleman has made any progress in the preparation of the agreement it might be very helpful to the committee to have that information before it. It may be possible that the Dominion Government are going to have more control than they are entitled to. They are only going to provide forty per cent of the money, and it looks as if they were going to have seventy-five per cent or more of the control. It would be well if we could have some information on that point.

Generally speaking, the object is one that I very heartily approve of. We can-

not ignore the fact that in the past discussions of this measure the impression existed in the minds of many hon. members that the Government at Ottawa were endeavouring to exercise an undue influence upon public opinion in this way. I do not endorse that view. I merely state as a fact that that was the objection that was raised to the measure in this House on a former occasion. I was not present, and I am only speaking from my general reading. If the minister could give us, before the matter is finally disposed of, some information as to the nature of the agreement which he desires to make with the provincial government, it would be helpful. We all recognize, I am sure, that if the Dominion Government are going to make a large contribution to this service, it is reasonable that they should have ample guarantees that the money is going to be applied to road work. There is a possibility, and more than a possibility, of difficulties between the local and Dominion Government in regard to the terms of the agreement. I would suggest to my hon. friend—I do not expect it now but at a later stage when he has made sufficient progress in that direction,—that he should give us some idea of what the terms of the agreement are and the conditions to which the local governments will be obliged to submit.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, I shall be very glad indeed to give any information that the House may desire in connection with this matter, either now if I have it with me, or hereafter when we go into Committee on the Bill.

With reference to the point raised by the hon. member, I may say that so far I have not any agreement that would be universal for the provinces. What I had in mind when I prepared this Bill was to decide on the amount to be paid to each of the provinces. First, as the resolution shows, we advance $80,000 to each province; after that we pay so much per capita according to the last official census at the rate of forty per cent of the work to be done on each road. I realize the difficulty the hon. member (Mr. Fielding) has advanced of making an agreement that will be satisfactory to the Dominion Government, and ensure the work being properly carried out. The hon. member will see that the resolution states that the money is to be expended in accordance with an agreement that is to be made with the several provinces. Of course, the provincial governments control the roads, and they will submit a plan showing the location of the main roads or the roads that they suggest the Dominion Givernment shall contribute to. Prior to that we would have to come to an arrangement as to who would control the expenditure.

In my opinion the fair way to do it would be this: Each particular province should select a commission of three of the very best men they could get in the province, men who have knowledge of work of this kind. The Dominion Government should have one representative on that commission. If we had three upright honourable men, men who knew their business, I should think if the Dominion had a representative who would see that the work was carried on honestly and in accordance with the agreement to be made, that would be an efficient body. In addition to that the commission would lay before the Dominion Government their location plans of the roads that the Dominion Government would be called upon to subscribe to. Those plans would have to be approved. After they were approved by the Dominion Government the work would be proceeded with. The Dominion Government would have an engineer for each particular work during its construction to see that the specifications were carried out. In that way, it appears to me, the Dominion Government would be properly protected, its representative on the commission would see that the money was honestly expended, and the inspecting engineers would see that the work was carried out in accordance with the specifications. Fears have been expressed that perhaps this money would not be expended in the way that we would wish, that is, that permanent roads would not be made. But I think we would be fully protected by simply having our man on the commission and our engineers in charge of the work.

I thought that perhaps when the Bill was going through the House I would get suggestions from hon. members either from their own knowledge of the subject of good roads or from information from their several provinces, as to provisions to be made, either in the Bill or in the regulations, that would ensure a full return for every dollar expended. When we get the Bill printed and before the committee I will try to have the form of agreement, for submission to the House, that I would ask the provinces to agree to.

In taking this matter up with the representatives of the different provinces—and they are all anxious that this Bill be proceeded with—I have found that they are all very eager to co-operate in every way to

make everything go satisfactorily and to see that the money is expended to the very best advantage. I do not think you will have any trouble if the Bill goes through and I am able to carry out the provisions that may be embodied in it. I shall be very glad indeed to have a discussion on the Bill and to receive any information or advice that can be given.

10 p.m.

Mr. FIELDING: It may be that the municipalities will have to participate in this matter, so I presume the agreement which my hon. friend may prepare will contemplate that, because the roads are municipal matters to some extent. Of course, the municipalities are created by the provincial legislatures, but I imagine that, to make this effective, you would need the co-operation not only of the Provincial Governments but also of the municipalities. Once or twice my hon. friend the Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) has referred to "main" roads. Well, I have had some experience in by-gone years in defining what a "main" road is, and my observation has been that every man thinks that the road that runs past his house is the "main" road, and any project which proposes the expenditure of money at some other point is looked upon by him with a great deal of suspicion. However, these are difficulties we shall have to meet and make the best of as we approach them.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): The minister (Mr. J. D. Reid) has asked the House for information in lieu of not giving any himself on this Bill. As I take it, one of the most important things that should be in the resolution is left out; that is, that this Government shall have some check upon the location of the highways which it is going to assist in building. The word "location" is left out. I called the attention of the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) to that the other night. He claims that it is in by virtue of the use of the word "otherwise."

Some hon. MEMBER: And "description."

Mr. MORPHY: And "description." Well, strike the whole section out and make it "description and otherwise." I think the most important word of all is "location." I take it that if these roads are to be permanent, they should be, first, provincial; second, interprovincial; and third, national. Location, therefore, is the very essential principle of the whole scheme. The roads must go through one province to meet a highway in another, and so on continuously throughout the country; otherwise the highway would in no sense be a national one. The word "location" should be in the resolution; otherwise it may afterwards be said that this Government never intended to exercise any control over the location—and I think we should.

The minister said the other night that there were to be roads of three different standards as to construction and as to material. The committee should know what standard will be number one, what number two, and what number three. Unless these roads are to be what a good engineer would call permanent highways, the cost of contributing forty per cent to their construction will be wasted money. My mind goes back to rural roads that have been constructed in Ontario under the Provincial Good Roads Law. Ontario has been assisting municipalities in the building of county roads by paying for grading and for gravel of a certain standard and its application to the roads. Forty per cent has been contributed to the roads of Ontario and forty per cent has been blown off by the winds and washed off by the water. They called them "permanent highways," but that expression is a misnomer. The natural cement in the gravel and broken stone had nothing to bind it to the road. and motor cars came along and whisked it off, assisted by the wind. I fear that this Government, unless their agreement with the provinces is such as to protect the exchequer, may fall into the error that occurred in Ontario. The Toronto and Hamilton highway is the only one that I know of in the province that is permanent. It is solid stone; it will last beyond the lifetime of any one living. Millions of dollars have been put into the roads of Ontario, and that is the only one that can be said to be lasting.

Mr. J. D. REID: Has the hon. gentleman any idea of what that road cost?

Mr. MORPHY: It is a pretty expensive road. I had the pleasure last year of going over hundreds of miles of the New York State roads. New York State has spent about $70,000,000 on its State roads, but they are there to eternity. I understand that the cost of maintaining these roads is about five dollars per mile per year. They are of solid stone, solid brick or solid tar macadam. A journey in a motor car or a waggon for a distance of a hundred miles becomes monotonous on any one kind of road. A ride of a hundred miles on a cement or concrete road tires you out, although the road may be as smooth as glass. So

over there they have tar macadam for a stretch, vitrified brick for a stretch, and solid concrete, with expension joints every twenty-five feet, for another stretch. Are we going to have roads like that? Are we going to have anything nearly like that? I see the minister smile. I think it is his duty to take the committee into his confidence and tell us exactly what kind of roads we are going to spend forty per cent on. The minister may say that arrangements have not yet been come to with the provinces in that regard. I quite appreciate that. I hope that Ontario will be more progressive in the expenditure of its money on roads. I admit that they have improved their roads, but they have done so more by improving the roadways than by what they put on them. The term "permanent roads" seems to signify the exact opposite of what it ought to mean. I concede that it would be impossible to make roads from one end of this country to another at the tremendous cost that would be required for permanent roads. It is important, however, that we should have a continuous chain of roads so that the Maritime Provinces will connect with a good road at Quebec, Quebec with Ontario, and so on. Through the co-operation of State and Federal Governments and the county authorities, the United States are going to build a road from Port Huron, opposite Sarnia, clear down to the Gulf of Mexico. The superintendent of highways of Michigan stated this in so many words at a convention in Stratford, the county which I have the honour to represent here. He came to Canada for the purpose of asking the people of that district to connect up their road with this one at Sarnia and Port Huron, with resulting advantage to both countries. It is the duty of the Government to be very careful in this matter; they should not entirely surrender the right to say as to the location of the roads in any agreement that they may make. I should like to hear the minister tell us how "permanent" these roads are going to be,—of what they are to be constructed and whether they may be denominated as permanent or semi-permanent roads. I do not want to see under the Dominion aegis what I have seen in Ontario: roads on which the province have paid forty per cent blown to—I was going to say blazes.

Hon. J. A. CALDER (Minister of Immigration and Colonization): Conditions throughout our country vary very considerably. What would apply to Ontario will not apply to Saskatchewan. I have lived in Saskatchewan for fifteen or twenty years; I was connected with the Government there, having been Minister of Highways for about five years, and I think I know the conditions in that province. The road problem was before us all the time. If you suggested the building in Saskatchewan of a road such as exists between Toronto and Hamilton, the people of that province would not stand for it for two minutes.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Is not my hon. friend furnishing the committee with a good reason why the provinces should be left to settle this matter?

Mr. CALDER: That is another phase of the general question. So far as Saskatchewan is concerned, our road problem is so huge, there is so much work to be done, the volume of expenditure that must be carried on during the next ten or fifteen years is so great, that to talk of spending money on a road that will cost in the neighbourhood of $12,000 to $15,000 a mile is out of the question. In our province we have mud roads. There are in that province large sections in which there is no stone and no gravel. Consequently, we have had to develop simply the best system we could of mud roads, clay roads, and in the main, they are serving their purpose fairly well. We can have a fairly high grade clay road if it is properly built and drained. Roads of that class may be considered as of three classes or grades. Therefore, if in the consideration of this measure the House is to determine that in all the provinces of Canada we are to have but one standard of roads, and that the various provinces will not have an opportunity of taking advantage of this measure if they do not conform to that standard, I doubt very much if that will be acceptable to some of the provinces. I think that, if the measure is to be adopted, it must be elastic in its provisions; that there must be sufficient latitude that the Government may make with each province an agreement which will suit conditions in that province.

Mr. ORREN D. CASSELMAN (Dundas): The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) asked for information from the minister (Mr. J. D. Reid) with regard to the class of road towards which the department purposes contributing forty per cent. If I remember correctly the explanation given by the minister, when he introduced this resolution to the House last Friday, he made a division of the roads into classes based on the classification which obtains

in this province. If I remember aright, he said that there were three classes of roads, namely, provincial highways, county provincial highways and county highways. That is the classification that is made in Ontario. He stated that it was the intention of the department to contribute only to those roads that were built to a high standard of excellence, namely, the provincial roads. I am heartily in accord with the principle of this measure, and my one objection to the plan outlined by the minister is that he proposes contributing only to those roads known as provincial highways. To my mind, if he adheres to that decision, there will be very few roads that will obtain this grant of forty per cent. I would ask him to contribute to the two classes of roads, provincial roads and provincial county roads. I believe that in Ontario a provincial road is supposed to cost from $8,000 to $10,000 a mile and a provincial county road is expected to cost from $5,000 to $8,000 a mile. I contend that roads of the provincial county class should also be given this grant of forty per cent.

During the time I have been in this House I have noticed that most hon. members commence their addresses by congratulating somebody. I want to be orthodox, and I conclude that I would be extremely heterodox did I not congratulate somebody on something. So I want to congratulate the Government on its decision to enter the field of road building. It is the opinion of those who have given this matter considerable study that the Government should have embarked on this work at a much earlier date. The construction of highways for vehicles in the opinion of many, should have kept pace with the construction of our railroads. Both are public transportation utilities; both are necessary to the easy, economical and rapid distribution of the products of our factories and our farms, and both require the expenditure of large sums of money, too large for the municipalities or the provinces unaided to undertake. We have built our railroads, if not wisely, at least extensively, and I think it may be said that so far as the trunk lines are concerned, we have not only met but anticipated the requirements of our country for many generations. But up to this time, if we exclude the abortive attempt of 1912, nothing has been done by the Federal Government to assist in this great and costly work of highway building. We have had roads of a sort since the days of the early settlers, and since the early settlers found it necessary to undertake the duty of building and maintaining roads, that duty, until recently, has, to a very great extent, been left to them. Indeed, in Ontario, the Crown, in granting titles to farms, made a proviso that property holders should maintain the roads adjoining their farms. Out of this grew the pathmaster system, a system that had many points in its favour and which was, perhaps, the best that could be devised and established in the days of the early settlers. A road was then regarded as a community convenience and it seemed right that the community should provide and maintain that convenience. But the usefulness of highways has broadened. The users are not now only residents of a community; people from long distances use the roads, and it is no longer an equitable arrangement that the property holders should provide and maintain the roads abutting their farms.

I congratulate the Government on attempting to solve this great problem of road-building. It is not a new problem; it was a problem which the people of ancient times had to face. It was a problem more difficult to solve then, in "the days when earth was young," than now, perhaps, and we moderns may with profit copy, if not the methods, at least the style of the ancients in road-building. There are roads in existence to-day, and, indeed, in use to-day, whose foundations were laid before Canada was discovered. You will remember there is an account in ancient history of a road being built at the time the Pyramids were built. Babylon was paved two thousand years before the Christian era, and the Roman Empire began its system of good roads many years before Christ. There will be few who will deny that the great success of the Roman Empire was due, in part, to its remarkable system of good roads.

The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell), in his speech at the opening of the session, laid down the principle that public money must be spent for public works, at this time, to serve two purposes: first, to provide needed conveniences, needed public utilities and institutions; and, second, to afford employment to those who otherwise would go to swell the ranks of the unemployed. I submit that there is no undertaking that will so well accord with the principle laid down by the Minister of Public Works, as the work of highway building. It will provide employment for the unemployed. The objection has been made that not many returned soldiers will wish to engage in this work, but some of them will, and, furthermore, the returned soldiers are more likely to get employment if unemployment is not general. Good roads will aid development and will prove a good

investment. Some years ago I had the pleasure of listening to the Commissioner of Roads for the state of New York, and he made an extraordinary comparison. He said that over the ordinary country roads, such as they had in the state of New York before their new state roads were built, and such as we have in Canada to-day, or at least in Ontario, it cost about 25 cents per ton mile to haul a load, but over the roads of their new system the cost has been reduced from 25 cents to 8 or 10 cents a mile. Now, if we can cut in two our haulage cost on the immense tonnage that is drawn over our country roads, we can look with less apprehension on the yearly obligation of Canada to provide interest on our borrowings. The commissioner also made this statement, that it had been found on investigation that there was a loss to each rig used in hauling loads of 12 days per year. I want to present this case from the farmers' point of view, because the farmers' are looking for better roads. There are about 750,000 farmers in the Dominion of Canada to-day. Allowing one rig to each farmer, and taking the statement of the commissioner as true, that there is a loss of 12 days a year for each rig, we have the tremendous loss of 9,000,000 days per year because of bad roads; and if we put the value of each rig at five dollars there is the tremendous amount of money lost by the farmers alone in Canada of $45,000,000 a year. If that amount can be saved by the establishment of good roads in the Dominion of Canada we need have very little fear that Canada will be able to pay the interest on her debt.

The farmers of our country are demanding consideration; they are entitled to consideration, and recent events in the province of Ontario, at least, must convince us that they are able to insist on consideration. They are demanding a condition of affairs that will produce tangible results, making for better conditions of life on the farm. One of the greatest problems that is facing this, and the government of every democratic country is the problem of keeping the boys and the girls on the farms and it is conceded by those who have given this matter study that the greatest chance of success in this direction lies in making farm life attractive; that we can best and most easily succeed in solving this problem by bringing the life and attractions of the city, home to the farm. Good roads, I submit, will help to do this. They will link up the farmers' families, separated by distance because of the very nature of their business. They will link up the farming communities with the villages, and the villages with the cities. They will bring the life and attractions of the city home to the people on the farms. The loneliness of country life, its solitude, the isolation which the students of this question say is responsible for hundreds of abandoned farms throughout this country, will disappear with the inauguration of good roads. Good roads will certainly have a tendency to keep the boys and the girls on the farms, and unless the boys and the girls can be kept on the farm, and unless the right class of people can be drawn from the cities to the farms, the future of our country must be regarded with considerable foreboding. If, then, good roads will tend to increase the farm population, they will increase production, and must, of necessity, reduce the high cost of living.

Some years ago a commission was appointed, in the United States, to investigate the high cost of foodstuffs. The commission, after a lengthy and exhaustive investigation, reported that, in their judgment, 50 per cent of the problem of high prices was the problem of transportation and distribution; and they further declared that the lack of good roads added tremendously to the price of farm produce. Now, there seems to be a general impression that the farmers are rapidly becoming millionaires. I am not a farmer myself, but I have been in close touch with farmers all my life, and I know the conditions that exist on the farm; and I am therefore in a position to say that the idea that farmers are becoming wealthy is a fallacy. The hundreds of abandoned farms throughout the Dominion, and the thousands of farms that are not worked to anything like their full capacity, prove that this is so. The very fact that rural population is decreasing explodes the theory that farming is a profitable occupation. In the last ten years, I am informed, rural population has decreased by about 45,000, while urban population has increased by 2,500,000. That fact, if it is a fact, also goes to prove that farmers are not by any means becoming millionaires. Why, even in Ontario—Ontario that claims to be the banner province of the Dominion, and boasts of being the leader in progressive thought and progressive action—according to Mr. Black, the chairman of the Soldiers' Settlement Board, there are 300,000 less acres under cultivation to-day than there were ten years ago. That very fact is sufficient proof that life on the farm is neither profitable nor attractive.

In conclusion, I shall make a contrast between the part of Ontario that I happen to know well,—the part of Ontario where the representatives from all parts of the Dominion are now gathered,—and the state of New York immediately over the St. Lawrence river. Infinitely better in the character of its soil, with a people fully as intelligent, fully as skilful, fully as industrious, and with climatic conditions equally as good, eastern Ontario, because of its lack of good roads, is leagues behind the state of New York, which, because of the fact that it has good roads and magnificent transportation facilities for vehicles, far surpasses us in productivity and general agricultural development.

I think that the only objection to this Bill is the method by which the money will be distributed. It involves the old principle of patronage; and I am of the opinion that if this Bill is wrecked, it will be wrecked upon the rock of politics, and not on the rock of principle. The Bill proposes to hand over certain amounts of money to the provinces, to be spent by the provinces. The Governments of the provinces must have the confidence of the people; they will be responsible for the money that they expend under this Bill if it passes the House. Surely, we can trust the people; and these governments are responsible to the people. Furthermore, while this Bill proposes to hand over money to the provinces, the money will be paid only after the work is completed; it will be paid only on those roads approved of by the Good Roads Department. Now there has been placed at the head of this department a man who knows roads and road building perhaps better than any other man in Canada, a man who has earned the name "Good Roads Campbell," a man who has given his life to the study of this work. Surely such a man can be trusted to see that the money will not be spent for political purposes, but in a way to give to the people what the people in Ontario and Quebec are clamouring for—good roads. There will be no difficulty in the province of Ontario. We have a Conservative Government in Ontario. There will be no difficulty in the province of Quebec; and Quebec, of all provinces of the Dominion, has gone further in this work and has spent more money to build good roads—and spent it judiciously, as the roads in that province will show—than any other province in Canada And I, for one, Mr. Chairman, knowing the history of road building in the province of Quebec, am quite content to trust whatever government may be in power in that province to spend to the best advantage the money that may be given it under the terms of this Bill.

Mr. EDWARDS: What about Nova Scotia?

Mr. CASSELMAN: I do not know anything about Nova Scotia. But the government of Nova Scotia, like that of every other province, is responsible to the people; and I have sufficient confidence in the intelligence and honesty of the people of Nova Scotia to believe that if the government there spent the money for political purposes, the people would immediately set about turning that government out and establishing in its place one that would spend the money honestly, wisely and well. However, the people of the Dominion must have good roads. They are looking to this government to contribute liberally towards providing them, and I hope that this resolution will be passed and that the Bill that is to be brought down, founded on this resolution, will meet with the approval of the House.

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (Calgary West): I have listened with great interest to the remarks of the hon. member for Dundas (Mr. Casselman) in which he has expressed such profound admiration for this resolution on which is to be based the Highway Bill which will be introduced into the House. I found the cause of his joy to be practically in the fact that he came from the province of Ontario, and I will endeavour to point out to the House later just what the cause of that joy is. I agree with everything that has been said in connection with this matter, in regard to good roads throughout Canada. But this is a measure which involves the expenditure of $20,000,000 of the revenue of this country, and my first objection to the resolution, and the Bill which will be founded upon it is the method of distribution of the money. The first clause in the resolution provides that each province in the Dominion shall receive a grant of $80,000 each year, and after that the balance remaining to be expended in any one year shall be based upon the population of the various provinces. I think that this principle, to begin with, is very unfair so far as the Western provinces are concerned, and more particularly the provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I cannot see any underlying principle why there should be a fixed amount of $80,000 for the province of Prince Edward Island, Alberta, Ontario, or any other province.

It was pointed out by the Minister of Railways in introducing this resolution that we hoped to benefit the farmers and settlers throughout the country, that we hoped to join the great centres and that the farmers, through these highways, would find communication with the markets in order to dispose of their farms. What will be the amount of the money expended? Will the amount of money which will be allowed to the province of Alberta under this resolution be such an amount as will produce for that province highways which would connect up centre with centre, Edmonton with Calgary, Calgary with Lethbridge, Lethbridge with Medicine Hat, or Medicine Hat with the towns adjoining? If we got the whole $20,000,000 for the next five years it would not be a sufficient amount to construct highways in Alberta alone such as were suggested by one of the speakers here to-night.

I submit that the foundation of the distribution of this money is absolutely wrong and that it is not such as to do justice to all the provinces of Canada. If you want any evidence in support of that I will call your attention in a rough way to the question of population and area in these different provinces. Take the province of Prince Edward Island. Its area is 2,184 square miles, while the province of Ontario has an area of 407,262 square miles. Yet, the province of Prince Edward Island gets exactly the same allowance as that which is given to Ontario and to every other province in the Dominion. That, I think, is unfair to all the other provinces, and supports my contention that the underlying principle is wrong.

When we come to the question of the remainder, we find that $720,000 of the annual appropriation of $4,000,000 will be used up. That leaves us slightly over $3,000,000 to be divided among the provinces, or at the rate of approximately forty cents per head of the population. What does that mean? It means simply that the province of Ontario, which has an area of 407,262 square miles and a population of 2,500,000, will receive $1,000,000 over and above the $80,000 in the original grant. When we come to Alberta, which has an area of 255,285 square miles, or more than half that of the province of Ontario, we find that it will receive, not $1,000,000, but only $200,000 to expend on its road. When we come to the province of Nova Scotia we find that it has an area of 27,985 square miles and a population of about 500,000. Notwithstanding that in Alberta we have an area ten times as great, the population of these two provinces being equal, Nova Scotia and Alberta will each receive approximately $200,000. What does that mean? According to the last figures that I have seen, the road mileage of Nova Scotia is approximately 18,000 miles. Any person in this House who is familiar with those western provinces, who has travelled from the north to the south and from the east to the west of Alberta and Saskatchewan, must realize that we will have ten times more mileage in roads when that country is opened up. Still, because Nova Scotia happens to have the same population, we are asked to accept for Alberta a grant which is exactly the same as the grant given to the province of Nova Scotia. My contention is that the division of this money should never be based upon population, but that it should be determined by what was suggested by the Minister of Railways in introducing this resolution: It should be determined by the needs of the people. We all know that the Maritime Provinces and the greater portion of Ontario and Quebec are thickly settled. We know that along their highways there are thousands of settlers while away out in the West there are only tens. We know that the people who will be served in these provinces will be numerous, but we know that the necessity for the man in Alberta who has to haul his grain twenty, thirty or forty miles is just as great as the need of the hundreds of thousands of people who line the roads down in the Eastern Provinces. If we want development, if we want to assist the farmer, if we want to furnish the settlers who are doing pioneering work with the assistance that they require, we must alter the whole basis of the distribution of this money. Distribution should be based on the mileage of the roads in the various provinces rather than upon population which includes the urban population of the large cities in the East. I would not be doing my duty if I supported the Bill, when brought in, if the money is to be divided upon that basis.

I think this is an inopportune time for the Government to bring in a measure providing for the construction of roads. We must all arrive at the conclusion that this money, when expended, is not going to be expended upon the construction of any national highway which will link up provinces or link up the East and the West, but it is going to be used for the purpose of assisting road work in the various provinces. Every man in this House must realize that the construction of highways is a purely local matter, and that it should

be deatl with by the provinces. We all realize that when this Government undertook to regulate certain matters in connection with the sale of stocks and bonds in Canada in times of great pressure and stress, they were promptly brought to task by the provincial governments throughout the country. Those governments would not stand any infringement of provincial rights; they would not allow you to cross the threshold one single step. While personally I am in favour of assisting the provinces in this great work if we can do so, I feel that there are so many undertakings to be carried out by the Dominion Government at the present time that we could not have launched a policy of assisting them in road-work at a most inopportune moment than we have done.

It has been suggested by my hon. friend from Swift Current (Mr. Argue) that this money had better be spent on branch lines of railway, and I agree with him. I think that if we used that money to provide the settlers in the West with the railways that they so much need, we would render a better service to the country than we will be by expending it on road work. I would call your attention to another matter in connection with the expenditure of this road money. What is the position of the province of Alberta?—and the same applies to some extent to the province of Saskatchewan. If, in the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan, we had control of the natural resources which justly belong to those two western provinces, we would not be asking this Government for assistance in the construction of our roads.

But we have valuable lands held by the Canadian Pacific Railway which are exempt from taxation; we have vast areas of unplanted land held by the Dominion Government which do not contribute one cent to our revenue; we have vast areas in the school sections which do not contribute anything to our revenue. Instead of voting one million dollars a year to the province of Ontario, eight hundred thousand dollars a year to the province of Quebec, and an equal amount to the province of Nova Scotia—which is only one-tenth of our size—as to the province of Alberta, we say you should distribute that money so there will be a quid pro quo to the provinces of Alberta and Saskatchewan for those resources which are withheld from us and against which we cannot levy one cent of taxation for the construction of our provincial roads.

There is another matter which affects the West and has affected it right along. We have heard discussions in the House and in the corridors in regard to the position which has been taken by Western Canada in regard to the tariff. I have been a protectionist, but I want to see some concessions given to the farmers of Western Canada, and when they tell us they cannot give us any concessions on account of the great needs of the country, my answer is that we should not embark upon provincial works and expect to pay for them out of revenues which are derived from the tariff. I would be much better satisfied if the tariff were reduced by $4,000,000, and keep the $280,000 which they hope to give us from this measure of road construction in the province.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): The hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat (Mr. Tweedie) has spoken loyally for one of the Western Provinces. His idea is that the money would be more fairly distributed if based on road mileage than on population. After all, I presume roads are built for the use of the people, and if you have not any people in a certain section of the country there is not much use building roads there. We happen to have a greater population down here in Ontario and the eastern provinces. But the western provinces are not the only ones interested in agriculture by any means. May I be permitted to tell my hon. friend that the province of Ontario produces a greater agricultural wealth every year than all the western provinces put together. And when it comes to a question of having a say in the tariff or how the tariff revenue should be expended, it might be pertinent to ask what part of the Dominion of Canada produces that revenue, where is the most of it raised? There again, I say, the province of Ontario comes in for special consideration. This is the province which not only produces more in agricultural wealth than all the western provinces put together, but this is the province where most of the tariff revenue is raised, and this is the province which contributed more than all the rest of Canada put together when it came to raising money for Victory Loans and other war purposes. We are entitled to some consideration, therefore, it seems to me. If you want to build a standard road out to every outlying settler on the fringe of civilization in the provinces of Saskatchewan or Alberta, your money will not go very far. And the hon. the Minister of Immigration and Colonization (Mr. Calder) has told us that the same class of roads we require in Eastern Canada would not do out in Western Canada. He says there they

have mud roads; that there are three standards of roads: mud road No. 1, mud road No. 2 and mud road No. 3. So I suppose No. 1 out in Saskatchewan would be the kind that would have most mud on it, No. 2 road with less mud on it would be entitled to a smaller grant, and the one that has the least mud on it, No. 3, would get the smallest grant.

11 p.m.

Now, Sir, I am not going to offer any congratulations to the Government or the minister in regard to this matter until I see the Bill. I am going to be Scotch for the time being and be a little canny. I suppose that more money has been wasted in Canada on railroads than on any other one thing. Next to that I suppose more money has been wasted on highways than on anything else, and I think the chances are very good, from present indications that the highways will out-run the railroads in the matter of waste. I believe that every dollar of money voted by this Government for the building of any kind of road except the kind that is absolutely permanent is money entirely wasted. In that respect I am entirely in accord with the hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy). There is no use giving $80,000 to Saskatchewan to pile up a little mud and call it a road; that is money absolutely wasted. They might better have five miles of road in Saskatchewan built properly, five miles of road that will last for all time, than have a hundred or two hundred miles of mud piled up on any road. That is the kind of road they have out there, we are told by the Minister of Immigration. Well, I do not think much of that kind of road. We should not vote the money of this country to the assistance of Ontario or any other province for the building of any kind of road except one built on a proper foundation and properly surfaced, a road somewhat similar to those built on the other side of the international boundary, a road which will be absolutely permanent. Money voted for any other road improvement is money absolutely wasted; at least, it is money from which you will get only a very temporary advantage. For a year or two second class roads will show up very well, but then they will be blown or washed away as the member for North Perth says.

It seems to me that if this Government is to vote forty per cent and the province sixty per cent, the province should have sixty per cent control, not only in regard to road location but in regard to the kind of road they want. If the province of Saskatchewan wishes to have sixty per cent interest in mud for a road, and this Dominion is willing to have forty per cent interest in mud, why, all right, if they can reach an agreement of that kind; but I do not think it is a very good or a very wise agreement.

I also think that if this Government is to vote forty per cent of the money it should have some say as to how that money is to be expended. That is to say, the money should not be handed over to a province, for instance, like Nova Scotia, which will unquestionably use it for political purposes, as they always have done. That is what they use the road money down there for. They do not use it for anything else except election purposes, I am credibly informed. The Government should not countenance any such actions as that; they should not encourage political dodgery in Nova Scotia, even though that province has persisted in following that policy for years. Let them fight elections on their merits, not simply on the expenditure of road money. If we vote forty per cent to the provinces for the building of roads, Dominion engineers should consult with engineers from the provinces regarding the kind of roads to be built. A standard road should be devised and agreed upon by the Dominion and provincial engineers, and the work should be let in sections by contract to the lowest bidder, thus getting it out of political control. Let the contractor build his section of the road in accordance with a standard fixed by agreement between the provincial and Dominion engineers, subject to proper inspection by some one agreed upon by the provincial and Dominion governments. We need better roads in Ontario; we are entitled to them; we are entitled to assistance. Our friends from the West must not forget that they have received a good deal of assistance from Canada as a whole in the building of the railway lines throughout the western country. An hon. gentleman says that the people of the West have paid for it all. Not by any means. The greater part of the burden of expenditure for the building of railroads throughout Canada, particularly throughout the West, has been borne not by the West, but by the eastern provinces. The East has contributed very largely to the prosperity of the West; the East has borne the bulk of the burden of railway construction in the West as well as in the East. Ontario, from every standpoint, particularly from that of population, and more particularly from the standpoint of the fair claims of its agricultural popu-

lation, is entitled to special consideration in the construction of roads. In Saskatchewan when one of two farmers live twenty miles from market, of course, they need a road. But in Ontario, Quebec, and the older provinces a good many farmers live on a twenty-mile road, and if it is in the interests of the country that one or two farmers in Saskatchewan have a road to enable them to get to the market, it is much more in the interests of the country that the twenty, thirty or forty farmers along the twenty miles of road in the older provinces also have means of getting their produce to market.

Mr. J. S. SEXSMITH (East Peterborough): I am entirely in accord with the proposal that the Government has brought forward. I do not know of anything that will benefit the country more to-day than a good system of public highways. It is evident that if we continued the old provincial or municipal system of road construction and improvement, we should be a very long time in getting proper roads. We have heard a lot about the high cost of living; if we had a proper system of highways within a radius of fifty miles of every city in Canada on which the farmer could run his car into market with his produce, a good deal would be done toward reducing the high cost of living.

In discussing this matter some hon. members have been looking at it from a provincial point of view. I wish to deal with it not from the standpoint of Ontario or in the interests of any one particular province, but in the interests of the whole country. I was surprised to hear the member for Calgary West (Mr. Tweedie) say that the little two-by-four province of Prince Edward Island would get as much under this proposal as his great province of thousands of miles. I would remind the member for Calgary that a few years ago the House provided some $12,000,000 for the purchase of seed grain for the farmers of Saskatchewan and Alberta. I understand that five or six millions of that money have not yet been repaid; yet not one hon. member from Prince Edward Island, Ontario, or any other province has found fault. We should get away from this provincialism and discuss matters of this kind from a national standpoint. If we are going to discuss from a provincial standpoint all matters that come before the House, we shall be looking up the records and finding out what each province pays most in taxes, what each province imports most, what province exports most, and so on. I wish to support this resolution purely from a national standpoint as furthering a system of national highways. When the Bill comes before the House we can go into the matter in more detail. I am not in favour of patching roads; I believe that whatever money is spent by the Federal Parliament should be spent on a system of permanent highways.

[Mr. Edwards.]

Progress reported.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid the House adjourned at 11.15 p.m.

Tuesday, March 25, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORT PRESENTED.

Shipping report of the Department of Customs containing the statements of navigation and shipping of the Dominion of Canada for the fiscal year ended March 31, 1918.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

SUPPLY.

AMENDMENT BY MR. McMASTER IN REFERENCE TO TARIFF REDUCTION AND RECIPROCAL TRADE WITH U.S.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister) moved:

That the House do go into Committee of Supply.

Mr. ANDREW ROSS McMASTER (Brome) moved in amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" be omitted and the following substituted therefor:—

Whereas in order to meet the great expenditure necessitated by our national obligations it is imperative that the labour and capital of this country should be directed to the obtaining of the greatest economic return, and that the energies of our people should be freed in order that the most be made of our natural resources and the strength and intelligence of our people be utilized to the fullest extent; and

Whereas it is advisable in the public interest that taxation should be borne by those most capable of sustaining the burden, and that the proceeds of taxation should reach the national exchequer, and should not be diverted into the hands of the privileged classes of the community; and

Whereas the reciprocal trade agreement negotiated with the Government of the United States in January, 1911, has been accepted by that Government, and legislation providing for its coming into force upon its acceptance by the Canadian Government has been passed by the Congress of the United States; and

Whereas the said agreement, providing as it does for the free interchange of the products of the farm, the sea, the mine and the forest, and for the freer exchange of many articles of prime necessity and universal use offers to the producers and consumers of this country an

opportunity which wisdom and patriotism demand should be availed of:

Therefore be it resolved that it is the opinion of this House:—

(a) That the increases of duties of 7½ per cent and 5 per cent enacted by the statute 5 George V, Chap. 3 should be repealed:

(b) That the offer of reciprocity contained in the reciprocal trade agreement now upon the statute books of the United States of America should be immediately accepted in its entirety, and that legislation for that purpose should be introduced forthwith;

(c) That without derogation from the provisions of paragraph (b) hereof, all staple food and food products not now free (with the exception of luxuries), and domestic animals and foods therefor should be admitted into Canada free of duty when coming from and being the product of any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty;

(d) That without derogation from the provisions of paragraph (b) hereof, all farm and garden implements, machinery and tools, including farm tractors; all mining, flour and sawmill machinery and repair parts therefor, as well as the raw material entering into the same; lumber, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers be added to the free lists—it being understood that the tariff benefit proposed to be conferred upon raw material entering into the manufacturing of the articles above set forth may be granted by way of rebate or drawback; it always being provided that in the event of any difference of duty existing under the provisions of different parts of this resolution, the lower duty or freedom from duty prevail.

(e) That having regard always to the requirements of the public revenue and the necessity of affording reasonable opportunities for adjustment to those affected by the proposed changes, substantial reduction should be made in the tariff with the object of reducing the burden upon the consumer in respect of the prime necessities of life, and with the object of delivering the consumer from the bondage now imposed upon him by the exactions of monopolies, trusts, and combines.

Mr. McMASTER: Possibly I can best introduce what I have to say in explanation and support of this resolution by taking up one by one the various matters embraced in the resolution. I presume it would be well for us in this discussion to find out the greatest common ground on which we are all agreed, in order that the points on which we differ may be clearly set forth. I presume there will be little difference of opinion as to the first clause of my resolution, namely, that the exigencies of the financial situation require that the labour and the capital of this country should be devoted to those lines of activity which will produce the greatest wealth. Where we may differ is in the means whereby this labour and capital can be so applied. A belief which I have cherished for many years is that people generally know their own business better than any government can, and that under the dual influences of free competition and personal initiative and energy, the greatest possible wealth will be acquired. This is always subject to two main exceptions. I take it that it is the duty of the State always to interfere in free competition when one of the parties to an economic bargain cannot protect himself. I believe it is right and proper that the State should interfere to protect women and children who happen to work in factories. I also believe there are certain great natural monopolies and perhaps certain great artificial monopolies which are properly the concern of the State and not of the individual, but with those two exceptions it is my belief that, by allowing people as much as possible to carry on their business in their own way, we shall create most wealth in Canada.

One of the main objections which I have to the protective theory is this: that the Government undertake to direct the labour and capital of the country into certain channels, and the Government is more often wrong than right.

The next point which I wish to bring before you, Mr. Speaker, is that which I have placed in the second paragraph of the resolution: Whereas it is advisable in the public interest that taxation should be borne by those most capable of sustaining the burden, and that the proceeds of taxation should reach the national exchequer, and should not be diverted into the hands of monopolists or trusts or into the hands of the privileged classes of the community which have a direct interest in the incidence of taxation.

That is sound doctrine, and I believe it will be appreciated, though not, perhaps, as fully as it should be on the other side of the House as well as upon this. The next clause merely states a fact—a fact which, perhaps, some people in Canada may have forgotten. The reciprocal trade arrangement —that great and beneficent piece of public work framed by the hon. member for Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding) and the late lamented Hon. Mr. Paterson—is yet open to the Canadian people to accept. It is only necessary for this Government to introduce legislation to have this beneficent arrangement come into effect.

The five steps which I ask this House to agree with me in thinking the best steps to be taken under the present circumstances are: First, the repeal of the statute 5, George V, chapter 3, which places certain increases of duty upon the statute book—an increase of 5 per cent on goods coming from Great Britain, and an increase of 7½ per cent on goods coming from other countries.

This Act was placed upon the statute book as a war measure. But now the war is over, at least, the fighting is done, and I think it is incumbent upon the Government to remove this burden which was placed upon the people merely as a war measure.

The next step which I wish to see the Government take is the acceptance of the reciprocity agreement. Next, the elimination of duties upon foodstuffs. Next, the elimination of duties on the means of production of the great extractive interests of the country: agriculture, mining, fishing, and lumbering. Next, a general downward revision of the tariff, made after careful investigation, and with the double object of relieving the consumer and bringing more revenue into the coffers of the state. The transition should be made very carefully, and be as little onerous as possible on those interested.

It is often well in discussing this subject to endeavour to remove from the minds of one's hearers certain misconceptions which they may have. I believe that many people will ask: How can we make these reductions in duties and still find sufficient revenue to enable us to meet the exigencies of the financial situation? I trust, Mr. Speaker, to be able to satisfy hon. members in that regard.

The increases of 5 and 7½ per cent have brought into the coffers of the State a certain amount of revenue by the taxation of raw material, generally for manufacturing purposes, which formerly came into the country free. But, on the other hand, by adding 5 and 7½ per cent to a tariff already somewhat high, the ingress of other goods into this country has been prevented, and the coffers of the state have suffered in that proportion. Again, if the increases of 5 and 7½ per cent are removed, it is reasonable to argue that the manufacturers, relieved from the tax on their raw materials, will possibly make more money, a certain portion of which should find its way into the public treasury through the Income Tax Act or the Excess Profits Tax. Now what will the acceptance of reciprocity mean? Will it involve a great loss of revenue to this country? I do not think so. The reciprocity agreement was negotiated in January, 1911, and I have had recourse to the figures for the year 1910 of the imports into Canada from the United States, and the exports from Canada into the United States, of goods coming under that reciprocity arrangement. These figures, though not for a recent year, are sufficient to be a guide for us. Canada, on the basis of the year 1910, would have remitted duties on goods coming in from the United States to the amount of $2,500,000, and the United States would have remitted duties on goods going into that country from Canada to the amount of just under $5,000,000. But since then matters have changed to a certain extent. A great number of articles then taxed somewhat highly by the United States are now subject to a lower rate of duty. The elimination of duties on foodstuffs would mean a loss of revenue, on the basis of the last fiscal year, of $14,366,000; on agricultural implements, $1,428,000; on cement, $4,376; on saw-mill machinery, $57,530; on fertilizers, $77,224; on oils of all sorts, a little more than $2,509,000. So the loss of revenue by placing these things on the free list would not make any substantial inroads upon the treasury of the country. Indeed, the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) said the other night, although I did not entirely agree with him, that ten million dollars here or ten million dollars there was not a matter of first-rate importance.

Mr. CARVELL: Will my hon. friend show me where I said that?

Mr. McMASTER: That is my recollection of what the minister said, and I think Hansard will bear me out. I have not a copy with me.

Mr. CARVELL: I should like you to produce it.

Mr. McMASTER: I think my hon. friend will find that I am right. That was certainly the impression made upon my mind, and I listened to him with all the care and attention which a former political friend should give to his speech. But, Mr. Speaker, we are not dependent in this country upon indirect taxation for our revenue. For many years it was thought in this country that direct taxation was impossible. The hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) was one of the first to raise his voice, strong and eloquent, in the House and in the country, to show that direct taxation was the proper way in which to raise the revenue. And to-day we are receiving a very substantial amount of revenue, though not nearly as much as we should, through direct taxation.

It will interest the House, I am sure, to learn what proportion of the revenue of the United Kingdom, the United States, and of Canada was raised by direct and by indirect taxation in the year 1917-18. The United Kingdom during that time raised 81 per cent by direct taxation, and only 19 per cent by indirect taxation. The

United States during the same period raised 69 per cent by direct taxation, and only 31 per cent by indirect taxation; while Canada, in the period under review, raised 11 per cent by direct taxation, and no less than 89 per cent by indirect taxation. My friend the hon. member for Huntingdon and Chateauguay (Mr. Robb), has handed me Hansard, from which I shall quote in order that I may not rest under the imputation of having misquoted the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell). On the 26th of February the minister said: "It is so big that a matter of $10,000,000 does not matter much one way or the other." So, I do not think I was unfair in the way I quoted him.

Now, I wish to call the attention of the House to what the United States is doing. In the issue of the New York Nation of March 1, there is a most interesting article by Mr. Thomas S. Adams. Mr. Adams is Professor of Political Economy in Yale University and is War Revenue Expert in the Treasury Department of the United States Government. What he says is so interesting that I will ask the House to bear with me while I read it. He says:

The Revenue Act of 1918—

That is, the Revenue Act of the United States.

—will impress the student of financial history as a signal victory for certain theories of taxation which a few years ago were regarded as "socialistic." Within a quarter of a century Justice Field pronounced an income-tax law socialistic and unconstitutional because it exempted incomes of less than $4,000 from the 2 per cent "burden" which it imposed upon larger incomes; and heated controversy waged about the practicability and propriety of progressive rating. But the Revenue Act of 1918, designed to produce in the first twelve months of its operation $5,788,260,000, will raise more than 80 per cent of this sum from progressive income taxes.

The estimates are worthy of notice. The war-profits and excess-profits tax—a form of income taxation unknown five years ago—is expected to raise $2,500,000,000, or 43 per cent of the entire tax budget. The income taxes proper, individual and corporate, will raise $2,207,000,000 additional or 27 per cent of the tax budget. Ability taxes—

I understand that the word "ability" has reference to taxes placed on those who are able to pay, and not on those who will feel the burden grievously.

Ability taxes therefore account for more than 81 per cent of the entire tax levy. If we add progressive estate or inheritance taxes the proportion rises to more than 82 per cent; and if or 37 per cent of the tax budget. Ability bacco and other luxuries—

I do not know whether all hon. members in the House will regard tobacco as a luxury. Some, indeed, may regard it as a necessity.

—together with taxes on admissions and dues, we account for nearly 94 per cent of this colossal tax bill, leaving only about 6 per cent to be provided by taxes on transportation and on necessary processes of production and commerce.

If I may pause here, Mr. Speaker, to interject a remark, it is this, that we have long regarded the United States as the example par excellence of a highly protected country, gathering into its treasury, to meet its public expenditures, the great part of its income through customs tariff. That day has passed. The progressive democracy of the United States now taxes those who can afford to pay, in order to obtain the money required to carry on the affairs of the country.

Practically no tax is laid upon articles of actual necessity. Contrast this with the tax programme of the Civil War and we find much reason for congratulation. The new Revenue Bill may be full of imperfections, but it represents a striking victory for ability taxation and democratic finance.

The most important feature of the new law is the striking advance in rates. Income-tax rates have, for most taxpayers, been more than doubled. The taxpayer having a wife but no children will pay, on an income of $3,000, $60 under the Revenue Act of 1918 as compared with $20 under that of 1917; on $10,000, $830 as contrasted with $355; and on $100,000, $35,030 as contrasted with $16,180. These amounts are not high in comparison with the similar British taxes. For example, a married man with no children or dependents would pay 3.6 per cent on an income of $5,000 in this country as contrasted with 15 per cent in the United Kingdom; on $25,000, 14.8 per cent as against 35.75 per cent; and on $100,000, 35.03 per cent as against 47.19 per cent. The British rates are notably in excess of our own for incomes under $150,000. The two schedules meet at $200,000, and on larger incomes the American rates greatly exceed the British. An income of $1,000,000 will pay 70.3 per cent in this country, but only 52 per cent in the United Kingdom.

"This country," of course, means the United States. Now—if I mistake not,—a man with an income of a million dollars in Canada does not pay anything like 70·3 per cent. I may say, however, that the author whom I have been quoting thinks that a rate of 70·3 is too high and will possibly lead to attempts to evade the tax.

My next point is this: The United States has a population about twelve or thirteen times greater than our own, and I think I am well within the mark when I say that its annual income or wealth is not more than twenty times as great as ours. That is merely an estimate. There are no figures, but I have checked that estimate with a gentleman who above all others is best

able to advise me, and he tells me that, in his opinion, the national wealth of that country is not greater than I have stated.

If we calculate the United States wealth as being twenty times as great as our own we ought to be able, if we adopt the same schedule as they do in the country to the south of us, to raise by direct taxation in this country $235,350,000. It is true that some of us will have to give to the state a great deal more than we have been accustomed to, but I do not mind that as long as the division is fairly done. I say that up to the amount that is absolutely required for a man to live respectably, and to bring up his wife and children respectably, the Government should endeavour as far as possible not to touch that amount. Over and above that amount, however, the Government should be prepared to take, and the people should be prepared to give, a very substantial proportion of what Providence has blessed them with.

Now, I have, to my own satisfaction at least, shown that it is not economically unsound to reduce the customs duties, and it is my desire now to place before the House the way in which the tariff affects the agricultural interests of this country. I have before expressed the opinion in this House —which I believe is concurred in by very many—that most difficult and troublous financial times confront this Dominion, unless we are able to induce to come upon our fertile fields and to remain upon those fields, a very much larger number of people than now live in the rural parts of Canada. I think, Mr. Speaker, that whoever is to blame for it, we are over-developed, as far as railways and urban development are concerned, and what we need to-day is to develop the rural parts of our country. Now, can we expect to induce people to come into Canada, and can we keep people on the farms of Canada, unless we give them substantially as good living conditions as they will obtain in the United States of America, or in other parts of the world? I do not believe we can, and that is the reason I would crave the indulgence of the House while I place before hon. gentlemen the conditions under which the farmer suffers, and perhaps especially the Western farmer, because the latter produces for a world's market. The price of his products, in many instances, is settled not in Canada at all, but in Liverpool, and it is necessary, in order that social and economic justice be done him, that what he requires to buy he should be able to obtain at a reasonable and proper price.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): Does my hon. friend think that the trend from the rural to the urban centres in Canada, say in the last ten or fifteen years, has been greater than it has been in the United States?

Mr. McMASTER: I am not prepared to say that, but I am prepared to advance the opinion that a high protective tariff has increased the trend of people from the country into the town. I know from my own experience as a member of the Bar in Montreal that, man after man, the leaders of the Bar, are country boys who came into the city because there was greater wealth, and greater opportunities for their ambition, in the city.

Mr. EDWARDS: How does my hon. friend account for the movement in England from the country to the town?

Mr. McMASTER: I will reply to my hon. friend in this way: That the trend citywards from the rural districts has been found in all countries. In the United Kingdom Free Trade was the great thing that built up the cities, and the drift citywards—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: I believe I am correct in what I state; that Free Trade is what built up the cities in the United Kingdom, and I say this—that if the cities had not been built up under Free Trade in Great Britain, the shield and buckler of the Allies would never have had the money to keep the war going that it has had.

What I propose to do is, to lay before the House, as graphically as possible, the burdens under which the Western farmer suffers through the tariff. I know that to read long lists of figures is tiresome for the speaker, and more tiresome for the hearer, but nevertheless, I would ask hon. gentlemen to come with me to the home of the farmer on the Western prairies, and if I make any mistakes, there are those on the other side of the House who will be able to kindly set me right, because perhaps they know a great deal more about the matter than I do.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: Let me say this, Mr. Speaker, that those who know more about this matter than I do will be those who will most entirely agree with me. Now the Western farmer gets up in the morning—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

An hon. MEMBER: At what time?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Mr. McMASTER: You will be glad to know, Mr. Speaker, that my few remarks have developed the keenest sense of humour on the part of some hon. gentlemen opposite. Well, the Western farmer gets up very early, my hon. friend from Victoria (Mr. White) tells me, and let us say that he needs woollen underclothing.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: The woollen underclothing, let us say, comes from England, and it pays a duty of twenty-seven and a half per cent. Let us suppose that the shirt which the farmer is putting on came from a Bradford manufacturer and was invoiced to the importer in Montreal at $24 the dozen, or $2 apiece. On the arrival of the goods in Montreal, the importer pays the insurance and freight, which, let us say, amounts to five per cent, and he in addition advances the duty of twenty-seven and a half per cent. Supposing the shirt costs $2. Very well, five per cent on $2 is ten cents, and twenty-seven and a half per cent on $2 is fifty-five cents, making a total of $2.65. Then the department head of the importing house calculates the profit, and let us say he puts on a profit—my friends in the dry goods business will say whether this is right or wrong—of twenty-five per cent. He calculates this profit, not on the invoice price of $2, but on the $2 plus the cost of freight and insurance, 10 cents, and plus the duty 55 cents, and we therefore find that when the Western retailer buys this shirt he pays $3.30 for it. To that should be added 5 cents to cover expressage, and the shirt laid down in the small town near which our farmer lives comes to $3.35. The Western retailer has to make his overhead expenses and his profit, and in order to do that he adds 30 per cent, so that shirt costs our farmer $4.40. Out of this amount the Government has received 55 cents by way of duty, but the amount by which the duty has increased the cost to the consumer is a great deal more than that, because the importer who advanced the duty in the first place has to have his profit on it, and the retailer who handled it in the second place has to have his profit as well. Therefore, if you work the sum out, omitting the duty altogether, and giving the same profit to the wholesale importer and to the retailer, you will find that there has been 95 cents added to the price of the shirt attributable to duty, and out of this only 55 cents has gone into the treasury of the nation. I submit for the kindly consideration of the Acting Prime Minister and Minister of Finance that that is a very expensive way to raise a revenue. If the goods come from the United States, the duty is higher and the amount of profit realized on the duty, advanced in the first place by the importer, is higher also. Now, putting on his socks——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: ——he finds that they are taxed. I do not know, Mr. Speaker, whether it is my friends the Western men that are laughing——

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, no.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think it is, because, if so, they will not laugh very loud when their constituents find out that they turn to derision any economic argument advanced with the endeavour to reduce the heavy burden upon the Western consumers, as well as those in other parts of the Dominion.

Now, to return to the socks, Mr. Speaker. If they came from England they would be taxed 22½ per cent, and if they came from the United States they would be taxed 32½ per cent;—I am mistaken, I have got ahead of my story. I should have mentioned the boots. If they came——

Some hon. MEMBER: You put the socks on first.

Mr. McMASTER: Mr. Speaker, in a dreary and dry subject like this it would be always a pleasure if my neighbours on the opposite side who have any remarks to make would make them in such a tone that I might have the advantage of them.

Now, the man pulls on his boots. If they came from England they were taxed 22½ per cent; if from the United States, 32½ per cent, and if they were made by a Canadian manufacturer I beg leave to suggest that you will find their price was just a little under what they could have been produced for abroad and brought into the country, freight and duty paid.

Mr. EDWARDS: I should think he had better put on his pants before he puts on his boots.

Mr. McMASTER: After our farmer is up, Mr. Speaker, he steps across a strip of carpet which was taxed 42½ per cent, and then he walks over his linoleum or oil cloth, which came from the United States, each of which is also taxed 42½ per cent; and as a great proportion of the articles used in the Canadian northwest come

either from the States or from Eastern Canada, where the price is raised to within speaking distance of the tariff charged goods from the United States, I will make use of the figures of duty as on goods coming from the United States.

He goes to the washstand which is taxed 42½ per cent, and makes use of a jug and basin, which were taxed 27½ per cent; the soap he uses was taxed 40 per cent, and his brushes were taxed 35½ per cent; the towel was taxed 37½ per cent. The water, you will say, was not taxed. Pardon me, Mr. Speaker, it was taxed, because it comes through an iron pipe and has been raised by a windmill. The iron pipe was subject to a specific duty of $8 per ton and an ad valorem duty of 7½ per cent, and the windmill, which came from somewhere in Ohio, was taxed 27½ per cent.

He then put on his outer clothes, consisting of a good ready-made suit, composed largely of wool. It was taxed 42½ per cent, although civilized man throughout the world has rarely got to withstand a more rigorous climate than that on the plains of Saskatchewan. Our farmer felt inclined to make some biting remarks about the eastern clothing manufacturer who taxed him 42½ per cent on his clothes, but then he remembered that that gentleman had to buy the raw material, tweeds, overcoatings, and such things as that, which were also taxed at exactly the same rate, 42½ per cent. The cotton clothes which his wife wore were taxed 42½ per cent, and her woollen garments at the same rate as her husband's. Our farmer was a very excellent man and he went out to do the chores, and while he was so engaged his wife lit the fire in the stove, which was taxed 32½ per cent, and put on an agate ware kettle which was taxed 42½ per cent. She also pushed forward to the front of the stove a double boiler in which the porridge had been cooking the night before while the supper was preparing; they were Scotch folk and therefore thrifty. The porridge was taxed 7½ per cent in addition to a specific duty of 60 per cent per 100 pounds. She fried some bacon, which had been taxed two cents a pound, plus an ad valorem duty of 7½ per cent. Out of respect for the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) I will make no unkind remarks about the price of the bacon. The tea which they used was taxed ten cents a pound plus war duty. The teapot was taxed 37½ per cent. If they had used coffee, Mr. Speaker, they would not have escaped taxation, because in that case if it had directly come from its country of origin it would have had a duty of from eight to ten cents a pound placed on it, with an ad valorem duty of 7½ to 10 per cent. Their table cloth and napkins were taxed 37½ per cent, their knives and forks at the same rate, while their modest display of silverware was taxed at the rate of 42½ per cent. I note, Mr. Speaker, with great satisfaction, that the hilarity of hon. gentlemen opposite has somewhat subsided.

Meanwhile our farmer had proceeded to the barn, and it was a cold dark morning in November he took with him a lantern, on which the duty was 37½ per cent.

Mr. DAVIDSON: Was that the light in the window?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. McMASTER: I will come to the light in the window later. He took with him the lantern, taxed at 37½ per cent, and with his milk pails (taxed at 32½ per cent), over his arm he started to milk the cow. After he had milked the cow he pulled the blanket off the horse, taxed 42½ per cent—that is the blanket, not the horse—led the horse by the halter, taxed 37½ per cent, to the hitching post, where he gave him a good grooming, the curry comb he used having been taxed 37½ per cent. After breakfast his wife washed up the dishes, taxed 37½ per cent, and the beds having been properly aired she prepared to make them. Being a woman of information and education, she was struck with the fact that if the blankets were of pure wool made in England they were taxed 27½ per cent, but if of an inferior quality, such as is used by the poorer people, they were taxed at the higher rate of 35 per cent. She put away her summer things and got out her winter things for the approaching cold weather. The hats she put away had been taxed at 42½ per cent, the fur caps she took out were taxed at 37½ per cent, the gloves at 42½ per cent, a fur coat at 37½ per cent, and a fur-lined coat was taxed at the same rate. The mitts were taxed 42½ per cent, and the new muff, which her husband had given her on the last trip he had made abroad, was taxed at 37½ per cent. Her husband had carelessly thrown aside a pair of suspenders and she remembered that those were taxed forty-two and one-half per cent. The handkerchiefs that she had laid aside for the weekly wash were taxed at the same high rate. Cuffs and collars were at the very peak of the load; they were taxed at 45 per cent, and the very buttons with which they were attached to the shirt were

taxed at 42½ per cent. As it looked as if it might rain, she got out some rubber clothing, taxed at 35 per cent; and her soliloquy was: Is there anything under the blue canopy of heaven that is not heavily taxed?"

The meat which she placed in the oven was taxed, and while it was cooking she took out her sad irons.

An hon. MEMBER: What?

Mr. McMASTER: Sad irons, articles which are used by a woman when she wants to smooth out things.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the hon. gentleman propose to collect under his system less taxes in the aggregate than are collected under the present system?

Mr. McMASTER: No.

Mr. BURNHAM: Then what is the advantage of it?

Mr. McMASTER: What I am endeavouring to place before the House is the fact that the articles commonly used by the plain and common people are taxed at exorbitant rates. These irons were taxed at 37½ per cent, and had they been plated they would have been taxed at 42½ per cent.

After this had been done she put some mince-meat on some pastry. The mince-meat was composed in part of raisins, spices, peel, etc., all of which were taxed. She also turned out a mould of jelly taxed at 3¾ cents per pound, plus war tax, and laid out a plateful of nuts taxed at 42½ per cent. She had a few minutes left before dinner time—she was an extraordinary woman, as you will all admit.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McMASTER: So she went through her cupboard to obtain a list of articles to give to her husband the next time he went to town, some little distance away. She discovered that she had plenty of cereal foods in small packages, taxed at 27½ per cent; plenty of molasses taxed at $1.11¼ cents per hundred pounds, plenty of catsup taxed at 42½ per cent, baking powder taxed at 6 cents per pound plus war tax, soap powder taxed at 40 per cent. She noted that she would have to ask her husband to buy on his next trip, tooth powder, taxed at 40 per cent, sage, thyme and savoury herbs taxed at 25 per cent. As the children had been particularly good recently she felt that they deserved some chocolate confectionery, taxed at one cent a pound, plus 35 per cent.

While she was so busy, her husband had been looking over his machinery with the idea of putting it carefully away for the winter. He found that his plough was taxed at 32½ per cent, and his harrow at 27½ per cent, his wagon at 32½ per cent, and his harness at 37½ per cent. He made some small repairs to the harness room, using for the purpose tongue and grooved lumber taxed at 32½ per cent. He also did a small job in cement near the kitchen door that his wife had asked him to do weeks before, and noted that the cement was taxed at 10 cents per hundred pounds.

After supper the family gathered round the dining room table on which stood a shaded lamp taxed at 30 per cent, burning coal-oil taxed at 2½ cents a gallon, plus 7½ per cent, and discussed the affairs of the day. Is it surprising that their conversation turned upon the extortionate and exorbitant rates of the tariff on what was used by the western consumer? Their thoughts were rendered none the less bitter because they knew that in regard to many of these articles of prime necessity, through mergers and trusts and combines, competition within the tariff wall had been practically eliminated?

I think that a short study of the tariff will bring one to realize how absurd the tariff is. I crave your indulgence, Mr. Speaker, and the patience of the House, because I know that to give the details cannot be otherwise than tiresome. However, I shall try to make it as little tiresome as possible.

Cream separators are free—an excellent thing—but a Babcock milk tester, which is used in every butter and cheese factory throughout the Dominion, is taxed at 32½ per cent, and the earthenware churns in which the butter is made are taxed at 37½ per cent.

If a man needs a bandage for surgical or medical purposes he will find that rubber bandages are taxed at 35 per cent, silk web bandages at 45 per cent, and flannel bandages at 42½ per cent.

If a man is slightly deaf he learns with interest that aurasage for treating the deaf comes in free, but if he is completely deaf he finds that an auriphone, acousticon or artificial ear-drum is taxed at 35 per cent.

Liquid asphalt is taxed at 25 per cent. Asphalt road oil for improving roads comes in free, although road scrapers, road graders and road rollers are heavily taxed.

Citron rinds in brine come in free, but candied peel is subject to a specific duty of

half a cent a pound and is taxed up to 42½ per cent.

Barrels come in free sometimes; other times they are taxed. Barrels containing pork, beef, petroleum, or linseed oil are taxed up to 32½ per cent, but barrels containing apples, wheat flour, cornmeal, or beer come in free.

Although seeds are either free or taxed on a low basis, cabbage, cauliflower and celery plants are all taxed at 25 per cent.

Dentists' instruments come in free, but the chloroform that the dentist gives to the patient to ease the pain is taxed up to 32½ per cent. A surgeon has to pay taxes on cotton wool used in dressings.

Although it is of the greatest possible importance that agriculture should be encouraged in every possible way, derricks and stump pullers are taxed up to 35 per cent.

Unset diamonds are subject only to the war tax of 5 to 7½ per cent, but set diamonds are taxed up to 42½ per cent. School maps and engravings for school purposes come in free, but the blackboard and the slate on which the poorer child writes his lessons are taxed, one at 42½ per cent and the other at 32½ per cent. Dormant orchids come in free, but onion sets are taxed at 37½ per cent, and rose bushes pay as high as 27½ per cent.

The tariff seemed to have been framed with the idea of placing a heavy tax on warmth and cleanliness. Woollens and flannels, fur caps, mitts, gloves, and muffs are all taxed, many of them as high as 37½ per cent and even 42½ per cent. Clothes-wringers and clotheslines are all taxed quite heavily. Indeed, at first glance, one would imagine that the tariff had been dictated to Alice in Wonderland by a committee composed of the Mad Hatter and the March Hare.

But closer examination shows that the tariff has been a battle ground not of principles but of appetites. For instance, one gathers from a consideration of the tariff that the woollen manufacturing interests, the biscuit manufacturing interests and the confectionery manufacturing interests must have had excellent friends on both sides of the political dividing line. One is also struck with the burden which the tariff imposes on industry. Let us suppose that a man purposes building a factory in Canada. A modern factory will be composed largely of brick, steel and belting. Brick is taxed as high as 30 per cent; structural iron and steel as high as 42½ per cent, and belting as high as 22½ per cent. It is, therefore, an undoubted fact that the tariff increases enormously the cost of establishing factories in this country. Machinery of all kinds made in Canada is taxed as high as 35 per cent; if not made in Canada it comes in free or at a very much lower rate, and this ridiculous result is obtained: Suppose a man on an inlet up in British Columbia needs some machinery for a factory or a cannery or something of that sort, if there is no factory in Canada making that sort of thing, he can bring it out free from England mostly by water carriage and place it in his factory at a low rate. If, however, there is a factory away down in Nova Scotia making that same article, the machinery is taxed. Is that a reasonable proposition? I do not think so. Lubricating oil which is used in all factories is taxed as high as 27½ per cent. The manufacturer of clothing operates under conditions which give to him a protection of 42½ per cent, but imposes against him practically the same rate of duty on his raw material.

We have gone very extensively into the railway business in Canada; we may have to go into it even more extensively than we have done, and I draw your special attention, Sir, to the fact that the duty on railway cars is as high as 37½ per cent and on locomotives as high as 42½ per cent. If we are going to run the railways of this country economically and well, surely the necessary machinery should not be taxed as high as 42½ per cent.

I would submit for the careful study of all members of this House, a study which would, I know, well repay the time and energy expended upon it, the present protective system as it operates against industry in this country. What remedy do I suggest? I have suggested first of all the removal of the duties of 5 per cent and 7½ per cent, and I have dwelt somewhat fully upon that aspect of the question. I would now ask the House to consider with me what the adoption of reciprocity would do for the Canadian people. What are the great advantages of reciprocity? First of all, in regard to the natural resources of this country, the products of the field and the forest, the sea and the farm, the North American continent would become one economic unit. On the whole North American continent people would apply their energy and capital on the farms to raising those crops that are best suited to their locality, and then there would be free interchange. There is another great advantage which reciprocity would give us. The Americans have, as I shall explain in a moment, very substantially reduced their duties, but they have left certain duties on certain second-

ary products of the farm, such as butter and cheese. All through the part of the country which I have the honour to represent, men send their cream and milk down to Boston and their cream and milk is allowed to go free of duty over the boundary line, but there is a duty on butter and cheese. What an advantage it would be to be able, if we wished, to ship to the United States, not only the raw products, so to speak, of the farm, the cream and the milk, but also the products of the cheese and butter factories, the cheese or the butter as the case might be. The same thing occurs in regard to fishing. The Americans have reduced their duties on fresh fish, but they have maintained their duties on preserved and canned fish. While the fishermen of Nova Scotia are able to ship great quantities of fresh fish to the United States, they have, of course, to depend on the market day by day as their fishing boats arrive in Boston or elsewhere, but they would be more independent if they were able, when the market was not good, to preserve or cure the fish and ship the cured product to the United States.

What defeated reciprocity when it last came before the Canadian people? It was defeated by base appeals to racial passion and prejudice. It was defeated by arguments unworthy of a great and serious-minded people. It was defeated by an argument such as that it would lead to annexation. Lead to annexation, to trade freely with a neighbouring people! Why, the state of New Jersey has been trading freely with the state of New York ever since there was an American Confederation, and that trading has not led to annexation. People do not want to join another political unit merely because they trade freely with that unit. If that argument was well founded, there should be a strong annexationist feeling in the county of Megantic in the province of Quebec, because the county of Megantic is the greatest asbestos producing part of the world, and I suppose that 80 per cent, if not 90 per cent, of the product of the asbestos mines in that county goes over the border into the United States. Are the people of that county any less attached to the Canadian flag and to the Canadian constitution than the rest of the people of Canada? Such a proposition is absurd. Let me ask the House and the country that when we come to discuss reciprocity, we discuss it as a serious, sober-minded people and not with a lot of hysterical waving of the flag and getting ourselves into a state of perfect want of judgment. One of the arguments raised against the reciprocity agreement was that if we did not enter into this reciprocity trade agreement with the United States, the Democrats who were then coming into power in the United States would give to the Canadian exporter of natural products all the advantages he would get under that agreement. That has proved to be false. The Democrats did very considerably reduce the duties on a large number of things, but I have before me, and I will again crave the patience and indulgence of the House while I read this list, of articles affected, of the present rate of duty in the United States, and of the proposed rate under the reciprocity agreement:

Articles affected.	Present rate of duty.	Proposed reciprocity rate.
Cattle	10%	Free
Horses	10%	"
All other live animals	10%	"
Poultry (dead)	2c per lb.	"
Poultry (live)	1c per lb.	"
Oats	6c per bush.	"
Barley	15c per bush.	"

Some western farmer will correct me if I am wrong in the argument I now purpose advancing. I understand that after having, for several years, cropped a field in wheat, you help the land by putting in a crop of barley. If that be true—and I believe it is—then the absence of duty on barley going into the United States would have not only a direct but an indirect benefit upon Canadian agriculture.

Articles affected.	Present rate of duty.	Proposed reciprocity rate.
Edible dried peas	10c per bush.	Free
Edible dried beans	25c per bush.	"
Hay	2.00 per ton	"
Straw	.50 per ton	"
Cabbages	15%	"
Onions	15%	"
Tomatoes	15%	"
All other fresh veget'bls.	15%	"
Apples	10c per bush.	"
Cherries	10c per bush.	"
Peaches	10c per bush.	"
Edible berries	½c per quart	"
Grapes	25c per cubic ft.	"
Cranberries	10%	"
Plums	10%	"
Currants, fresh	½c per quart	"
Quinces, apricots, pears and nectarines	10% per bush.	"
Dried apples	1c per lb.	"
Other dried fruits	1c per lb.	"
Butter	2½c per lb.	"
Cheese	20%	"
Honey	10c per gal.	"
Flax seed	20c per bush.	"
Seed of beet, carrot, parsnip, turnips, etc.	3c per lb.	"
Seed of cabbage, kale	6c per lb.	"
Other garden and field seeds	5c per lb.	"

Articles affected.	Present rate of duty.	Proposed reciprocity rate.
Cod, haddock, ling and pollock, smoked	¾c per lb.	Free
Sea fish, preserved	25%	"
Salmon, smoked	¾c per lb.	"
Salmon, canned, prepared or preserved	25%	"
Fish, smoked	¾c per lb.	"
Fish, boneless	¾c per lb.	"
Fish, prepared or preserved (canned)	25%	"
Gypsum	10%	"
Certain sorts of paper	25%	"

Hon. gentlemen will see the advantage reciprocity would have given to us, over the present tariff of the Democratic party in the United States, in the matter of fish.

If one compares the rates of American duties prevailing at the time the reciprocity arrangement was negotiated with those prevailing at the present time, one is bound to admit that the Democrats did reduce the duties very substantially, but not so low in very many cases as would have been the case under the reciprocity agreement. Now what would that have meant, supposing one economic unit for natural products had been established between the United States and Canada? One of the most densely populated portions of North America is found on the northeastern Atlantic seaboard of the United States. In that area we find the great city of New York, and the manufacturing cities of New Jersey and of New England. Now if you will visualize the map of the United States and Canada, and place one end of a pair of compasses, let us say, on the city of New York, and draw a circle with a radius of 500 miles, in that area you will find practically the whole of Nova Scotia, the whole of Prince Edward Island, the whole of New Brunswick, practically the whole of the inhabited part of the province of Quebec, and the province of Ontario as far west as Sudbury. What is left outside the circle? Six-sevenths of the United States itself. The whole thing would have come down to a question of transportation, and as that part of Eastern Canada which I have just mentioned lies within easy water communication of the great consuming centres of the north Atlantic seaboard, one can see the advantage which the reciprocity agreement would have given to the producers of Eastern Canada.

Now one of the arguments which I have advanced this afternoon has been that if we are to attract people to our fertile fields and keep them there, we must give to the agriculturalists of this Dominion as good living conditions as those enjoyed in the northwestern States. We have all of us, I presume, been brought up with the idea that the United States has a very high protective tariff; but I believe that is not true to-day. Certainly, some duties have been retained at a high figure, but a great many duties to-day are ten, fifteen or twenty per cent. In addition to that, the United States have a free list which is very long and very wide. I shall read a list of articles that are on the free list under the American tariff and the rates of duty which these same articles have to pay under the Canadian tariff. I shall read only the rates on goods coming from the United States; the duties on the same goods coming from Great Britain will of course be substantially lower.

Articles free on American tariff.	Canadian Rates. Corresponding
Plows	20 25 27½
Tooth and disk harrows	17½ 25 27½
Headers	20 30 32½
Harvesters	12½ 12½ 12½
Reapers	12½ 12½ 12½
Agricultural drills, planters	12½ 17½ 20
Threshing machines	20 25½ 27½
Machinery for use in the manufacture of sugar.	Free.
Wagons	22 30 32½ 17 22½ 25
Carts	Buggies-carriages: Children's Carriages and Sleighs, minimum duty for open rigs is $40; covered, $50. 27½ 37½ 42½.
All sorts and kinds of agricultural implements, whole, or in parts, including repair parts; as well as animals for breeding purposes	Hoes: 20 27½ 30 Hay carrier: 25 35 37½ Rollers: 20 30 32½ Hay-forks: 20 27½ 30 Hay-loaders: 20 30 32½ Cultivators: 17½ 25 27½ Hand cultivators: 2½% additional Feed cutters: 20 30 32½ Potato digger and other quality implements, n.o.p. 20 30 32½

Articles free on American tariff.	Canadian Rates. Corresponding
All sorts and kinds of agricultural implements —*Con.*	Horserakes: 17½ 25 27½
	Mowers: 12½ 12½ 12½
	Manure spreaders: 17½ 25 27½
	Rakes: 20 27½ 30
	Reaping hooks: 20 27½ 30
	Scythes: 20 27½ 30
Biscuits	Not sweetened: 20 30 32½
	Sweetened: 20 30 30
	Shredded wheat: not exceeding 25 lbs., 35%; over 25, 27½
	Breadstuffs, n.o.p.: 20 25 25
Bread	Sweetened bread: ½c 27½ 42½ 42½
Buckwheat	10c: 12½ 15—5: 7½ and 7½
Buckwheat flour	per 100 lbs.: 35c 45c 50c
Cash Registers	25 35 37½
Linotype and type setting machines	Free.
Sewing machines	25 35 37½
Cement	14 17 17
Typewriters	22½ 30 32½
Shoe machinery	20 32½ 35
Cream separators under $75.	
Coal—Anthracite	20 25 25
Coal—Bituminous	35 45 53 war tax.
Cocoa	Green direct or in bond from U.K. per lb..5c 7c 7c
	Green direct or in bond from elsewhere..5c 7c 7c
	7½c 10c 10c
Coffee	Roasted or ground directly from country of growth..8c 10c 10c
	Not directly..8c 10c 10c
	7½c 10c 10c
Corn—Corn meal	Per bbl..20c 22½c 25c
	plus..5c 7½c 7½c
Cotton	Free
Eggs	2c 2½c 3c per doz. plus 5 7½ 7½
Fish	Cod ½c ¾c 1c
	Mackerel ½ ¾ 1c. plus war tax.
	Herrings: salted pickled per 100 lbs.35 45 50 plus war tax
Fruits	Cherries: 1½c 1¾c 2c per lb. plus war tax
	Melons 2 2½ 3c. each plus war tax.
	Apples: per bbl..60c 90c 90c
	Dried apples and other fruits..22½c 30c 32½c
	Dates and figs per 100 lbs..40c 55c 55c plus war tax.
	Plums: per bu..20c 20c 20c
Berries	Black, Goose } per lb..1½c 1¾c 2c plus war tax.
	Rasp., straw, cranberries 22½ 30 32½
Furs—Fur skins undressed	Free
Gloves (except made of calfskins)	27½ 37½ 42½
Grease	17½ 25 27½ for dressing leather free, for making soap, free.
Fats—Vegetable, tallow and oils.	
Gunpowder	2 2¾ 3 and war tax.
Hides	Free
Lard	1½ 1¾ 2c plus 5 7½ 7½
Lard, compound and substitute	Cottonlene: 1½ 1¾ 2c plus 5 7½ 7½
Leather—Leather boots and shoes	25 35 37½
Harness—saddles	25 35 37½
Lemon juice	22½ 30 30
Lime juice	Not over 25 p.c. proof spirits per gal. 75c 75c 75c and over 25 p.c. proof spirits per gal $3.00 $3.00 $3.00 plus 30 30 30
Fresh beef, Veal, Mutton, Pork	2c 2½ 3c plus 5 7½ 7½
Bacon and hams	Bacon 1½ 1¾ 2c plus war tax
Meat of all kinds prepared or preserved	Fluid beef 22½ 32½ 35
	Beef tongue 22½ 32½ 35
	Beef suet, 20 25 25
	Canned meats 22½ 32½ 35
Cut nails, cut spikes	Per 100 lbs 30c 45c 50c plus war tax.

Articles free on American tariff.	Corresponding Canadian Rates.
Horse-shoe nails	25 35 37½ per cent.
Wrought iron and steel nails	
Wire staples	
Wire nails made of wrought iron or steel	
Horse shoes	
Tacks	
Needles	25 35 37½ per cent.
Nuts	1c 2c 2c plus war tax.
Cod liver oil	17½ 27½ 30 per cent.
Oil cake	Free.
Cotton seed oil	17½ 25 25
Petroleum	1½c 2½c 2½c plus 5 7½ 7½
Spermaceti	17½ 27½ 30 per cent.
Railway bars, T rails	$4.50 $6.00 $7.00 per ton and war tax.
Rennets raw or prepared	Free.
Rye	7c 9c 10c per bushel and war tax.
Rye flour	Per bbl. 33c 45c 50c and war tax.
Sago	22½ 32½ 32
Sago flour	¾c 1c 1c plus war tax.
Salt	5 per cent 6½c plus 7½ per cent: 7½ plus 7½ per cent in bags or barrels. In bulk 5% 4c plus 7½: 4c plus 7½
Shrimps, lobsters	Live—20 27½ 32½
Skins of all kinds, raw	Free.
Swine, cattle, sheep and all domestic animals suitable for human food	Swine 20 30 32½
Tallow	
Tapioca	22½ 32½ 35
Tea	10c 10c 10c
Wheat	Free.
Wheat flour	Free.
Semolina	Free.
Barbed wire	Free.
Logs	Free.
Timber (round, squared, etc.)	Free.
Pulp woods	Free.
Firewood	Free.
Fence-posts	Free.
Sawed boards	Free.
Planks, deals and other lumber not further manufactured	Planed, jointed or tongued or grooved, 22½ 30 32½ per cent.
then sawed and planed or tongued and grooved	Lumber sawn or split, free.
Clapboards	
Laths	
Pickets	
Palings	
Staves	Free.
Shingles	
Ship timber	
Ship planking	
Wool of sheep	2c 2½ 3c plus war tax.
Camel's hair	Free.

(The three rates of duty are given in the above table.)

I would like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that wheat flour and semolina were placed upon the free list by the Government of which the present Government is the residuary legatee,—the Borden Administration. Of course, in 1911 it was said that the Liberals were disloyal because they wanted to trade freely with the United States in wheat, barley and oats. That assertion was made again and again on Conservative platforms in that election campaign, but the Government which came into power, largely through this appeal, thought it quite fit and proper,—and indeed I heartily agree with them,—to place these articles upon the free list. Barbed wire is free on both sides. Certain unmanufactured lumber is free on both sides; but manufactured lumber, even tongued and grooved, is free for the American farmer in the northwest plains of his country, while it is taxed as high as 32½ per cent for the Canadian farmer who lives under very much the same circumstances.

I regret, Mr. Speaker, that I have been obliged to weary the House at this length with this long rehearsal of tariff schedules; but it was unavoidable. Now, under these circumstances what does this House propose to do? Is the tariff to be left as it is? Is the reciprocity offer, which is yet open, not to be accepted? It is for this

House to decide how the Government shall deal with this matter.

After the American war of the revolution had ended, conditions in the United States were in a very precarious condition. One state was jealous of another. The currency was debased. There was financial distress—aye, even armed rebellion in the state of Connecticut—and George Washington made a speech in which he said: "Let us set up a banner to which all honest and wise men may resort."

Mr. Speaker, I propose this afternoon to set up a banner to which all wise and honest men may resort, in the form of this resolution, and I invite all those who agree with me, no matter where they sit in this House, to support this resolution. We have at the present time, Mr. Speaker, a somewhat extraordinary condition of affairs in this House and in this country. The Acting Prime Minister, in his eloquent and masterly address at the opening of the session, said that the ship of state never required more careful and sane handling than it did at the present time. I agree with him, but, Mr. Speaker, what is the condition of the ship of state to-day? The captain stands there with some of his officers around him, and to him enters the quartermaster from Moosejaw (Mr. Maharg). The quartermaster from Moosejaw says to the captain: "I belong to the starboard watch, and if you, captain, are not prepared to navigate the ship as I and my watch want, then we are going to desert the ship after next pay day, and you will have a large number of by-elections on your hands." Then the quartermaster from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) approaches the captain. He is even more—not mutinous, I would not say mutinous—but more truculent than the quartermaster from Moosejaw, and he says: "Captain, I belong to the port watch, and if you are not prepared to navigate this ship as the port watch wants, then we are going to call in our friends who are not on board ship, but who agree with us, and you, captain, and your officers, are going to walk the plank." Then approaches with swift tread the quartermaster from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), and he says: "Captain, I belong neither to the starboard watch nor to the port watch. I believe in party government, a party of one," and he goes on to say: "I tender you, captain, my independent support until I consider it is time for me and my friends to unite and make you walk the plank." I do not know whether I can congratulate or commiserate the Acting Prime Minister, the captain of the ship, for the support he gets from the eloquent and the revered quartermaster from Shelburne and Queens.

But the captain of the ship, the Acting Prime Minister, is in a position which is hardly fair to him, or fair to this House, or fair to the country. I believe in party government. I think that this country will be best governed by a strong government believing in liberal principles, and with the courage to put those principles into practice, but I say this: That if we cannot have a strong Liberal Government, we should have a strong Conservative Government; we should have a government that stands for something. Does the Acting Prime Minister know whether he enjoys the confidence—no, I will not put it that way—does he know whether the views he holds on public questions are the views which his Cabinet holds in its entirety? I do not think he does. Does he know whether the views he holds on public questions are the views which his supporters, sitting to your right, Mr. Speaker, hold on public questions? I do not think he does, and yet he is entitled to know that. Our party system arose at the same time as did the system of responsible government, when that great man—because he was a great man, one of the great men of the world—William of Orange, came to be King of Great Britain and Ireland. He, at the beginning of his reign, endeavoured to have in his Cabinet the same balance and proportion of parties as were in the House. He had within his Cabinet both Whigs and Tories. The thing did not work. The House of Commons was broken up into factions, and the Earl of Sunderland devised a simple scheme and it was this: that the King should choose for his ministers those who belonged to the majority party of the House of Commons. Then arose our party government, then arose our system of responsible government; I believe one cannot exist without the other. If the majority of the people of this country believe in high tariffs, believe in leaving things as they are, then the Prime Minister, if that is his view, has got the right to know it, and he has got the right to have their support. But if the majority of the people of this country do not believe in high tariffs, but, on the contrary, believe in low tariffs, then the Liberal party should be in office and should rule.

There are two roads open before the Canadian people. There is first of all the road that leads straight on, which may be called the road of leaving things as they are. It is an easy road to travel on for a while.

You do not have to surmount any difficulty at the present time; you have just got to leave things as they are. But I say, Mr. Speaker, that the time has arrived in the world's history when things cannot be left as they are. I do not say that the time for special privilege has passed, but I say that the time when special privilege will be patiently and silently endured has passed, and the people want a change. I say that that road of leaving things as they are leads downhill, and that there is danger for those who follow it. I say that when the night comes, and the mists will arise the only guide those who travel that road will have will be the flitting lights of political expediency. The other road leads up the Hill Difficulty. It will be difficult, there are things to adjust and hard things to do, but up that Hill Difficulty lies the road that the Canadian people should travel, for up that Hill Difficulty we will reach the Delectable Mountains, from whose summits we can view the Promised Land. Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have much pleasure, seconded by the hon. member for Victoria, Alta. (Mr. W. H. White) in moving the resolution which, Sir, is now in your hands.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, on this side of the House we are always glad to hear from the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). He has a pleasing countenance and a vein of poetry which we greatly like to hear express itself from time to time in this practical and prosaic chamber. I think it will be conceded by all that a member who can start his address to this House with a Canadian customs' tariff and finish it with an excursion to the Delectable Mountains of John Bunyan's Pilgrim's Progress, is at least entitled to high distinction in the realm of the imagination.

In politics my hon. friend is not only practical, but he is optimistic and decidedly persevering. Only the other night the hon. leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) hung up a light which was to guide the errant footsteps home. Well, the light appears to have gone out, but my hon. friend from Brome, determined to have something by way of attraction, has this afternoon set up a banner; but I think when this discussion comes to an end this afternoon my hon. friend will find that, while the light has gone out, the banner will not wave, and that all the allurements which have been set up on the other side of the House are indeed in vain.

My hon. friend covered a very wide field in his dissertation—political economy, free trade, protection, the fiscal policy of the United States, together with its income taxation system, reciprocity, and finally, and the most interesting thing to which my hon. friend referred this afternoon, his delineation of domestic scenes of Canadian farm life.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Now, I have an advantage over my hon. friend because I was born on a farm, and I am sure he was not from the description of farm life which he gave us this afternoon. I thought as I listened to him that he must have learned what he knows of farming from one of those correspondence schools—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: and if I may—without offence to my hon. friend and in justice to the intelligence of the farming community of Canada,—I should like to correct one indubitably false impression which he has as to the habits of the farmers of Canada, especially in the morning. I should like in all seriousness to point out to my hon. friend that the farmer on rising in the morning does not as he told us, first put on his socks and his boots; there are other garments which have priority over the boots at least.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh.

Mr. McMASTER: Those are the unmentionables.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend did not mention any of the unmentionables. My hon. friend did make one true observation about the Canadian farmer this afternoon, and that was that he got up in the morning. He does get up in the morning, and when I was a boy upon a Canadian farm, quite a small one, I had to get up very early in the morning myself, and I have never forgotten it. The farmer gets up in the morning, and, Mr. Speaker, he gets up too early in the morning, and his representatives in this House get up too early in the morning, to be caught by any want of confidence motion masquerading in the guise of a genuine tariff resolution. Political economy, free trade, protection, American fiscal policy, reciprocity, the constitution and constitutional practice, winding up, as I have said, by an excursion to the Delectable Mountains—Mr. Speaker, what is it all about? What is the amendment of my hon. friend from Brome, and what is the motion before the House? Let us come back from his expedition into the realm of imagination and find out what is the motion before the House, and what is the amendment proposed by my hon. friend

to the motion, and what is the effect of that amendment if adopted by this House.

My hon. friend knows perfectly well that this is not the time to bring forward a tariff resolution in this House. The time for a tariff resolution is not upon going into Supply, but upon going into Ways and Means on the Budget. That is the time for a resolution on the tariff, and if my hon. friend genuinely and sincerely desired to put forward a tariff resolution, that is the time when it should be put forward, because that is the only time on which a tariff resolution can be intelligently discussed.

Now, why do I say that? Because it is only when the Budget is brought down that the financial position of the Dominion is disclosed, the needs of the Dominion exchequer are made known to Parliament and the country, and the policy which the Government has to meet those needs is submitted to the House of Commons. The time for a resolution on the tariff therefore is not, as I have said, upon a motion to go into Supply, but when the Budget speech has been brought down and the policy of the Government is before the House.

What is the motion before the House to-day? The motion before the House is, that the Speaker do leave the Chair and the House go into Committee of Supply. Any amendment whatsoever, no matter what its merits or demerits may be, moved as my hon. friend has moved his motion is a motion of want of confidence in the Government. My hon. friend knows perfectly well that the adoption of the amendment which he has moved to-day would mean the defeat of the Government upon a vital matter, namely, Supply. Why does the Government move that the House go into Supply? In order that the Government may be enabled to carry on the administration of the affairs of the country. The motion is to go into Supply in order that the Estimates which have been submitted to the House may be taken into consideration; in order that items may be voted—items providing the necessary funds for the payment of members of the Civil Service, to provide effectually for the judicial administration of Canada; to provide for the construction of important national works and undertakings; to provide for carrying on the railway systems owned and operated by the Government; to provide for pensions for our returned soldiers; to vote the sums of money necessary to bring our soldiers back from across the seas. That is the reason why the House is moved into Committee of Supply. My hon. friend moves in amendment that the House do not go into Committee of Supply; therefore his amendment is a motion of want of confidence in the Government, because if the House does not go into Supply, if the items contained in the Estimates are not voted by Parliament, the Government cannot carry on. While my hon. friend's motion is technically in order, as an amendment, it is entirely out of place. I say that with entire respect to my hon. friend, because resolutions of that kind have been moved in the past. But their effect has been precisely as I have indicated; they have always been regarded and must be regarded under our constitutional system as a motion of want of confidence in the Government upon a vital question.

As I have said, my hon. friend should have postponed the moving of this resolution, if he desired to have it considered by the House, until after the bringing down of the Budget, until after the financial situation of the country has been disclosed to the House, and until the Government proposals have been submitted to the House for consideration following the Budget speech. I do not propose, therefore, to discuss the proposals in this resolution because this is not the time to discuss them. They are important proposals; they relate to revenue, to trade, to finance, to international treaties. But I shall not discuss them because, as I have said, the proper time to discuss proposals of this kind is in the Budget debate, not on a motion to go into Supply.

While my hon. friend is a popular member of the other side, as indeed he is on this side of the House, I was interested in observing that no very great happiness was expressed in the faces of hon. gentlemen opposite as he proceeded with his dissertation. Some of them I noted particularly. When my hon. friend was talking about the duty on woollens and might have inadvertently touched on the duty on cotton goods, I looked at the member for Huntingdon (Mr. Robb); his face seemed grave. That, however, may have been merely a synchronism, not cause and effect. Similarly, the member for Richmond and Wolfe (Mr. Tobin) did not look particularly happy until the member for Brome had taken his seat, and the member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) by no means reflected the expression of enthusiasm which beamed from the face of the member for Brome when he was putting forward his want of confidence in the Gov-

ernment in the form of a resolution in respect to the tariff.

Now, many members in the House may desire to speak upon this amendment. As I have said, I do not intend to do so except to point out its nature and its effect if it should be adopted by the House. I do not desire to chide the member for Brome. This is a free House, and no one stands more than I do for freedom of opinion and its expression, even in war time. But may I say to him in all seriousness that I think he should have regard for the critical condition of the world to-day; for the fact that the war is not yet at an end; that we are in the midst of war conditions, that we are labouring with the vast problem of bringing back the soldiers who have upheld the honour of Canada in the field abroad. By far the most important thing we have before us is to get these men back, to reestablish them in civil life, and to maintain conditions in this country under which there will be confidence, and such stability as can be created in this trying period. It is, to say the least, inadvisable that my hon. friend should at a time like this bring forward a want of confidence motion the only purpose of which can be to obstruct or to embarrass the Government. Speaking for myself, I do not believe this is the time in which that policy should be pursued. But hon. gentlemen opposite are not taking advice from me in matters of policy and I am the first to admit that my hon. friend or other hon. gentlemen opposite should take such a course as may seem to him or to them advisable.

As this discussion will probably go on, may I suggest that when it does go on, regard should be had to the conditions which exist in Canada and outside of Canada to-day. What I mean to say is that the discussion should be carried on in the light of those conditions. The war is not yet at an end. In the matter of international trade, many nations which have been engaged in the war have to-day restrictions and prohibitions upon imports. Although London used to be the great money centre of the world and sterling exchange was nearly always at a premium, sterling exchange is to-day down from $4.86\frac{2}{3}$ to $4.65, due to the unsettled financial conditions of the world and the effect of the war upon Great Britain and European countries. Then we have the fact that the Peace Conference which is sitting at Paris will not only consider the terms of settlement, so far as boundaries and governments are concerned, but deal with most important economic questions including duties. It is quite possible, even probable, that all existing treaties may be denounced and new treaties entered into amongst the Allies and others who may be parties to the League of Nations. Any discussion which takes place upon tariff matters in this Parliament to-day must, it seems to me, be conducted in the light of those existing conditions.

The Government will bring down the Budget, I hope, early in April. My view would be that if it be possible to wait, it would be advantageous that the Budget should not be brought down until conclusions have been reached by the Peace Conference, and while I would not be disposed to defer the Budget too long on that ground, it is desirable that the international situation should be cleared somewhat before it is brought down. I fully realize the importance of the question of the tariff; no man in this House realizes it more fully than I. I know that differences of views exist with regard to it; that there are extreme views on the one side and extreme views on the other side. The Government has given and will continue to give the closest attention to this most important matter. I believe, Sir, that when the Budget is brought down, and the financial situation disclosed, and the policy of the Government announced, that policy will have the support of the great majority of the members of this House and of the people of Canada. We shall have tariff proposals for the present session and we shall have an announcement to make as to steps to be taken looking towards a revision of the tariff when conditions become more normal.

I fear that all of us are prone to overlook the fact that this is a war year and that our expenditures this year may be greater than last year. We have brought down Estimates involving the expenditures of a vast sum of money, a considerable portion of which will be spent upon national improvements which will afford employment during this very critical period. In that respect I think, Sir, that Canada is in a particularly favoured position to-day. In addition to the Estimates, I have given notice of a resolution involving the provision of a sum of no less than $350,000,000, which must forcibly direct the attention of the House and the country to the fact that this is a war year. We are not spending immense sums of money for ammunition as we did last year, but there are hundreds of thousands of men not yet demobilized. Their pay has to be provided as well as the

expense of their transportation back to their native land, and of their re-establishment in civil life. The Government has made provision for a war gratuity, deserved if ever anything was deserved by those heroes of Canada who have done so nobly on the battlefields of Europe. I mention this only to call attention to the fact that our expenditures for this year are inevitably going to be on a war scale. This discussion should, I think, proceed in the light of this and of the other facts I have mentioned.

I was interested, as I think all hon. members were, in the address of the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), but I submit to the House, that while my hon. friend is in order, his amendment is out of place; that it is in substance and in fact a want of confidence motion; that if adopted would mean the defeat of the Government on a vital measure, namely, the provision of supply. The amendment should be voted down.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I do not purpose, at this stage, addressing the House at any great length. The amendment which has been moved upon this side of the House has been very fully and clearly discussed by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). Every phase of it has been as well put and as well supported by facts and figures as could have been done by any one. For that reason, it would not be proper for me to endeavour to duplicate the work of my hon. friend. The training which you, Sir, and I have received in our profession is that when a thing is once well done, when an argument is once well put, it should not, in the same case, be put the second time. For that reason, I shall leave well enough alone—a good Tory injunction.

I am very much surprised at the attitude taken by the leader of the Government (Sir Thomas White) in regard to this amendment. I would like to ask him and other hon. members who are interested in the tariff, and who have to say to their constituents and the country generally whether or not they are satisfied with the present condition of the tariff. When you go back to your constituents, is it an answer to them to say: "Why, the leader of the Government from his seat in the House told us that if we voted for this amendment it would be a vote of want of confidence in the Government, and consequently, we had to vote it down." The hundreds of thousands, aye, millions of people in this country from the Atlantic to the Pacific who are after the Government and after improvement, do not care very much whether that Government is sustained or not. They want relief; they want the right thing done. I appeal to hon. gentlemen in this House who are better acquainted with the history of government in the Old Land than I am, whether governments have not been defeated in the Old Land on a vote of want of confidence and turned out of office on scores of occasions, resulting in the necessary reform being brought about. So long as the supporters of this Government always obey the crack of the party whip we shall never have reforms in this country; for I should like to see the motion from this side of the House, which the hon. gentleman who leads the Government would not pronounce a motion of want of confidence if it was likely to be supported by his followers. That is an old cry; it has no significance. I ask the Acting Prime Minister, or any of the experienced parliamentarians sitting behind him, in what form a resolution should be introduced into this House that would have for its effect, if carried, the putting of the Government out of power, which would not cause the Acting Prime Minister to run into this little hen-house of "Want of Confidence."

What the people of this country are looking for is action, reform, the bettering of conditions in this country, so far as it is in the power of this Parliament to bring that about. We have heard a great deal said in this House condemnatory of the party system. It is not party that is the curse of this country, but the hanging on to power. And when we arrive at the stage when hon. members of this House will put the interests of the people first and the love of power second, we need not be very much concerned which party is in office. It would appear that no matter what aggregation of supporters you get behind this Government, the same nostrum will do. When they are afraid of their toes being trampled on or of being disturbed in their seats, as the ants will fly when a stone is upturned, the same argument is made as was made by the old line Tory government. The people of this country ought to know that the crack of the whip that was good in the days of the old Tory Government of Sir Robert Borden is equally good in the days of this so-called Unionist Government. I have just had placed in my hand Bourinot, an authority on Parliamentary procedure, who lays down the principle (P. 424):

An amendment moved to the motion to go into Committee of Supply or Ways and Means does not necessarily involve a want of confidence in the Administration.

I would suggest to the leader of the Government that he pay less attention to the Pilgrim's Progress and more to Bourinot and parliamentary procedure.

The minister talks about waiting. This game of waiting does not appeal to live, progressive people. If the leader of the Government is so particularly strong on waiting, on teaching pupils what they ought to do, and on bringing his children to task, he should give his attention to some hon. gentlemen on his own side of the House who should have waited. The minister had a gun, so to speak, put at his head the other day, and he was told that unless certain things happened within a certain set time, His Honour the Speaker would have in his hand a certain set of resignations which would bring the hon. gentleman to his milk. And that was with regard to the tariff question.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will pardon me for correcting him, but I have never even heard of such a suggestion, let alone receiving any intimation of that character.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. gentleman must have been absent on his Pilgrim's Progress, for that statement was made in the House the other evening by the hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg). If my hon. friend will look up that speech he will find the intimation word for word just as I have given it, except that the hon. member did not say he was holding a pistol at the head of the Acting Prime Minister; but that was what he was doing. The hon. member for Simcoe (Mr. Currie), that veteran war-horse and leader of the Ginger Group, that real true-blue Tory, spoke in the House the other night not only of putting a gun to the head of the Government, but of a Government funeral unless certain things were done, and he was not satisfied with an ordinary funeral but predicted a state funeral unless the leader of the Government pronounced himself along certain lines of action. We have also had a spectacle since Parliament met such as I have never seen before in this House. The Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) was not willing to wait. He was put up, I presume, upon the advice and direction of the leader of the Government. He fully understands his position as a minister of the Crown; he knows the practice that ought to govern ministers who sit together in Council, and I venture to say—at least I hope I am right in saying—that when he stood up in this House he did not give a full explanation, an open-book account, so to speak, of the deplorable condition of the finances of this country. When he was asked why he did not wait for the budget he said he was not giving a budget speech but was disclosing the financial condition of this country, which should be remedied if possible. The question of finance having already been dealt with by cabinet ministers and by supporters of the Government, it cannot therefore be improper for hon. members on this side of the House to put their cards on the table and say to the Government and to this country, as we ought to say: We do not know what the Government proposes to do, as we have no means of knowing, but we appreciate the necessities of this country, and we know what should be done to meet them. We are simply saying to the people of this country: This is what we are prepared to do, and we ask your opinion upon our policy. That is the proper course to take. We have no business to go behind closed doors and conceal our ideas on the tariff. I might say to the leader of the Government that I never knew when he was willing openly to discuss what he was going to do about the tariff. His plan always has been to go behind closed doors and do what he proposes to do with regard to the tariff by Order in Council. He will not trust this House on a matter of that kind, because it might lead to a vote of want of confidence in himself and his colleagues.

So long as they can govern by Order in Council, this fifth wheel of a coach, as they treat this Parliament in matters of this kind, has nothing at all to do with it. "We will do it by Order in Council," they say, "and the thing will be in operation before Parliament knows anything about it." Let me remind our western friends, who are particularly concerned in the tariff, that when this matter was adjusted under Order in Council we on this side of the House said, "If you are in good faith with the West and mean what you have done, confirm it by statute; make it absolute for the people of the West for all time to come." There are some hon. members on the opposite side to-day who sat on this side on that occasion and voted for our resolution, while every Tory on that side of the House voted against it and said that it would be merely an Order in Council, and that when the proclamation was issued repealing it, the Order in Council would be void. That, Sir, is not the way that Liberals on this side of the House intend to deal with the people

of Canada. We shall deal with the people openly and above board. If ever there was a time when the masses of the people want to know what Parliament is doing, what the Government is doing, what the true inwardness of things is, and what is in the hearts of Parliamentarians, that day is now.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McKENZIE: The great masses of Canadians do not care a button for such technicalities as to how motions are proposed to the House. On the real merits of the case, they will ask my friends from the West and those from the East—every man who has the authority of a vote in the House—"what have you done and what answer have you to make for your action on this resolution?" It is our duty to give the people an opportunity of expressing their views on a matter of this kind. The responsibility for their action is upon them. This is a free Parliament. We have no means of coercing any one, and if we had such means we would not use them, because the principles of Liberalism recognize the fact that every man has a will of his own upon which he should act. And when the day comes for any man to appeal to Cæsar as to whether he has done right or wrong, we hope the people will be free to pass judgment upon our actions in this House, whether we sit on your right or on your left, Sir. The views of Liberals on this side of the House have been put plainly and forcibly by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). I accept every word he has said. I do not differ from him in the least, and I think he expressed very fully, indeed, the views of Liberals as well in the House as out of the House. So far as Canadian Liberalism is concerned, I look with pride to my hon. friend who represents the county of Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) as a man whom I have followed for about fifteen years in this House, a man who has stood true to the policy of Liberalism which he laid down and which brought such magnificent success to this country. We appeal to the people upon the record of Liberalism in the past, the record of Liberalism to-day, and the record of Liberalism which we intend to carry forward when it may be their will to cast upon us the responsibilities and burdens of administrating the affairs of Canada. We have nothing to conceal, and for that reason we have made this motion. It now rests with this House to say what it shall do with it.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): Mr. Speaker, I shall detain the House but for a few minutes on this question. I shall imitate the brevity of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie), who has just resumed his seat, but I sincerely trust I shall avoid the unusual heat which developed with his remarks. There is not the same reason for heat on my part as there is on the part of my hon. friend. I do not resemble the apostle Peter to the extent that he does. We all remember that when that apostle made a famous recantation upon a famous occasion, he accompanied that recantation by unnecessary cursing and swearing. My hon. friend, of course, did not break the rules of this House and of good Presbyterian conduct by indulging in blasphemy, but he went as near it in his remarks as it was possible for him to do.

I must offer hearty congratulations to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster). I cannot pretend to be greatly disturbed by the fact that I see opposite to me a whole party, such as it is—shall I say, without offense, a whole opposition?—who are at long last united upon a really radical tariff policy so far as declarations in this House can tell us where they are. That is a matter which cannot possibly seriously discompose me, Mr. Speaker, for I was working for that very state of affairs, with the most indifferent success, for a great many years. I congratulate my hon. friend from Brome that in two short sessions, or rather in one session and a very small portion of another, he has been successful where I was a lamentable failure during a period of many, many years.

I shall have no hesitation in following the leader of the Government and the House in voting down this resolution, and I shall do so for very plain reasons which will commend themselves, I am perfectly sure, to the people of Western Canada who are careful students not only of tariff but of tariff records and of tariff situations. I shall vote against this amendment to go into Supply, because, in the first place—I do not want to say anything unparliamentary, and I do not think I shall be doing so when I say—it is not meant to succeed. Hon. gentlemen opposite know very well, and they knew before the motion was introduced, exactly how it would be treated. They knew it would be voted down. Ostensibly it is a motion to change the Government of this country from one set of rulers to another; but in reality it is not such a motion, for its authors know it will not have that effect, and it is not meant to have that effect. I will go a step further

than that, Mr. Speaker. We have had the most absolute evidence from my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island (Mr. Jos. Read) that this is the state of mind of the Opposition upon the subject. My hon. friend without contradiction on the other side of the House, said expressly in his remarks upon the Address that they on the other side did not wish to have a change of Government at the present time. They did not wish to have a general election at present, he said, because it would be folly to have an election—which, of course, might result in a change of Government—until the return of the soldiers. In view of that statement, to which no exception was taken by any hon. gentleman opposite, and which, I take it, expressed the opinion of the Opposition, I do not think I am going too far when I say that this resolution is not seriously proposed to the House as one which it is hoped will succeed. That is the first ground upon which, as a man with sincere views upon the tariff question—which views I have never altered and never will—I cannot vote for this resolution.

Now I want to say, in the second place, that I shall not vote for it because there are only certain possibilities in regard to the handling of a tariff. It is a very sweeping resolution, and I thoroughly endorse what has been said by my hon. friend (Sir Thomas White) who leads this House about the impropriety of introducing a sweeping resolution, which ought to be an amendment to the Budget, weeks, and possibly months, before the Budget can be introduced. Why, it is a perfectly elementary fact, in connection with parliamentary practice and governmental procedure, that if the attitude of a government upon customs duties were to be avowed before the Budget is presented, it would inevitably lead to commercial transactions in the way of avoiding these very duties after they were imposed by the Budget. That alone, ought to have guarded my hon. friends opposite from bringing in this resolution at this time; and I shall be very pleased indeed to hear how any one who speaks upon this subject will meet that point. If the Government were to accept the amendment of the Opposition, weeks before the changes advocated by the amendment could possibly be given effect to in the Budget, the result would be to defeat the Government in the very objects it had in making changes in the tariff, because commercial transactions would take place beforehand which would save the merchants of this country from the effect of the tariff, whether it was heightened or whether it was lowered.

My hon. friend, the leader of the Opposition, with a good deal of vehemence of manner which showed he was not very sure himself whether he was on safe ground, appealed to his record on this matter, and the record of those with whom, in former years, he and I were associated. Well, there are records which might have guided my hon. friend and his associates at the present moment in regard to the sweeping nature of the resolution to which I have just referred.

It is interesting to recall how tariffs were handled when they were abolished in the Old Country, and it is important historically to be well acquainted with what is possible in the way of handling tariffs at any given point, having regard to the very principle which my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) laid down himself—that these changes should be undertaken without unduly disturbing existing conditions. Every one who knows the tariff history of the Old Country knows that Sir Robert Peel made comparatively trifling changes in the tariff, in the year 1842, on manufactured goods in Britain, and in the same year he introduced an income tax. Well, when my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition is working himself into a state of excitement upon the state of the country, and the need of doing something, he should recall that at least fifty per cent of the policy carried out by Sir Robert Peel in 1842, in moving towards freer trade in England, has been carried out in its entirety by my hon. friend the leader of the Government, for he has followed exactly in the footsteps of Sir Robert Peel in introducing an income tax in this country, something which did not find its place upon the record of my hon. friends opposite, to which he has made such confident appeal. The changes of 1842 were followed by the repeal of the Corn Laws in the year 1846. In three successive Budgets after 1846, going on to the year 1861, Mr. Gladstone swept off in stages almost all the protective duties of the Old Country, ending with the abolition of the paper duty in the year 1861. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to reflect that from the year 1846 to the year 1861 is included a period of fifteen years. That fifteen years period is the span of the period during which hon. gentlemen opposite held power in this country—power achieved by the profession of Free Trade—and it is not only interesting to make this reflection but to draw a comparison between how real

Liberals, led by Mr. Gladstone, dealt with tariffs, and how tariffs were dealt with under the record of my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) to which he makes such confident appeal. In the year 1896, coming in with certain professions—which I have no desire to be repeating in this House, but the need of doing so is forced upon us, shall I say by the disorderly parliamentarism which brings in a Budget amendment on a vote to go into Committee of Supply, and I am compelled to make this statement to renew my hon. friends' acquaintance with the history of tariffs in other countries, and with their own tariff history—in the year 1896, the so-called Liberal party came into power in this country, and in 1897 they introduced some trifling reductions of the tariff, and put two or three articles of importance upon the free list. They also introduced the British preference, which was a fairly substantial piece of tariff reduction, and then they went to sleep for ten years. That is not the way Mr. Gladstone tackled the tariff. For ten years, from 1897 to 1907, my hon. friend (Mr. McKenzie) who is so excited now—who says there is to be no such thing as waiting—waited with absolute patience during that long term, because the tariff was practically passed over for ten years, and then it was, —I was going to say tackled, but that would be an absurd misuse of language,—flirted with again in the year 1907.

Well, what happened to the tariff in 1907? Absolutely trifling alterations were made in it, and in some cases, so far from following the example of Mr. Gladstone, the tariff was raised. It was raised notably on those woollen goods about which my hon. friends are so anxious at the present moment. Any one would have thought that the climate of Canada had improved in the ten years during which these fiscal-preaching Rip Van Winkles had been sleeping. Any one would have thought that the climate of Canada had changed from an Arctic to a tropical one, because hon. gentlemen opposite actually put up the duties on woollens. I suppose they conceived in the intervening time the desire to bring their children up a little more hardily. Well, I am thoroughly at one with my hon. friend from Brome that there could be a good prima facie case made out in a Budget discussion for having woollens reasonably cheap, because there are many months of the year in Canada when we are liable to have a temperature at forty degrees below zero; but when I agree with my hon. friend I must ask him also to disagree with the record of the hon. gentlemen with whom he is now associated, and to which record appeal has been made by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition.

It is true that the reciprocity agreement was brought in. Now, I do not want to detract by a single word from the credit for that agreement. My hon. friend the member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) seemed to chide myself and others from the West the other night, because we did not always give full recognition to what he, and the Government of which he was a member, had done in this connection.

There is no hon. gentleman in this House, Sir, by whom, on many grounds, I should less care to be chided than by my hon. friend; there is no hon. member of this House for whom I have a higher personal regard. I want to say now that I do not desire to detract from any of the merit that attached to the reciprocity proposals, though a great deal can be said as to whether that is the best method of dealing with the tariffs of a country. But I do want to say this in regard to the reciprocity agreement, and I want to put it on record with these few remarks: that there was a notable quotation made from a notable speech by my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queen's (Mr. Fielding)—as he did not divulge the authorship I should not—but he uttered language in which he pointed out that under the reciprocity agreement the manufacturers were not disturbed. I am not sure that my quotation is verbally accurate—it might have been that he said that they were not hurt. In any case, he quoted from a speech which was made in Montreal in the spring of 1911 for the purpose of soothing the manufacturers, and I hope that western voters and members will note that it was a speech made for that purpose. The manufacturers of Canada were told by someone high in the authority of the Liberal party on that day, that they were not hurt in the reciprocity agreement. That is part of the record relied on by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition. Well, when he comes to attack the tariff in earnest he will not be able to use that language.

If I were dealing with this question on its economic merits, I should try to prove that free trade would not hurt manufacturers who were really self-reliant. I have said in this House that the manufacturers of Great Britain never did anything worth the name until free trade was established in that country. And that is capable of proof by the most exact figures. But that was not the sense in which the statement, reproduced and commended by my hon. friend

the member for Shelburne and Queen's, was made. The sense in which it was made was that it was meant to commend to the country an arrangement which had regard to natural products only, and which gave practically no relief from protection on manufactured goods, which is the only real protection there is in Canada. That is something that my hon. friend would do well to pay attention to before he asks this country to vote for him and his friends—at any rate, on that record.

In the face of that record I cannot help thinking how much more freely men can talk when they are in the position of great freedom conferred by sitting on the Opposition benches, and when they have not that responsibility which weighs so heavily upon my hon. friend, the head of the Government, in regard to the great subjects that he has touched upon in this House this afternoon. When one thinks of the fifteen years' record of the Liberals in power, which practically amounted to the tariff being untouched, and not proposed to be touched in any way worthy the name in the reciprocity agreement; when one compares that with the record of real reform during an exactly similar period of English history between the years 1846 and 1861, then one cannot help exclaiming about the hon. gentlemen opposite: What patience they had in power compared with their eagerness and impetuosity when they are in opposition! Having regard to the record of the way in which tariffs have been dealt with in this country in the past, compared with the way they were dealt with in Great Britain, I must say that this motion is a very great compliment to the Union Government. The Union Government has only been in existence about a year and a half. They came into existence at the most critical period of the greatest war of history; they have seen that war to a victorious finish in accordance with the wishes of the great majority of the people of this country, and they are now tackling in manful style the difficulties of the early months of reconstruction; and yet my hon. friends opposite have such confidence in their ability that they say, "In your very first Budget, within three months of peace being declared, we want you to make ten times as drastic tariff changes as we were able to do in fifteen years in the times of piping peace." Is that a reasonable proposition to bring before this country on a motion for going into Supply? On that ground I shall have no hesitation in voting against this motion.

[Mr. M. Clark.]

I need not amplify the special points which have already been made by the leader of the House. It is a motion that, while technically correct, is highly irregular and calculated to upset and embarrass the trade of the country, and we need be in no doubt as to why it is introduced.

I heard no argument in the long speech of my hon. friend (Mr. McMaster) about the bearing that this question would have upon actual reconstruction in the country. I did hear him give a most emphatic declaration of his belief in party government. His position in that respect was very strongly and emphatically endorsed by my hon. friend who leads the Opposition, and in those declarations we have revealed, unintentionally no doubt on their part, the real meaning of this amendment. It is an amendment by which they do get back to party government; they forget pensions, they forget reconstruction; they snatch at the first thing that seems to have excited a few voters and inclined them to come back from an allegiance which they entered into for the noblest of all purposes. They seize upon the first handle by which they can abuse the Government, the first inducement which they can offer to voters outside. They tell us they emphatically believe in party government on all these grounds.

I hold that on the Budget would have been the time to introduce this resolution, that it is not meant to succeed, and therefore has in it an element of insincerity which does not make an appeal to me; that it is playing a purely party game, and that there is no evidence in the general conduct of the Opposition that they are so vastly in earnest upon a number of other matters which are exercising the people of this country. We had an example of that last night, when one of the policies of the Government of this House was debated for two hours without any gentleman on the opposite side of the House stating his opinion. On all these grounds I shall not have the slightest hesitation in voting with the leader of the Government.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAM HENRY WHITE (Victoria, Alta): Mr. Speaker, in rising to second the resolution moved by the member for Brome (Mr. McMaster), I may say that hon. gentlemen on this side of the House have frequently brought resolutions of this nature before Parliament. Since the year

1911, when the Liberal party were defeated in trying to reduce, in a measure, the high tariff of this country, we have on many occasions moved resolutions to show that we still stand by the principles that we stood for at that time.

We are told by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) that this is not the time or the place to bring in a resolution of this kind. It certainly is the place, Mr. Speaker; I do not know what the Acting Prime Minister would consider to be a proper time. If we brought it in, as he suggests, in the Budget debate, it would still be a motion of want of confidence. There is no proper time, according to his way of thinking, for hon. gentlemen on this side to bring in a resolution which in any way interferes with the policy of the Government.

The Acting Prime Minister said that many things would have to be settled before this matter could be taken up. It is true that many things have to be settled, but in many parts of the country, particularly the part of it from which I come, where the same problems have to be solved, the people do not consider this an inopportune time to give attention to the tariff. Perhaps more men went overseas from my province than from any other, consequently, there will be more to come home. The fathers of these men and the people generally throughout that country think that this is the proper time to consider matters relating to the tariff. Not only do the farmers, representing seventy-five per cent of the population, hold this view, the three provincial legislatures have unanimously adopted resolutions in favour of action being taken. The Conservatives in the western provinces must be different from those in this part of the country, because these resolutions were supported by the Conservative Oppositions in the three legislatures to which I have referred. Surely the Acting Prime Minister cannot say that this is a political move; that it is made for the purpose of gaining something for party, when he knows that the Conservative Opposition in Alberta, Saskatchewan and Manitoba unanimously voted for resolutions in favour of tariff reduction.

A few days ago a platform was laid before this House—that of the United Farmers—that everybody engaged in agricultural pursuits stands for. The Western Legislatures stand for it; the tillers of the soil and the organized farmers of the three Western Provinces stand for it. It is not surprising that Liberals, particularly those who went down to defeat on the same question some years ago, should stand for it; and in doing so they should not be accused of trying to make political capital. An hon. gentleman on the other side of the House who is, perhaps, as fluent and as well-informed as any to be found there, speaking the other day in favour of the large interests which this resolution is directed against, said that Toronto alone paid more income tax than the whole of the four Western Provinces. I believe that is absolutely correct, but it is an unfortunate condition when an area of not more than ten square miles can produce more wealth than the large areas of the Western Provinces. The member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), came, perhaps, nearer the mark than any other when he said that the average income from exports of the farmers in the West was about $700 per capita. I think that is pretty nearly correct, and the farmers who work so hard for what they receive want to reduce a little the income of the large interests and at the same time increase their own.

When the income tax law came into force a year ago many farmers found it difficult to strike a balance and find out what their net receipts were. I have in mind one farmer in the West who, if not the most intelligent man in his district, was as progressive as any other. I cite his case in order to show that the conditions in the West are not what they should be. This man, living in one of the most fertile parts of the country, with land and stock to the value of about $50,000 found that his credit balance last year was $95. True, the year was not one of the best, but he is no small farmer. His gross income was over $7,000, but his expenses were almost the same amount. When you consider that we are paying over twice as much for a plough as we did five years ago, twice as much for wagons, harness, machinery of all kinds, and supplies, it is no wonder that this man's expenses were within $95 of his gross income. You will admit that the farmer whose gross receipts are $7,000 is a great deal more than an average farmer. Besides some hundreds of acres of land, this man had a splendid stock. He had over one hundred head of cattle and possibly forty or fifty horses. I have known him for thirty years, and I know that he has never used anything but registered sires for breeding purposes. He has improved his stock until probably it is the best in the country. Yet he found himself in the position that I have stated, and was obliged to borrow some $2,000 to carry himself over.

The Acting Prime Minister said this afternoon that the farmers would not be misled by this resolution; they would know that some political motive was behind it. When the farmers have not had a prosperous year, members of this House receive telegrams from them. I have received over one hundred, and I shall read a few of them from different districts; the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and the member for Strathcona (Mr. Douglas) will see that I am distributing them pretty well. I will give to the House only a few samples, marking the different corners of the district. The opinions expressed are very similar and they will, perhaps, go to show the unrest that exists amongst the farmers of this country as well as their sincerity in regard to this tariff question. I do not think any hon. member, the Acting Prime Minister included, will say that these men are sending these telegrams in order to make political capital. I do not think the men who sent them ever marked any ballots for me. This is a telegram from Bawlf in the Strathcona Riding:

Bawlf Local of U.F.A. request you as federal member for Victoria constituency to stand resolutely for downward revision tariff along lines proposed in farmers' platform being essential for more production.

Yours respectfully,
(Signed) R. C. Reinhard.

Bawlf is in the northern end of the district. I have here a telegram from a district which, at one time, had the honour to be represented by the eloquent member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). This is from Forestburg, and is signed by Mr. A. Mallett, secretary, Forestburg local:

Forestburg Local U.F.A. sends the following resolution: Be it resolved that the Government of Canada be requested to make substantial reductions in the tariff for imports into Canada.

Forestburg is in the southern end of the district. I have here another telegram from Sedgewick. I might say in passing that out of 200 votes in this section I received seven or eight, so that the gentleman who sent this telegram is not very likely to be a supporter of mine. This telegram reads:

The members of Sedgwick U.F.A. respectfully urge downward tariff revision outlined by farmers' platform proposed by Council of Agriculture and endorsed by provincial farmers' convention this request based on grounds of common fairness to great body of people unjustly burdened by excessive cost of production in basic industry.

I have altogether a little over 100 of these telegrams, all couched in pretty nearly the same language. It seems apparent, therefore, that it is not only the Liberals in this House who are anxious to see some change in the tariff, but the farmers of Canada as well; and when the position is this, that the people of one town in Ontario are producing more, getting more revenue, making more money than all the farmers of the West, it is time for the Government to wake up and look into the matter, in order to see whether some remedy cannot be found for such a condition of affairs. No better land can be found that that in the West; the climate is good and the people are optimistic, and perhaps work harder than any other body of people in Canada, and yet they find they cannot make much money. My opinion is that heavy taxation is the cause of the lack of success in the West. The statement will be made that the people of the West are rich, but I have been a member of this House for ten years and since I have been in this House, I think the Government, on four or five occasions, had to come to the rescue of the Western farmers by giving them seed grain. If they were prosperous they would not require assistance from the Government. It shows how close they are sailing to the wind when one bad crop will compel them to appeal to the Government for aid. I do not think such a thing has happened in any of the older provinces, but when we hear it stated that everybody in the West is making money, why is it that every time there is a crop failure in the West the Government has to render aid? This is a serious question. The Government surely do not understand the real conditions in the West, because if they do, they have a great deal to answer for. There must be something wrong in that country when people who have managed a $50,000 plant for a number of years cannot make an income of over $2,000 and come under the income tax. The people of the West have also the geographical position of the country to contend against. Up to the beginning of the war, the average price of oats was 25 cents a bushel, or 35 cents at the lake front. Let us take these prices, and we cannot expect any higher prices now that the war is over. As transportation costs 12 cents a bushel, that leaves 23 cents. It costs ten cents for threshing, so much to bind the grain and so much to till the land. Therefore, if you make a calculation, you will find that 200 acres of land will bring less than $2,000.

An hon. gentleman from Ontario, a manufacturer, I think, laughs at the idea that the farmers are bearing their share of the

taxes. The farmers are willing to bear their share. They have suggested a method by which they can do so; namely, taxation on unimproved lands. As one who has been a farmer all his life, I am in favour of that. Let the Government figure out our share of what revenue is needed, and tax all lands in Alberta, improved and unimproved, and let us pay by direct taxation so that we may know what we are paying. I think every province will be willing to agree to that. But let us not be taxed in this indirect form whereby no one gets the benefit and yet the farmers are paying the taxes just the same.

Mr. MORPHY: I understand the hon. gentleman to favour direct taxation on all lands.

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alta.): Yes. If there cannot be found in Alberta enough uncultivated land to pay our just share of taxation in proportion to the population of Canada, I think that is the proper way to get it. The Government might as well take it one way as the other.

When I was reading out some telegrams a little while ago, I overlooked a very important one. This resolution was passed at a farmers' convention:

> Farmers of Vegreville district covering an area of over 1,000 square miles request that agricultural implements and all farm machinery and vehicles be placed on the free list that the reciprocity agreement of 1911 which still remains on the United States Statute Books be accepted by the Parliament of Canada that the customs tariff on all necessaries of life be materially reduced.
>
> (Signed) Thos. Balam,
> Vegreville Organised Farmers.

The hon. member for Maple Creek (Mr. Maharg), I understood, stated that he was in favour of the Government's fixing a price on wheat. I am not in favour of anything of that kind. I do not think there is any necessity for the Government to fix the price of any commodity in the way of foodstuffs. It was decided at the farmers' convention, I understand, although I was not present, and it was stated by the president of that organization who, my hon. friend from North Simcoe (Mr. Currie) claims is an annexationist, that they did not want any privileges and they would not go on record as asking the Government to fix a price on anything.

He said they had to go into the open markets of the world and sell, and they wanted an opportunity to buy in those same open markets. In spite of all that has been said, after all the objections made by the Acting Prime Minister in that beautiful "twilight-sleep" speech that is said to have worked such wonders at the caucus the other day, I should like to know what other opportunity we had of stating where we stood with regard to the tariff; I do not know of any other way myself. He was followed by my old friend the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark). As long as I have been in political life I have known the hon. member for Red Deer. In the year 1908 he and another gentleman were good enough to give me a good deal of assistance in my first campaign. He was very well received, and may have made some converts. I was very much surprised to-day to find him deprecating the efforts of the late Liberal Government; he said that as regards the tariff they had done nothing but sleep for ten years. I remember his chief argument on that occasion—and I put it to you, Mr. Speaker, whether he cannot put the best side on any cause he undertakes—he carried the people along with him and made them believe that their only danger was in being led away by some misfortune, perhaps like the present Elections Act, from the Liberal Government which had done such wonderful things in respect of the tariff. We were both successful on that occasion, but my hon. friend was not elected on his political or personal record. He was a new man in that country with no political record behind him, so naturally he "went nap" on the political record of the Liberal party. I might say that prior to that occasion, at a provincial election, when my hon. friend did not depend upon the record of the Liberal party, he was not successful, being one of the two Liberal members defeated in the whole province of Alberta. I am not saying that in an unkind way, because we have all had our experiences. We know that, perhaps, the best representative that Alberta has ever sent to this House was defeated in an election; I refer to the Hon. Frank Oliver. But he was not defeated in Alberta, nor by the farmers. He was defeated in France. He won ninety-five per cent of the rural poll; the farmers for whom he had striven so hard stayed with him to the end. He was defeated in the city of Edmonton by people who did not know him. I mention this to show that defeat in an election is not necessarily a reflection upon a man's character or political record. My hon. friend (Mr. Clark) scolded us this afternoon, and he is getting into the habit of scolding hon. members on this side of the House, in whom he used to take such pride when leading them on the straight and narrow

path. He pointed out, in very different terms from those used by the Acting Prime Minister, that this amendment was only political jobbery and humbug, and did not mean anything, being only brought in for political effect. Now, to show what trouble a bad memory may cause, I shall read an amendment moved by the Hon. Frank Oliver to the motion for Supply, on May 29, 1917, which I think is as close a parallel to the amendment moved this afternoon as could be found. Hon. Frank Oliver (Edmonton) moved in amendment:

> That all the words after the word "that" in the motion be struck out and the following be substituted therefor:
>
> In the opinion of this House it would be in the public interest if the Customs Tariff Act were so amended as to provide:
>
> 1. That wheat, wheat flour, and all other products of wheat be placed upon the free list.
>
> 2. That farm implements and machinery, farm tractors, mining, flour and saw-mill machinery, and repairs for same, rough and partly dressed lumber, illuminating, lubricating and fuel oils, cement and fertilizers be added to the free list.
>
> 3. That staple foods and food products (other than wheat flour), domestic animals and foods therefor, be admitted into Canada free of duty when coming from and being the product of, any country admitting like Canadian articles into such country free of duty.
>
> 4. That substantial reductions be made in the general tariff on all articles imported into Canada, excepting luxuries.
>
> 5. That the British Preference be increased to fifty per cent of the general tariff.

I do not think two amendments more similar in language and meaning could be moved, than the one I have just read and that moved this afternoon. The amendment of Hon. Frank Oliver was voted on, and I want to call attention to what happened. We were told this afternoon that it was in bad taste, very unfortunate, and none too patriotic to move such an amendment now that the soldiers were being brought back, but the amendment of Hon. Frank Oliver was moved in 1917 when the war was at a most critical stage, and among the 'Yeas' who voted for the amendment I find the names of Buchanan and Clark (Red Deer).

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Was that after or before the Budget?

Mr. WHITE (Victoria, Alta.): It was before, but whether it was before or after, the war was on, and my hon. friend voted for the amendment which was so similar to the one moved this afternoon. My hon. friend should not scold us just because we cannot follow him across the floor. Perhaps we learnt our lesson too well when he was our teacher.

He also told us that the Opposition had no responsibilities I might tell him that if we were as erratic as he has proved to be, we might never be in the Opposition; we would be supporting the Government. There is a way of keeping out of the Opposition, and there are other reasons for an hon. member being on the other side. I have heard of a man who represented a district as a party man and received the party endorsation for some years; and when that endorsation was refused him, he changed sides and ran as candidate for the opposite party. That is another way of staying in the Government. After all, we can say that we have the support of all organized farmers in the province from which he and I come. We have the support of both sides, Conservatives and Liberals, in our legislature; and if we are guilty of playing politics all those people in the province of Alberta are guilty of the same offence. I suggest to my hon. friend, who is so well versed in the principles of Liberalism, which he probably learned in a better school than we did, and had perhaps a more sincere teacher than many of us who learned the free-trade doctrine in this country, that he should be more tolerant, if we are not able to see eye to eye with him. My hon. friend admitted the other day that all the preaching and all the beautiful speeches that had been made in this House had been without avail. He said that the most promising pupil of all was the hon. Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White). But I do not think there is much to show for twelve years of labour. I do not notice any tendency in that direction. If the hon. minister has views of the kind indicated, he has kept them very well concealed. We hope the statement is true, however; and hon. gentlemen on this side will be only too glad to support a resolution of this kind, whether introduced by the Acting Prime Minister or by the hon. member for Red Deer.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): Mr. Speaker, I shall not detain the House very long in any contribution I have to make this evening to the discussion on the resolution introduced by the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster). The subject matter of the resolution is particularly interesting at this juncture of the session and at this time in the life of the nation. I shall be quite frank with the House, as to where I personally stand in this matter. My record in regard to the fiscal policy of Canada is well known at any rate in that part of the country which I have the honour to represent and in

which all my work has been done. The position of the farmers of Western Canada on the question has, I think, been stated to the people of Canada very clearly and in an unmistakable manner. I have been associated, and am still proud to be associated, with the organized farmers. When I entered this Government some eighteen months ago, I did so from a profound sense of duty upon the most outstanding issue before the Canadian people at that time. I followed my conscience then on this question, and I shall do the same on other questions that may call for settlement. I do not disguise the fact that I have always believed in a low tariff policy for this country. I know that there are those in this House, and many in the country, who differ conscientiously from me; but I trust that we can still have differences of opinion on important questions of national policy that are of vital moment to the welfare of Canada, and discuss them purely and simply on their merits. That being my position in this important matter, let me say, Sir, that I think the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) has introduced his resolution at a rather inopportune moment; and I cannot help thinking that perhaps it has been introduced by the hon. gentleman as much for the benefit of some of the members on his own side of the House, as for the benefit of some others on this side. As the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) stated this afternoon, hon. gentlemen on the opposite side must know that this resolution cannot be accepted at the present time. What is the situation? If the amendment to the motion were accepted, it would mean the overthrow of the Government and a general election, with all the necessary turmoil that would ensue.

Mr. McKENZIE: Not by reason of the acceptance of it.

Mr. CRERAR: Yes, that is what it would mean. It could mean nothing else.

Mr. McKENZIE: The hon. minister states that if the resolution were accepted it would mean a general election. It would not, Mr. Speaker; it would not mean a division at all, and the Government certainly could not be defeated.

Mr. CRERAR: The Acting Prime Minister, this afternoon, made the position quite clear as to what the real significance of the resolution is, and there is no difference of opinion, on this side of the House at any rate, as to what is involved. I say that it would mean the plunging of this country into a general election, and that is not desirable at this stage. It is wholly undesirable for several reasons, which I do not need to enumerate. I propose to vote against this resolution because it should not have been introduced at the present time. If the hon. gentleman wishes to press the principles contained in it, the proper time to do so is when the Budget has been brought down and when we are considering the future fiscal policy of the country.

Mr. McMASTER: If I withdraw this motion will the Minister of Agriculture pledge himself to vote for a similar resolution later?

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. CRERAR: The hon. gentleman is very ingenious; at any rate he thinks he is. As far as my position is concerned, I am quite willing to leave it until the Budget is under discussion. The fiscal policy of the Government will be disclosed when that Budget is brought down, and that will be the proper time, in my judgment, to discuss the question which the hon. gentleman has raised this afternoon. Nevertheless, this question is an important one. There is no disguising the fact that in Western Canada there is a very strong feeling that substantial reduction of the tariff should be made, and I think I may say that there are good arguments to support that contention. I do not desire to twit hon. gentlemen opposite with their past record on the fiscal policy. I think I can say, however, that they will have to go a long way before they convince the farmers of Western Canada that they are absolutely sincere in the position they take. If I understand the temper of the Western farmers—and I mention this because free allusion has been made to it this afternoon—he is looking with a very critical eye indeed upon this whole matter. I frankly say that I do not think that a resolution such as the hon. member for Brome has introduced this afternoon—introduced for no other purpose that I can conceive of than to embarrass the Government in carrying on the business of the country at the present time—will find very much favour with the Western farmers at this moment. If the hon. gentleman had introduced the resolution later in the session, and if he had been able to convince the people of Canada as to his bona fides —I do not question that for a moment, because I think the hon. gentleman is entirely sincere—he might have had a better chance of carrying conviction to their minds. Whatever

the future may have in store if in the turn of the wheel of political fortune hon. gentlemen now sitting opposite should be entrusted with the reins of office in this country, I only wish to express the hope that they will then be as sincere in their position on this question as they purport to be at the present time. For the reasons I have given, Mr. Speaker, and particularly because this is not the proper time to introduce or discuss this resolution, I intend to vote against it; and I have no doubt whatever in that my action in so doing will be understood by the country.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, my name has been brought into this debate by the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark) who made the assertion that during my speech on the Address I declared we could not have an election just now, and that I was going to support the present Government by giving them good advice, and helping them in every way I could, as long as I thought they were right. Another hon. gentleman (Mr. McIsaac) in his criticism of my speech stated that I had at one time been a follower of the late Sir John A. Macdonald.

Hon. Mr. REID: Hear, hear.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: It was true, and I am proud of it, because at that time Sir John A. Macdonald was the strongest advocate of Reciprocity in Canada. However, it does not make any difference; if I get sufficient new facts at any time to justify me in changing my mind I am going to do so. I believe that "a foolish consistency is the hobgoblin of little minds." The wise man may change his mind several times, but the fool never. My mind has been changed since I made the appeal referred to. What do hon. gentlemen suppose caused me to change my mind? I almost gave my Western friends the assurance—I am sure I gave them the assurance—that the interests of my province down by the seas were identical with theirs. We are a farming population, purely and simply, in Prince Edward Island, and our interests are identical with those of Western Canada; and I told my friends to-day, when they were talking about bringing in this motion: "Bring it in and let those Western people have a chance to save themselves." I hold in my hand a little paper, the only Liberal paper published in the city of Charlottetown. It is called The Patriot, a paper once owned and established by the late Hon. David Laird, the great Liberal that hon. gentlemen from the Northwest at one time had out there taking care of their interests. Here is an advertisement which takes up practically the whole front page of this paper, and it reminds me of the anti-reciprocity dodgers of 1911. Those people went down there and bought up the space in every paper they could get in the Maritime Provinces in order to debauch public opinion. Listen to this extract from the advertisement:

> At the very moment when Canada is struggling with this problem—

That is, the problem of raising the revenue.

> —the Western Grain Growers come forward with insistent demands for:
>
> An immediate and substantial all-round reduction of the customs tariff.
>
> Free Trade with Great Britain inside of five years.
>
> Reciprocity now, and Free Trade later with the United States.

Then the advertisement goes on to say—

An hon. MEMBER: Who signs it?

Mr. READ: The Canadian Manufacturers' Association, the particular and especial friends of the hon. gentlemen who occupy the Government benches.

Mr. DEVLIN: What does the advertisement say further?

Mr. READ: This is what is says:

> These demands are apparently made in the hope and belief that, if they are granted, those making them will be relieved of a large part of what they call the "Burden of Taxation," which the tariff imposes upon them.
>
> They may argue that under a lower tariff the volume of goods imported will increase, and consequently there will be no decrease in the revenue. But mark this: they want the duty removed entirely from implements, lumber, cement, oil and other articles of which they are large consumers. If the revenue is to be maintained under such a rearrangement of the tariff schedules, other classes of the people must pay what the Grain Growers will escape.

It is pretty nearly time that the Grain Growers begin to do something. My province, as I said before, has identical interests with the great provinces of the west, particularly the three prairie provinces. What has happened in our province through this tariff, the brightest province in the Dominion—that province which nature has done more for to the square mile than any other province in the Dominion of Canada; the jewel of the Dominion? This is what has happened: That province has become absolutely depopulated through forty years of this tariff—forty years of protection. When we were an autonomous province doing our own business, and doing it well, the whole revenue was raised by a ten per

cent ad valorem tax on imported goods, and we did not have to pay one per cent of direct taxes. That ten per cent has been raised up to 35 per cent to forty per cent to-day, and they expect the province to live under a burden like that. Why, the agricultural interests of this country are hewers of wood and drawers of water for these Big Interests. Here is another paper —not a Charlottetown paper, but 9 p.m. no less than one of the greatest financial and trade papers in the Dominion of Canada, the Montreal Gazette. This advertisement is headed "Dangerous to Production, to Labour, and to Industry." Then it goes on and gives the whole story, just the same story only in other words, and below are "The proxies of the fifteen thieves,"—Madam Smith the other day in the British Columbia Legislature, drew attention to. She said that the soul of Canada was held in leash by fifteen of the Big Interests of the Dominion of Canada—fifteen men own the whole shooting match. If their names are not signed, well, their representatives are there—Shaughnessy, George, Godfrey, Beatty, Black, Drummond, Ellis, Nanton, Nicholls, Willison, Bulman, Rolland, Russell, Scully, Worthington—just fifteen they total up.

Now, Mr. Speaker, that is the reason why I have changed my mind, because I see the danger that the Western people are standing in. As I told you the other day, we will send you four members from Prince Edward Island—I am as sure of that as that I am alive—if we get a fair show, but if they come down with that stuff, if they buy the press and debauch the people, as they do whenever they have a chance, where are you going to get off at? I may as well tell you Western farmers that you are not going to get this thing if you work alone, you have to get assistance from the Eastern Provinces, and if you do not look out for yourselves you will be in the soup.

Some hon. members: Oh, oh.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: The Acting Prime Minister told you that the appeal we were making to you would be in vain. Very well, if it is in vain, then the burden is on your political souls, and when you go back we will see what the Western people will say about you for losing this cause. There is the danger of delaying for the Budget. If my hon. friend, the Acting Prime Minister, could be entirely depended upon, and we could have the assurance of what he told you people in caucus, it might be all right, but you remember the trick he served us in 1911, when he went in with Sir Edmund Walker and that gang in Toronto. I have not too much confidence in him in that respect.

All the Government has got to do now, if they do not want defeat—as I said before, I do not want to see them defeated at this juncture—is to come out flat-footed and accept this motion. I dare say a few of the Ginger Group would vote against them, but I am pretty well satisfied that if they accept the motion they will get the bulk of the men on this side. That is the proper thing to do, accept this motion and avoid defeat or stultify itself. Let the Government show its hand.

If you defeat this resolution, what is going to happen to the reciprocity agreement? You cannot, you know, according to the rules of this House, bring up this motion again this session; do not make any mistake about that, unless you get the unanimous consent of the House, which you are not likely to get. My hon. friend, the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. Crerar) said that it should not be moved now. Let me tell him in the words of the good old Methodist preacher: "Now is the accepted time, now is the day of salvation."

Mr. LEVI THOMSON (Qu'Appelle): Mr. Speaker, the sentiments contained in the amendment before us have a somewhat familiar ring to me. I had an idea when I heard them first that my hon. friend had been "cabbaging" some of the work of others. I have a very distinct recollection of being on the committee that framed the original resolution from which this present one is drawn, and I may say that I fully agree with the principle contained therein. I remember that while my duty was to assist in the framing of that resolution, the duty of some other members was to canvass support for it, and my recollection is that the men who were sent out to canvass said they had harder work than we, that we had taken the easy part.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Where are those members you were speaking about? They are not on this side; they all crossed to your side.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I think some of the members we canvassed are with you still. However, that is not the point. I thoroughly agree with the principle laid down in the amendment. There is no man in this House who is more thoroughly earnest in support of a low tariff and even free trade.

I have no use whatever for the principle of protection; it is vicious in principle and

the sooner we do away with it the better. Perhaps, however, that is beside the question, because the resolution before us does not propose free trade. As the member for Brome has said, our present tariff system is the most expensive way of collecting a revenue. Last year we collected, I believe, about $160,000,000 under the customs tariff. I am satisfied that we paid on account of that tariff at least $500,000,000; that leaves $340,000,000 that does not go into the treasury. I agree that there are many other less expensive ways of raising revenue, and if the question before us were simply whether or not we were in favour of the principle laid down in this amendment, I should be quite willing to vote for it. There is no excuse for our present tariff, and it is up to this Government to see that it is materially reduced. Former Conservative and Liberal Governments had an excuse for not reducing the tariff, which does not exist now. When they were in power the American customs tariff was higher than ours and its existence was the main excuse for protection in Canada. At present, however, we pay practically double the average tariff rate paid by the people of the United States; therefore it is the duty of the present Government to see that there is a material reduction in the customs tariff. I have some hope, notwithstanding what the member for Prince, P.E.I., (Mr. Read) says, that the Acting Prime Minister and the Government will give that some consideration. I do not see how they can avoid giving it consideration. The fact that agricultural implements, cement, boots and shoes, harness and saddlery, and other things mentioned by the member for Brome—I mention only some of the more important ones—are on the free list in the United States is a good reason why a material reduction in the duty on those articles should be made here. The Canadian manufacturers have the American market open to them; they have as good a chance in that market as American manufacturers have, and I see no good reason why Canadian manufacturers should have preference over American manufacturers while American farmers have a preference over Canadian farmers. I am confident that the Government will take this into consideration when they come to deal with the matter of the customs tariff in the Budget.

While saying this, I agree with most of what has been said by the member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark) and the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. T. A. Crerar). I think they have placed the position of the Western members on this side fairly well before the House. The member for Red Deer says that in bringing forward this resolution the Opposition had no desire to defeat the Government; in other words, that it was not their desire to stand by the natural consequence of their action if this resolution should carry. Is the leader of the Opposition prepared to form a Government to carry on the business of the country if this resolution is adopted?

Mr. McMASTER: Why not?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I do not think he will say that he is; I think it is thoroughly understood that there is no desire of that kind. In what he said the other night, the member for Prince, P.E.I., was voicing his own sentiments and the sentiments generally of the members opposite.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the hon. gentleman did me the honour of listening to my remarks this afternoon, he must have heard me say that the Liberal party was prepared to assume any responsibility which this country chose to cast upon it.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: He did not say that he thought this country or the House were prepared at this time to cast that responsibility on the Opposition. What would the consequences of carrying this resolution be? If all the members from the Prairie Provinces, who are deeply interested in the carrying out of some such policy as that suggested by the resolution —very much more deeply interested in it than most of these hon. gentlemen are— should vote for the resolution, the Government would be obliged to resign. A great many of those western members would not be prepared to support a Government formed by the present Opposition. And even if every man of us was prepared to support it, we would not have a working majority in the House, and a general election would have to follow. Who wants a general election? Does the leader of the Opposition want a general election now? I have too much respect for him to suppose that he does. I certainly do not want one.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. THOMSON: The member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross) laughs at that. It is implied, I suppose, that I do not want to go back to my constituency for election. I do not care a straw how soon I go back for election; I do not care a straw whether I ever go back for election or not. I am not hankering for it; I do not know whether I shall run again or not. But if the Oppo-

sition are not prepared to abide by the consequences of their action—and I do not think they are—their object cannot be altogether to defeat the Government. When I saw this resolution brought up at this stage, it occurred to me that its main object was not to defeat the Government, but to place members from the western provinces on this side of the House in a false position. And if I had not thought that before this debate commenced, I would be quite sure of it now, because member after member on the other side has held out a threat to western members on this side of the House. What hon. gentlemen have said in that regard bears out the idea I had at first. Of course, it is quite open to my hon. friends to do whatever they see fit. I am not worrying about the false position; I am not worrying about my electors. I addressed only one meeting in my constituency before I was elected, and that meeting was attended by intelligent men who had been strong supporters of the different parties—good red-hot Grits and Tories, pretty equally divided. I explained to them as fully as I could what my position was and would be. I foresaw just the position that we are in to-day. I told them that it was quite possible that a resolution of this kind would be brought up in the principle of which I would concur, but that I reserved to myself the right to use my discretion if I felt that the Government in power should be sustained. I said: "If you are not prepared to send me to Parliament on those grounds, send some one else; I positively will not go as your representative otherwise." I say that those who attended this meeting had been strong party men, but not one of them raised the slightest objection; all approved of the position I took.

And I think the position of the western members generally is the same. I want to make it clear that I am thoroughly in sympathy with the principle laid down in the amendment, and were it a question of voting yea or nay on that without its having any other effect, I certainly would vote for it, but I cannot agree with my hon. friend from Victoria, Alberta (Mr. W. H. White), when he says that the position is the same now as it was when we introduced a resolution some two years ago, because my hon. friend must remember that at the time we introduced that resolution the Budget debate was over. I think my hon. friend knows that very well.

Mr. W. H. WHITE: Some hon. member near me, when the question was asked, stated that the Budget had not been brought down. I accepted that statement. I am not altogether sure that such was the case. If the Budget had been brought down I apologize to the hon. member for Red Deer.

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: I am not accusing, and I do not wish to accuse my hon. friend of purposely wishing to mislead the House, but I am quite sure that is the position. My hon. friend (Mr. Richardson) has just placed in my hand a note to the effect that the Budget was introduced on April 24 and the resolution was moved by Mr. Oliver on May 29. The position would, therefore, be different. But whether the position is different or not, I do not think that would bind us, under the present circumstances, to vote for this amendment. The circumstances are a little different, but I do not purpose going into them. I do not say that I might not, under certain circumstances, feel justified in voting for this amendment as it stands. It might be the simplest matter for a few of us who represent the most red-hot free trade constituencies in the West merely to sit back quietly, and when the vote was taken to vote for the amendment. That would not defeat the Government. But hon. members must remember this, that there are at least 30 members from the western provinces who are in practically the same position as I am. Would it not, then, be the meanest thing on earth if I did that sort of thing? What would my hon. friends opposite think if I acted in that way? In fair play to each other, under present circumstances, we have to stand together.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: Does not my hon. friend know that during the debate on the Address, many speakers on the other side challenged us to show where we stood on the tariff question, and no one asked us to wait until the Budget was brought down?

Mr. LEVI THOMSON: That may be. It is not necessary to deny or admit that. People may make challenges to my hon. friend which they have no business to make; but it is not necessary for him to fall into every trap laid for him, is it? I am afraid my hon. friend is rather hard pushed for an excuse—and finds a rather poor one—for the position which he occupies at present. He will have to endeavour to secure some better reason for the action of his party than that. I do not purpose complaining about the action of the Liberal party when in power. At least I do not wish to complain any further than I complained of their action when I was on the opposite side of the House. I do not wish to adopt towards the action of the Liberal

party when in power in regard to the tariff question a different tone from that which I adopted when I was a member on the opposite side of the House, or a Liberal candidate. On those occasions I endeavoured to make it perfectly clear where I stood on the question. I also endeavoured to make it perfectly clear that I was not satisfied with the record of my party on that question. And I may say that I am very much dissatisfied with the want of progress shown by the Liberal party when in power on their much-talked-of pilgrimage towards "free trade as it exists in England." They did not make such vast progress as would satisfy me then, and it will not satisfy me now. I do not purpose making any further criticism; but when my hon. friends speak about dealing with the West, satisfying the West, they must remember that the West wants action. The West does not rely very much on opposition promises. The West is more likely to take cognizance of the performance of a party when in power. The West is not playing politics and is not favourable to the playing of politics by any person, and I do not think it will look with favour upon the present action of the Opposition, because the West will regard it as playing politics.

Mr. EMMANUEL B. DEVLIN (Wright): Before entering upon my remarks, I wanted to ask the hon. gentleman a question without wishing to interrupt him in his speech. Could the hon. gentleman suggest any other way than that we have taken by which we might bring this matter before the House in order to get an expression of view from hon. gentlemen on the other side?

Mr. LEVI THOMPSON: If I were going to suggest a way, it might better be done when the Budget is brought down. But I am not objecting so much if my hon. friends merely wish to place themselves on record. I placed myself on record before and I have placed myself on record here this evening as to what I think. If my hon. friends are actuated merely by a desire to place themselves on record, I have no objection to the method they have adopted. If I suffer by it, that is all right.

Mr. DEVLIN: My purpose in asking the question was simply to endeavour to establish in my mind just how sincere the hon. gentleman was, because I think hon. gentlemen in this House know me well enough by this time to understand that I do not want to make myself the judge of the actions of my fellow-men. But to-day I have listened to a debate which has been somewhat marvellous. I gave very keen attention, as I generally do, to the speech of the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Michael Clark). I always admire his manner of speaking, and when he sat with us upon this side of the House I admired his earnestness. If I speak along the lines I speak to-night, I will make an open confession—it is said confession is sometimes good for the soul—that it is greatly due to the lessons which the hon. member taught me. He will remember quite well that for years we sat in this House as desk-mates. He said, upon several occasions since this session began, that he was the father of free trade in this House. Perhaps I will not go quite as far as that.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: If the hon. member will pardon me, I never used that expression about myself. I never called myself the father of anybody except four boys.

Mr. DEVLIN: The teacher?

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK: I never describe myself.

Mr. DEVLIN: Does the hon. gentleman say that he was not a teacher? Why, the hon. gentleman pointed out to me on a hundred and one occasions—and this is no breach of confidence—that I must be blind if I could not see that free trade was the only thing to save this country.

Does not the hon. gentleman remember how cleverly he put the matter when he spoke of the rays of the sun coming through the window, and turning to me, said: "Would you put a wall in front of those rays?" Does not the hon. gentleman remember that language? "Why," he said, "it is the same thing exactly when you try to build up a wall against the free entry of goods into this country." Now, I take it that my hon. friend was sincere when he said that; I may be credulous, but I certainly thought he was sincere. And when I heard him say this afternoon that this was not an opportune time for a resolution such as this, I began to think: Has my old deskmate gone back on the principles which actuated him during so many years, simply because he has changed from a seat upon this side of the House to a seat upon that? We all have the privilege of changing our opinions, of course, and I hope that none of us is so glued to any one particular opinion in non-essentials that he will not change it on any account. But the hon. member for Red Deer has pointed out, not on one or two or three or half-a-dozen occasions in this House, but in season and

out of season, that free trade as they have it in England is the proper thing for this country. Remembering how he had told us with that eloquence of his how he had learned free trade under William Ewart Gladstone, we thought he was going to instil into the minds not only of hon. gentlemen on this side of the House but of hon. gentlemen opposite, the same undying principles —until this afternoon, when he said: "A punctilio, the merest technicality, prevents me from supporting the opinions I have held on the tariff during my whole political career."

Mr. Speaker, what is good for this country in the matter of trade? Is a low or a high tariff the best? The Acting Prime Minister will tell me that a high tariff is best; my hon. friend from Red Deer, that a low tariff is best. The hon. gentleman from Red Deer says that a low tariff is best, provided there are no technicalities in the way. Away with such talk about technicalities! How often have I heard the hon. member from Red Deer use similar language: Away with your technicalities and your precedents; give us free trade.

I must now leave, with very great regret, my hon. friend from Red Deer and turn to my hon. friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Levi Thomson) for a very brief moment. He is another gentleman who sat with us upon this side of the House; another gentleman who said that he had great difficulty in finding converts, as he put it, to the resolution which I have now in my hand, proposed on the 29th of May, 1917, by the Hon. Frank Oliver, when the war was perhaps at its most critical stage. The hon. member says that he is thoroughly in accord with this present amendment, I understand that the hon. member is a lawyer, who occasionally does some farming. He wants the West to know that he is in favour of this resolution, and he is going to support it by voting against it. He hopes the Government will give consideration to the matter. Why, my hon. friend must know that all Governments give consideration to all matters that come before them; oftentimes that consideration is unfavourable, and sometimes it is favourable, and judging by the attitude of those on the Government benches this afternoon and their attitude during the past few days I do not think I am prophesying rashly when I tell the hon. member for Qu'Appelle that the Government is giving very serious consideration to this question, and its final decision will be unfavourable. After saying that he is in favour of the resolution, the hon. member goes on to say that he cannot support it because it might result in the defeat of the Government. Surely the hon. gentleman has not reached the stage where he clings more strongly to Government than to principle. I can hardly believe the hon. gentleman is sincere, because upon other occasions when he sat upon this side of the House looking across at the Government he did not care whether the Government was defeated or sustained. He believed then in principle, but now he has apparently changed, not his principles, let me hope, but his mind. A strong argument which the hon. member brought to the debate this afternoon, and which must have appealed to you, Mr. Speaker, was that whilst he wanted to support the resolution by voting against it, he could not vote for it because it would place his western colleagues in a false position. Mr. Speaker, his vote will not place his western colleagues in a false position if I know anything of the sentiments of the West as we read of them in the Unionist press of today. The West is demanding a lower tariff. Is that not so? The West is not asking hon. members representing western constituencies to wait, but is demanding immediate action. Am I right, or wrong? The hon. member, however, says that he does not want to vote for this resolution, because it will place the western members in a false light. And that can be readily understood. Western Canada has sent representatives here in great numbers to support a lower tariff, and is now demanding action. The West says to its representatives: Now is your time to ask for a lower tariff; we want you to act immediately. One hon. member from the West replies: Will you not wait until the Budget comes down? Another hon. member says: Will you not wait until we see what consideration the Government gives the matter? And yet another hon. gentleman tells us that he will go back to the West and explain his position. He says: It would have been all right for me to do it, but I would have placed my western colleagues in a false light. It seems to me, Sir, that we have come to a time in the political history of Canada when the representatives of the people must not be actuated by political motives, but solely by motives of principle. We, unfortunately—and I shall only allude to the fact in passing—have lost our leader. We have lost one in whom we could confidently place even our own judgment. We were so sure of the greatness of his mind, we were so sure of the position he would take, and that his every action would conduce to the greater advantage of Canada, that we

could safely follow him on all political questions which might come before this House. We no longer have him with us, but we have the beautiful fruits of his life work, the principles which he laid down and which should guide not only the Liberals who supported him, but every man who is intent on his country's good and wishes to do his duty by those who sent him here and by the Dominion at large—not as he sees it in his own parochial way but from the broader standpoint of the whole Dominion. Sir, these principles have been instilled into the minds of Liberals in this House and throughout the Dominion, including my Liberal friends on the other side of the House who would follow them if they had the courage of their convictions. I listened with much interest to my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster), who gave a good reason why his motion should be adopted—indeed, he gave many good reasons. He took the question up in its economic phase, and although I shall not weary the House by repeating the virtues of the resolution, I will assure my hon. friends from the West that in supporting the resolution we are not at all guided by what action they may take. We do not care a jot whether they desire to place their colleagues in a false or a fair light in the House. That is a matter of their own concern. But what we wish to place upon the record is the fact that, of all classes in this Dominion, the one class that is not protected is the farming population; and we wish further to record our recognition of the just demands of the farmers and our support of them in those demands. Will technicalities stand in the way? Let that same resolution in a different form be introduced by any hon. gentleman on the opposite side as a Government measure, and I appeal to my leader to tell me whether I am right in saying that hon. members on this side would give the same measure of support to the resolution so introduced as they propose to give to that now before the House.

It is not my intention to endeavour to embarrass the Government. Heaven knows, Sir, they are sufficiently embarrassed as it stands, although they have brought this embarrassment on themselves. They have made innumerable pledges, and if they cannot fulfil those pledges, well, we can only shrug our shoulders and pray for them. But I want to say one word to my friend the Minister of Agriculture (Mr. T. A. Crerar). We recognize the extremely difficult position he is in, and sympathize with him. We understand that he has been for many years the spokesman for the farming communities in the West. He entered this Government as a matter of conscience, he tells us, and adds that to support this resolution would place him in a false light, it would perhaps mean the defeat of the Government; in any even he did not think the present was an opportune time to propose it. Well, I readily agree with the hon. minister in that last argument; any resolution which may have a tendency to embarrass a Government is likely to be regarded by that Government as inopportune at any time, war or no war. The resolution which was proposed on the 29th of May, 1917, and which was supported by the hon. gentlemen now seated on the other side of the House, was not, according to my hon. friend the Minister of Agriculture, introduced at an opportune time. Its introduction, I take it, would be eminently opportune if the Hon. the Minister of Agriculture happened to be seated on this side of the House; but he is not on this side, hence his opinion. Other members following him spoke along the same lines. Well, Mr. Speaker, any time is an opportune time for the farmers of the East; and if it is not an opportune time for the farmers of the West, my advice to hon. gentlemen representing Western interests will be to wait until such time presents itself. If the farmers of the West are satisfied to wait indefinitely, it is well; but we who represent constitutencies wherein farmers are to be found, and who know something about the farming communities of Eastern Canada, are of opinion that the farmers are not prepared to wait any longer for action on the part of the Government.

Hon. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): Mr. Speaker, considering the importance of the amendment before the House, and the number of times that I have discussed the tariff question in this House during the last fourteen or fifteen years, I do not feel justified in giving a silent vote upon the amendment, and for that reason I shall proceed to place myself on record very briefly as to my position. In doing so I hope it will be distinctly understood that I am speaking for nobody but myself; I am not attempting to represent the Government, and I am speaking, in so far as it is possible to do so, as an ordinary member of the House. Like my friend from Qu'Appelle (Mr. Levi Thomson) when I heard the amendment read this afternoon it sounded very familiar to me: it was practically the Oliver resolution of 1917, which

I seconded, which I supported, which I honestly believed in when I supported it, and with the principles of which I am strongly in accord to-night. There are two matters referred to in the amendment now before us which were not included in the Oliver resolution. The first is a declaration that the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911 should be brought into force by the Parliament of Canada at the present time in order that we might have the advantages of it.

Let me say, Sir, that there was no man in Canada who honestly believed in the virtues of the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911 to a greater extent than I did. There has never been anything in my whole political experience which I viewed so favourably from the economic standpoint—which I believed would be to the advantage of the great majority of the people of Canada—as I did the Reciprocity Agreement. I have not changed my mind one jot or tittle down to the present day, and the greatest regret of my life—not from any personal feelings, but from the standpoint of the public—was that the Reciprocity Agreement of 1911 was not sustained by the people at the polls. I am, however, unable to agree with my friend that any very great good would come by the adoption of the Reciprocity Agreement by this Parliament at the present time, for the simple reason that practically everything which the Reciprocity Agreement grants to the people of Canada has already been obtained, either by the action of the United States Congress, or by the action of the Canadian Government during the last three or four years. Lumber has been made free. That means a tremendous amount to the eastern portions of Canada, and I believe to some extent as well to the western portions of the Dominion. Fresh fish have been made free, which must be a tremendous gain, I know it is in fact, to the people of Eastern Canada. A great proportion of the agricultural products of Canada are free into the United States. Cement has been made free, boots and shoes are free; and practically, as I said before, everything which is produced in large quantities, and which means a great deal to the industries and the producers of Canada, now goes into the United States free of duty. There are, it is true, a great many small items, referred to by my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) this afternoon, which are not free, but they play a very small part in the general trade of the country.

In addition to the articles which have been made free by the United States Congress, wheat and wheat products, or the great majority of them, have been made free by the action of this Government. The same thing can be said of potatoes, due, of course, to taking advantage of the provisions of the recent United States tariff. My reason for saying that the adoption of this policy would not be of very much value to Canada at the present time is, that I always contended that the reciprocity arrangement was not a treaty, but was simply an agreement by which like tariffs should be adopted by the two countries on a certain list of articles. It is well known that a change has taken place in the political complexion of the Congress of the United States during the past three or four months. What course the new Congress may take I do not know; but I am sure that any action which this Government or this Parliament may take to-night would have no influence whatever upon the action which the United States Congress may take when it meets, some time probably in the month of May.

I am not going to-night over all the ancient history in regard to this question, but I do feel that I ought to read one extract from the letter written by the two gentlemen who negotiated the treaty on the part of Canada in 1911, to show that this was not a treaty, but simply an agreement that certain tariff reciprocal arrangements should be provided by the two countries. I am going to take the liberty of doing that because it seems to me it goes to the very pith, the very heart, of the proposal of my hon. friend as embodied in the amendment which he has submitted. I am reading now from the letter, dated 21st January, 1911, signed by W. S. Fielding and William Paterson, in accepting the proposal of the United States Government as contained in a memorandum of the American Secretary of State to them. I will read one paragraph from that letter, to show what was the real intention of the document. It is to be found at page 2457 of Hansard, 1911:

> Nevertheless, it is distinctly understood that we do not attempt to bind for the future the action of the United States Congress or the Parliament of Canada, but that each of these authorities shall be absolutely free to make any change of tariff policy or of any other matter covered by the present arrangement, that may be deemed expedient.

With that understanding, and with the changed conditions that have taken place in the United States, I can see no very great good in the Parliament of Canada, after nearly eight years have gone by, attempting to adopt the provisions of that agreement, and therefore I have no hesita-

tion whatever in voting against that portion of my hon. friend's amendment.

The hon. gentleman next deals with the repeal of the Customs War Tax imposed in 1915. I want to say here that I realize the full gravity of the statement which I am making, or about to make. I was opposed to the imposition of these duties in 1915; I did not believe they were necessary for the purpose for which they were intended. While it is true they may have brought in some revenue, I want to tell you, Mr. Speaker, that they have added a tremendous burden on the consumers of Canada. I was opposed to them then, and I have failed yet to be convinced that they were necessary.

As to the remainder of the amendment, it is practically the Oliver resolution of 1917, to which I have referred before, and I have but very little quarrel with any of the sentiments expressed in it. I agreed with it in 1917, and I have not seen very much to cause me to change my opinion at the present time.

I do, however, want to point out to my hon. friends opposite that, as was said by the hon. member from Prince, P.E.I. (Mr. Read), a man has a right to change his mind if he finds that he is wrong. If a man has any honesty about him, and is convinced that he is wrong in his views, he will not hesitate to change them. I have not arrived at that point yet, but I may tell my hon. friends frankly that I am very much at sea as to what should be the policy of this country during the next three or four years, as to the whole question of the taxation by which we are going to raise a revenue. Earlier in this session I took occasion to point out, in a very brief manner, and in a very general way, the financial situation as I viewed it in Canada. I pointed out that I could not see how, under present conditions, we were going to raise the last $100,000,000 of revenue required in the next twelve months, after the current fiscal year, and I have listened in vain for any person on either side of the House even to discuss the matter, let alone point to the solution.

I think I can go as far as to say that I have seen no very great change in the attitude of the people of Canada and their representatives in their demand for the expenditure of public monies. I am afraid that my teaching has not produced very much result up to date. On account of the changed financial conditions, I tell you very frankly that I am at sea to know exactly what ought to be the proper method of raising taxation in this country. I think practically every method which we have ever heard of before and which we can conceive of in the future is going to be necessary in order to produce the required amount of money; and I want to point out to my friends opposite that the debt of this country will be a billion dollars more before the affairs of the present year are wound up than it was when the Oliver amendment was discussed. While that may seem a very unimportant matter to some hon. gentlemen of this House and some people in this country, it is a very, very serious matter to me.

With many of the general principles laid down by this amendment I am in hearty accord. I do not believe in the doctrine of protection for protection's sake. I do not believe that any industry is entitled to protection to such an extent that it means the prohibition of the importation into this country of the article covered by that industry. I do believe that the raw material of the farmer, his agricultural implements, should be made free, or as nearly free as it is possible to make them under existing conditions. It may be that the manufacture of some of those articles could not exist in Canada if they were made absolutely free. I have not been convinced of that yet, but I am willing to listen to argument, and I would feel like deciding only after a very mature consideration of the subject. But I believe that a great majority of the agricultural implements of this country ought to be free to the farmers.

Now, I realize, Mr. Speaker, that I am making statements which, considering my position, mean a good deal to me. I can only say that when I entered this Government—I am not going over the very, very long and somewhat unpleasant conditions which existed between the month of April and the month of October, 1917; possibly another occasion may arise when they can be discussed—I did so after the most mature deliberation, which many of my good old friends opposite know all about, and nobody knows so well as does my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). I did so for one specific purpose and for a specified time. The purpose, I am happy to say, has been achieved; the time has not yet expired. During the election in the province of New Brunswick I issued a letter to my constituents and to the people of our province, setting forth the fact that the Government was to be composed of an equal number of former Conservatives and former Liberals, for the

purpose of carrying on the war and providing recruits for our army, and that it would continue for the duration of the war and a reasonable time thereafter for demobilization.

Demobilization has not yet been completed, and so far as I am concerned my contract has not expired. Therefore, regardless of what may have been my opinions in 1917, and regardless of what my opinions may be to-day, on economic questions I am not going to take any action which would put this Government out of power while the soldiers are on the ocean coming back and before they are demobilized, and which action would probably, if carried out to its logical conclusion, bring on a general election while this great movement is in process.

10 p.m.

I have no fault to find with my hon. friends for bringing up the motion as they have done; that is their business. I have been in this House long enough I think to know the political game pretty well, I have supported governments and I have been in opposition, and I realize the situation. If my friends wish to bring this up at this particular time, it is not according to my views of good political strategy, but, that is their affair, and I realize they are not asking my advice, and I am not tendering it. But the motion having been brought up I am perfectly prepared to face the situation, and I do not think there will be any question that everybody on this side of the House will be prepared to take the same stand exactly, and to vote upon this matter simply for the reason I think very largely that it would be little short of a crime to bring on a general election in Canada under present conditions.

It is all very well for my friends to say, "Well, accept the amendment." Let us get down to earth for a moment. I tell my friends, and they know very well, that this Government could not accept it, and when they say, "Accept it," they are simply asking this Government to do something which is impossible; it could not be done. Therefore it means a vote, and a vote which, if the amendment carried, would mean the resignation of the Government and a general election. I am not prepared to take that responsibility to-night, the members on this side are not taking that responsibility. Further, I do not believe there are more than two or three on the other side who would assume such a responsibility if they knew that was going to be the result.

Therefore, Mr. Speaker, I have stated my views, perhaps somewhat frankly, and I propose to stand by this Government until the soldiers are home. When that time arrives it will be up to me, the same as it will be to every other man in this country, to do exactly what he has a mind to do. I am making no promises of what I will do; I believe that sufficient unto the day is the evil thereof, and when that time arrives I am absolutely free to take any course which I consider in the interests of the country and in honour to myself.

Mr. FRANK S. CAHILL (Pontiac): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words in support of the resolution. We in this country with abundant resources have struggled against the tide of protection for more than forty years, and we have fought a losing fight. Protection was inaugurated about forty years ago, and since that time we have been losing in population at the rate of two hundred thousand people per annum. Instead of having as we should have had fifteen million people in the Dominion, at the last census we had only about seven million. That was largely due to the protective tariff, which induced the people to go into the cities, the manufacturing centres, at the expense of the rural districts.

When the Liberal Administration came into power in 1896 and advocated their low tariff policy, they at the same time inaugurated a system of immigration, and they were able to get a very much larger number of immigrants from the British Isles and from the United States than had ever been attracted to this country before. We gained in population from 1901 to 1911 1,835,000 people and in the preceding ten years we gained only 530,000 people. During the 1901-11 period we gained that number of people largely from the British Isles and the United States, and they were mainly people coming to settle on the land. But again in 1911 and after that period our immigration fell off and our people quit settling on the land to any extent.

Now, Mr. Speaker, there has been a good deal of talk in this country by the protectionists for some time past about the production of wealth. Well, the production of wealth in this country comes largely from the land.

The wealth of the nation is created for us in our magnificent land, timber, fishery, and mineral resources, but the only producer of wealth is labour. If you exhaust the timber resources and do not replace

them by reforestation; if you deplete the minerals or the fisheries, you are drawing on capital account; but agricultural production is practically self perpetuating if it is properly carried on. The soil, therefore, is the place from which we should largely draw our wealth. For the last forty years the protected manufacturer has been advocating through the press, through active politicians, and on the stump, the principle that we should build up large manufacturing industries, that we should build up an export trade in manufactured goods. Well, previous to the war, England, the chief exporting country of the world, was an importer of foodstuffs. The foreign trade of England previous to the war amounted to $100 per capita; of Germany, the next greatest trading nation, $50 per capita; of the United States, only $30 per capita; and of the smaller nations lesser amounts. No nation ever built up its export business until it became an importer of foodstuffs. Great Britain before the war was importing practically two-thirds of her foodstuffs and Germany one-third; they were doing a world trade in manufactured goods. The export and import trade of the United States was largely in luxuries and in goods they did not produce; it amounted to about ten per cent of their internal trade previous to the war. The export and import business of Germany was done through a free port; the export and import business of Great Britain was done, of course, through a free trade country. It is impossible to build up an export and import business unless you do it in a free trade country or through a free port.

We are asked by the manufacturers to give them protection on their goods, to pay them a bonus on the goods we consume, in order that they may be able to build up an export business. Then, if we allow them this protective tariff or bonus, they say that they are not able to sell their goods in foreign countries; that they cannot find a market unless we, the people of Canada, furnish the funds to foreign countries with which to buy the goods which we produce in Canada. Of course they cannot sell their goods, because they cannot exchange them. The export and import business of a nation is an exchange business. If you are not able to buy from the nation to which you wish to sell, necessarily you cannot sell to that nation. They cannot ship you gold to pay for their purchase. There is not enough gold to go round; they must exchange goods with you.

The Bill that is to be brought down to provide for a loan to foreign countries to enable them to buy our products provides, I understand, that two-thirds shall apply to manufactured goods and one-third to raw and finished farm products. We expect to sell, say, to Roumania and to Serbia not wheat or beef, but finished articles such as bacon, flour and other manufactured foodstuffs. That being the case, the Canadian manufacturer gets the benefit. We are being asked to furnish the money to buy the goods of the manufacturer.

I am not familiar enough with the rules of the House or the rules of the game of the manufacturer to be in a position to say when this subject should be taken up and debated, but I am quite sure that so far as we are concerned, and so far as the men who believe in a lower tariff or free trade are concerned, the time is now. Certainly the manufacturer will never be ready to say that the time is now; and if we do not take action now, when are we to take action? The western people are asking that action be taken now, the farmers of my constituency are asking that action be taken now. The member for Qu'Appelle (Mr. Levi Thomson) may be able to explain his attitude to his constituents; but I make this suggestion to the Government: If they have any doubt as to the seriousness of the farmers in this matter, let them hold by-elections in the constituencies of Assiniboia, North Ontario, Glengarry and Stormont, and Quebec East. If they do that, they will find out what the farmers are thinking to-day. If they will not do that, and if the member for Red Deer or the member for Qu'Appelle has any doubt about the attitude of the farmers in their constituencies, I make this proposal: If either of them will resign his seat I will resign mine, and we will test public opinion on this question and find out whether the people think this is a proper time to give it consideration. Hon. gentlemen opposite who believe in low tariffs and in free trade should accept this as an opportune time for action, and vote accordingly.

I must admit that I was rather taken aback this afternoon when I heard the great free trade lion from Red Deer let out a yelp at the Opposition about their attitude, and then come to heel when he heard the party whip crack. If that is the attitude of hon. gentlemen opposite who are free traders, we shall never get to the point where we can agree on this question in the House. But a majority of the people favour this resolution; why do not the free traders on the other side vote for it? Members on the other side as well as on this side of the House should show the people where they

stand in this matter in order that those who sent us here as their representatives may know what to expect from us.

Mr. EDWARDS: Is my hon. friend in favour of absolute free trade for Canada?

Mr. CAHILL: I am in favour of absolute free trade for Canada at the present moment.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the question before the House is important in one or two respects, notably in that it has to be taken, if carried, to involve a vote of want of confidence in the Government. It is not my intention to discuss many of the aspects of the matter that have been touched upon this evening, but rather to reply to some remarks made by hon. gentlemen opposite who are evidently going to vote for the amendment and who have attempted to justify their vote by all the arguments that they consider necessary to support their position.

It is an amendment to the motion for going into Supply, and it is argued by the leader of the Opposition and by most of the other hon. members who have spoken on that side of the House that it is not thereby a vote of confidence motion. It is true that during the years that I have been in this House, I have heard this point argued a good deal, and especially has it been argued that this is not necessarily to be taken as a vote of want of confidence, if the subject matter of the amendment is not of any very great importance. There may be some force in that, but I do not think any hon. member in this House, either on this side or on the other, could possibly say that this was anything but a want of confidence motion, when it involves an absolute and complete change in the whole of our fiscal policy at the present time. A matter so fundamentally important must certainly, if brought up in this way, if carried or rejected, be regarded as a want of confidence motion, especially when it is brought in at this time before the Budget is brought down. The amendment, as every hon. member knows, relates to the whole of our fiscal system. It is intimately concerned with all our business ramifications throughout the country, and yet the leader of the Opposition said that if it was accepted, it would not be a vote of want of confidence. I can only say that from my point of view, if an amendment of that kind were accepted at this time, when the Budget is at least a few weeks off, and when the closest study is being given to the fiscal and trade conditions of this country, I can conceive of nothing that would so disturb, dislocate and perhaps destroy the industries of this country as to have an amendment of this kind carried at this particular moment. The leader of the Opposition rather taunted the members of the Government and other members on this side of the House and said: Waiting, waiting, what are you waiting for? My hon. friend (Mr. Cahill) said that the time to take this action is now. The leader of the Opposition said that he was extremely impatient and that everybody on that side was satisfied that the matter should not be put off, and he appealed to the record of the Liberal party on this whole matter. May I say to my hon. friend that the record of the Liberal party on this matter is not one of rushing into violent fiscal changes at very short notice? I happened to be in this country in 1896, not taking a very keen interest in politics and certainly not taking an interest in party politics. I listened to the discussions that took place throughout the country at that time. Everybody knows that the party which my hon. friend supported then and which he is supporting now was pledged to free trade as it existed in England. At that time I happened to be engaged in farming, largely fruit growing, in the Niagara peninsula, and I will recall to my hon. friend, if he does not know it, that all the people of that district—it did not matter what their party affiliations were—were greatly disturbed as to the possibility of the promises of the then Opposition being implemented. They did not know what was going to happen, and the whole case was argued very completely before a tariff commission which came around and which comprised amongst others my hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding), who spoke the other night. My hon. friend from Shelburne and Queens, as a member of the Government that had been elected in 1896, did not do what the leader of the Opposition is now getting impatient to do when urging this country to rush into this change suggested to-night, but he toured through the country and listened carefully to all the presentations made by interests affected by tariff changes of any kind. As a result, the particular industry with which I was associated at that time was left practically untouched by a Government which had been pledged to free trade. As the years went on, there came demands for tariff changes, and again the Government which was supported by

the leader of the Opposition made another tour of the country and the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens was at that time a member of that commission. He came out to British Columbia where I happened to be living. I was still associated with the same kind of farming and the same kind of business, and I had the honour again of putting forward some of the arguments in reference to that particular industry and everything was given a most careful and patient consideration. And, I may say, again to our satisfaction there was practically no change in the tariff as it affected that particular industry. I put these matters before the House as showing the tremendous contrast between a party which was still in power and with which my hon. friend was still associated when it had the responsibility of advocating changes in the tariff, and the attitude assumed by those hon. gentlemen who now have no responsibility at all, except to endeavour to disturb the affiliations of those who are now forming Union Government and a Union party and to try to make ammunition on that side of the House for political purposes throughout the country.

A good deal has been said about reciprocity. The word has a familiar sound to many of us who debated the matter for many weary months in the House and throughout the country I will not discuss it except to refer to the statement made by the mover of the amendment (Mr. McMaster) this afternoon, that the only thing that affected the people of Canada in giving what he called this unfavourable and mistaken verdict upon this point was the appeal to racial passions and so on. I think the hon. member completely misjudges the people of this country if he puts them down as such fools that, after a campaign of education of months and months, the vast majority of them could come to a decision only through appeals to passions. The people of my province came to a decision for various reasons. So far as the industry in which I was engaged is concerned, they came to that decision because they were absolutely convinced that a policy of free trade as regards the fruit growing industry would have meant the absolute extinction of, or at all events, a serious blow to that industry, in which millions of dollars were invested. Over and above that there was a very strong and healthy sentiment amongst the people of Canada at that time that helped to defeat the reciprocity proposal. They believed then—and I believe they do now,—that it was better, whatever mistakes we might make, to be master in our own house, to have complete autonomy and power and control over our own affairs, than to allow our powerful neighbour to have a finger in the pie so that in years to come she could exert over our affairs a control that might be disastrous. I do not wish to argue that point. The leader of the Opposition argued that this was not a want of confidence motion. I will recall to him what the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) said the other night. That hon. member said that he did not wish to see an election precipitated in this country at the present time; that he was prepared to vote against any want of confidence motion, because he did not feel it was in the interest of Canada to have an appeal to the electorate at present. My hon. friend hardly did himself justice in his taunt that our desire not to accept this amendment was because we wanted to hang on to power. I do not think my hon. friend, if he would give a conscientious expression of his opinion, will accuse any minister who has gone through the stress and strain of the last four years of being anxious and keen to hang on to power with all the nerve racking responsibility that is entailed on members of the Government. I can only assure him for myself—and I think I can say the same thing for other members of the Government—that there have been many times when we would have gladly relinquished to others the responsibilities of power and all it entails, and I think it was rather unworthy for my hon. friend to throw out a taunt of that kind. If he thinks the desire of the Government is to hang on to power, then it is still more unworthy of him to show such an anxiety and eagerness to attain to power by the manner he proposed to the House to-night by putting an amendment of this kind. I do not agree with him when he argues that the people will realize that our position is based on a technicality. I do not think my hon. friend need think that the people of this country are so foolish as not to see through the insincerity of such an amendment at this time and not to see that it is simply a political game. We have all played it more or less in the past. There is hardly a member of this House who has not, in some form or another, been guilty of precipitating a vote, or putting the other party on record, knowing that nothing will come of it but thinking: Here is some good ammunition I can fire out to my constitu-

ents to show what a lot of blighters these fellows were voting against the best interests of the country, at the same time knowing it was not going to be effectual.

He knows perfectly well this motion will not carry, and I venture to say the leader of the Opposition would be the most disappointed man in this House if the motion did carry and he found himself in the extraordinarily difficult position of having to form a government in this country at this time on a platform along the lines of this amendment. Plunged into the enormous tasks facing this country at the present time, how long would he hang on to power under these conditions? He would not last five minutes; that is my opinion.

My hon. friend from Victoria, Alta. (Mr. W. H. White) dealt at some length with our good friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark). I do not think I or any other man in this House need take up the cudgels for the hon. member for Red Deer, because I have never seen a man better able to handle them than he is himself. But I submit that there was absolutely no argument whatever in taunting the hon. member for Red Deer for voting on a motion on May 29, 1917, of a fiscal character, at a time when the Budget was six weeks old. We all know how ardently the hon. member for Red Deer has advocated the cause of free trade, but I venture to say that even if he had been on that side of the House he would not have voted for this amendment, or would have done his best not to have it introduced at such a time if the Budget had been coming down on May 29 and the amendment had been moved on April 24, because he would have known perfectly well what it would have involved. His position was absolutely consistent.

There is sometimes an approach to hypocrisy in this House in regard to political and tariff matters. I think if we told the absolute truth we should express the conviction that the tariff is in a very large measure a local matter. I know that in British Columbia we are mostly protectionists. Speaking for my constituents, they are protectionists because it is a matter of life and death with them in their industries. Coming to the prairies—I am not criticising at all—farming is carried on under different conditions, and the farmers there believe that free trade will in the end be better for them from a financial standpoint. Coming east, the same differences exist, and it is quite natural that even in our own Unionist party on this side of the House there should be difference of opinion amongst our members. We honestly recognize that difference do exist; there must be honest differences honestly held, and the task of statesmanship, at all events, is in the face of extraordinary national difficulties to try to reconcile these differences to some extent. No man on earth can satisfy the extremists of either sides. People talk about compromise. It reminds me of the old story that was told of a man and his wife who had a violent quarrel over what colour they should paint their house. The man stuck to it that it should be painted green. The wife insisted it should be painted white. A friend later asked the husband how the matter ended, and he replied: "We effected a compromise." "What colour did you paint the house eventually?" The husband said: "We compromised on white." That was the wife's idea of a compromise, and I think lots of people would like a compromise along those lines. My hon. friend the leader of the Opposition who is so wild in his enthusiasm for the amendment of his friend from Brome, and who possibly, whilst he is in Opposition, would support my hon. friend who has just sat down, who declared for absolute free trade, has never shown any keen enthusiasm for free trade, and he will probably not get up in his place and say he is in favour of free iron or free coal, because he knows perfectly well that these things affect different parts of the country differently. If he wishes to say that he is in favour of free iron or free coal now is the time, as my hon. friend from Pontiac (Mr. Cahill) would say, to state so. Now what is the good of my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition saying: "We deal openly and above board?" And he talks about hon. members on this side of the House rushing to get into line when the party whip is cracked. I have a high personal regard for my hon. friend, but I must say that, politically, I have never seen in this House a more slavish adherent to the party whip and the party system than the hon. gentleman who leads the Opposition. Again and again, during the last ten years, I have known my hon. friend get up and vote against amendments of this kind on going into Supply, not on vital questions which would overturn the fiscal system of the country, but on matters of an entirely trivial character, and that had no bearing on the substantial policies of the Government. Again and again I have known him get up and vote against such an amendment on going into Supply, on the ground that it was a vote of want of confidence. Let me say to hon. gentlemen opposite that amend-

ments of this kind, and much of the discussion to which I have listened thus far since the House met, show too feverish an anxiety to try and break the affiliations which at all events hold now various members on this side of the House, who have perhaps thoroughly strong antagonisms or honest differences of opinions on trade matters. There is too feverish an anxiety to try and split up the members on this side of the House who have come here for a high and noble purpose, and who naturally do not want to split up so long as the present conditions face the world. I would say to my Unionist associates—and I am speaking as an old-time member of the Conservative party and of the Conservative Government—I admire the men who came into Union Government because (and I say this advisedly) they showed a far higher sense of proportion than hon. gentlemen opposite. They showed a real knowledge of values; they knew something of the differences between essentials and non-essentials. They left political friends and joined political opponents, than which there is, perhaps, no more distasteful task to any man in public life. They joined political opponents whom they had berated and with whom they had perhaps had very acrimonious discussions in this House. They turned from policies which they had advocated vigorously, simply because they realized they were small in comparison with the infinitely greater matters facing the nation at that time. My hon. friend from Red Deer was one of these men, and I especially admire him for this reason: there was no man on that side of the House who had advocated so vigorously and so consistently the policy of free trade; I venture to say that he was the only member I have seen on that side of the House during the time I have been a member since 1908 who has unceasingly and consistently preached the same gospel in regard to fiscal matters. I admire him for realizing that these things were as nothing in the balance against the pressing and deadly danger that faced this nation at that time. I say it is infinitely to his honour and the honour of other hon. members who did the same thing that the non-essentials counted as nothing against the pressing, grievous and deadly danger facing this country in 1917 and 1918. Talk about taxation and differences of opinion as to taxation methods. What would these have mattered if that danger had become an actuality? If the Hun had won we should have sweated under the most grievous kind of direct and indirect taxation for a lifetime. These men knew that, and not only to my mind did they take the right stand, but they took the sound view according to the opinion of those like the hon. member for Skeena (Lt.-Col. Peck), who pointed out the other day that those who were in the trenches fighting that bloody fight for freedom knew that was the right course if the Empire was to be saved.

Those hon. gentlemen who came over and joined us are now taunted because they happened formerly to have held certain trade theories and convictions, and hon. members on the other side seek to embarrass them and the Government by a resolution which they know they cannot carry, and do not want to carry, but which they propose simply to put those who have joined the Government in an invidious position in the House and before the country. I do not think that the people of this country are so foolish as my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition assumes they are. I do not belong to the same political school as my hon. friend from Red Deer (Mr. M. Clark), although we were born in the same country and lived there for many years. I belong to an opposite school of political thought; but as I look across the seas at this juncture of the world's history, perhaps more grave and portentous than at any period during the war—at all events equally so—with all the terrific turmoil and confusion, military, political, social, ethnological, and fiscal; unrest in every phase of life,—as I look across the seas and consider this state of affairs, I feel that our older theories of life are upset and that there is no man either over there or in Canada who can say at the present moment exactly what political doctrine should be preached and what line of policy should be laid down. My hon. friend from Red Deer was of the same political faith as Mr. Lloyd George—a school of thought that I as a Conservative was brought up to detest, and I would like to call the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. Lloyd George, an ardent exponent of advanced Liberalism, during the war, sat side by side with many dyed-in-the-wool political opponents, and indeed is still so sitting to-day because he sees that party affiliations are of smaller moment than the great issues that should make for national and international unity.

The country will not mistake the attitude of the House in a vote on a question of this kind at the present time. They know that there are greater things than putting into effect or rejecting this particular piece of political economy. They know that there are greater and vastly more important things that must be done in the face of the dangers threatening the whole

world; and that it is absolutely essential, if the world is to be saved from the greatest of all evils—which my hon. friend from Brome (Mr. McMaster) seemed the other day to hold rather lightly, the peril of Bolshevism,—if we are to hold the sanity of this world and preserve it against the inroads of what all thoughtful men regard as the gravest menace with which we are faced, graver perhaps than even the war; they know that there must be on the part of thoughtful men a recognition of what things are great and what are not great but merely temporary. And it seems to me that the salvation of this country, as of other countries, lies in the frank recognition of differences, and the full determination to reconcile, in the face of bigger things, these differences, and the determination above all things that we shall not be pushed aside from our path by little catch votes but shall recognize that there are larger purposes in view which we intend to achieve.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity a few days ago, in a recent debate, of expressing my views on the general tariff question, and therefore I do not deem it necessary that I should enlarge upon them now. I am reluctant to give a silent vote on this matter, the more so because I am obliged to differ from the hon. gentlemen who sit on your left, and with whom, I assure you, I am more anxious to agree than to disagree. I do not agree with all that was said by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) in his opposition to this resolution. I cannot at all concur in the opinion he expressed that any motion in amendment to Supply is necessarily a vote of want of confidence, though this particular one may be argued to be such. A motion in Supply is one of the occasions on which the representatives of the people have an opportunity to present their grievances, if they have any. It is an opportunity for free discussion, and it is not an unusual thing to have an amendment to Supply moved. My hon. friend drew a distressful picture of what would happen if the amendment to Supply carried. Why do we go into Supply? He says it is to vote money for railways, public works, soldiers, and pensions; and that all this would be stopped if anybody moved an amendment to Supply. That is altogether a mistaken notion. The parliamentary rule was read by the leader of the Opposition, but I know from my own experience that again and again motions in amendment to Supply have been accepted. I have not turned up the records, but I have no doubt it can be found that more than once, when I was Minister of Finance, I accepted motions of that character. Nor do I agree with my friend when he says that we should wait until the Peace Conference deals with our tariff matters. If he will not deem it offensive, I must describe this as some of the "eye-wash" we get concerning Canada and the conference. There is no fiscal question concerning Canada before the Peace Conference. The fiscal questions of Canada must be settled here on the floor of this Parliament. Our right to settle them is beyond dispute, and we will not surrender it to Downing Street or the War Cabinet; neither will we surrender it to the Peace Conference or the League of Nations. We retain that right, and need not wait a single moment to see what the Peace Conference intends to do regarding the matter.

I have not had the opportunity of studying the motion that has been read by way of amendment, but from its general tenor I know it is in accordance, largely, possibly wholly, with my own views upon the tariff questions which are more or less agitating the country. It may be asked, "If the motion is in accordance with your views, why not support it?" Well, I agree with the Minister of Finance that the motion is not opportune at this time. I am obliged to take that position for several reasons. If I were younger and more enthusiastic, less experienced and less responsible, I might feel free to vote for the motion. But I happen to have been Minister of Finance for a period of fifteen years—longer, I am informed, than any other man. Therefore I know something about how tariff questions have been dealt with in Parliament, and I look back on my own experience and put myself for a moment in the position of the Finance Minister. It is well, in considering public questions, sometimes to place yourself in the opposite position. And I ask myself the question, if I were Minister of Finance to-day how would I view this motion. I have to view it as I viewed similar motions when I was Minister of Finance. The records, I am sure, will show that on several occasions, at an early stage of the session, efforts were made to commit the House to particular actions in tariff matters, and I argued that it was appropriate to wait until the Budget was under consideration. If I took that view when I was Minister of Finance, why should I change it to-day merely because another hon. gentleman

happens to be occupying that position? I do not think this is the right moment for raising the question. It is a fair case of applying the rule to do unto others as one would have done to him. If I were Minister of Finance to-day I should have to regard this motion as inopportune, and that being the case, I regret very much that I cannot join my hon. friends on your left in supporting it. Later on the question will come up again, but for the present I do not think the motion is a wise one, and it should not prevail.

Mr. FRANCIS N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, before casting my vote on this amendment I wish to explain my position. The amendment contains much that I approve of, but there are some features in it which do not meet with my approval. I deem these to be unjust, and consequently I shall be compelled to vote against the amendment.

Doubtless I am looked upon as a manufacturer, and that designation is correct, but I wish to place the House in possession of the facts with respect to my attitude in the tariff. In the products that my firm turns out we are prepared to meet the competition of the world; we need no protection, and would be only too glad if free trade were to prevail. What we produce we sell in the open market and are prepared to meet the competition of the world—in fact we invite that competition. On the other hand, very much of the materials that enter into the manufacture of our goods and the construction of our plant are subject to a high duty. Speaking for myself personally, and as one engaged in manufacturing operations, free trade would be welcomed in our business. But I recognize there are some industries that do not occupy such a position, and that are not prepared to compete against the world. That is my position as a manufacturer speaking on this question.

This afternoon while the hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) was explaining his amendment, and the Finance Minister was replying, I was absent from the Chamber. I understand, however, that the latter hon. gentleman said I looked very uncomfortable, and that he did not think I was enjoying the situation. I may have looked uncomfortable, but I was thinking of the unjust features embodied in the amendment submitted by the hon. member for Brome.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Hear, hear.

Mr. McCREA: Hon. gentlemen had better hesitate a moment before they applaud. That brought to my mind the unjust treatment which our industry has received. I do not wish to be offensive to the Finance Minister, but it recalled the unfair and unjust treatment that the industry with which I am connected has suffered at the hands of the Government, and that, no doubt, accounted for my doleful look.

The hon. member for Prince, P.E.I., (Mr. J. Read) in his speech to-night declared in very emphatic terms that the public press of Canada had been debauched—had been bribed, bought, and paid for and so on—with the people's money. I am inclined to think the hon. gentleman is not in possession of all the facts upon which he based his statement. I am not, and therefore I cannot say how much public money went to paying, or buying the public press; but I do wish to say that about a million and a half of the newsprint manufacturers' money was devoted towards buying the press of Canada in the last election, and since that time. That is to say, the manufacturers of newsprint in Canada during the last two years have had to contribute the necessary paper for the press of Canada at about a million and a half of dollars less than they would have received if they had been allowed to sell newsprint in the open market of the United States and elsewhere. Consequently I say that is what it has cost the manufacturers of newsprint in Canada to support the Government. We have heard the emphatic statement from hon. gentlemen on both sides that they do not want an election at the present time. Certainly from the paper manufacturers' standpoint we do not want an election just now if we have to pay the newspapers the same price we paid last election.

In part the amendment does meet with my entire approval. That is in so far as it calls for the acceptance of reciprocity as specified and laid down in the agreement of 1911. I was in favour of reciprocity at that time, and for that reason presented myself as a candidate in the county of Sherbrooke where I succeeded in being elected, although that county had never previously returned a Liberal member.

The features of the amendment to which I object, and which I say are unjust and unfair, especially at this particular time, are those which are likely to make inroads into our revenue. Faced, as we are now, with an enormous debt, when the expenditures of the country call for $437,000,000—and I venture to say that when the supplementary Estimates are brought down the total will be swollen to approximately half a billion of dollars—the situation calls for the exercise of caution. If every man is

to be exempt from paying his fair share of taxation, if all are not to be required to contribute towards the revenue, where is the money coming from to meet our national necessities? That is the question that puzzles me. If we did not require money on this vast scale I would be a free trader, but on a basis in which all parties would be placed on a position of equality. The amendment calls for the placing of agricultural implements of all kinds, and mill and mining machinery, on the free list, but other industries are to remain untouched. Let me give an illustration of what the effect of this will be. Supposing there is in the city of Ottawa a large manufacturer of farm implements, and on the other side of the street there is a manufacturer who produces another class of goods on an extensive scale. Both men import a great part of the raw material which enters into the manufacture of their products. The man who manufactures farm implements is allowed to import his steel, iron, and brass, the metals of all kinds which he needs, his paint and other materials, free of duty. The man on the other side of the street has to pay a duty on his raw articles, and has to compete in the labour market, has to pay the same wages, and meet other outlays on the same scale. Where is the fairness in that kind of tariff arrangement? If it is possible to reduce the tariff let us do so, but let that reduction be carried out on a uniform basis, and not select certain industries for favoured treatment.

It would appear that the population in the western provinces are largely farmers, and they represent a great many votes. Is it the interest of the country we are supposed to be working for, or are we influenced by the desire to gain the votes of these farmers? For my part, I believe the present to be too serious a time to play politics; it is too serious a time to be bidding for votes. I do not believe in a tariff when it reaches the point that it protects industries in this country; then it is too high. But I do say that the manufacturers of this country with its population of some seven and a half million people are not in a position to compete with the manufacturers of England or the United States, and they must have some protection as tariff for revenue. There is no man more anxious to help the farmers than I am, but there are two sides to the farmers' question. If you give the farmers free implements and everything else, and if they have no population to sell their crops to, what are they going to do with them? I say that it is just as essential that we should build up industries in this country and create centres to consume the products of the farm as it is for the farmers to produce, and the way to do that, in my judgment, is for this Government and for the people of this country to work out some policy which will be fair and reasonable and equitable to all parties—a tariff to produce revenue. I do not think it makes very much difference whether we call upon the farmers of the West to put their hands down into their pockets and pay direct taxes or call upon them to pay in the shape of a duty on implements, provided that that duty does not build up a tariff wall and enable the manufacturers to put the money in their pockets.

The manufacturers of this country, in my judgment, must have some protection, and if I may be allowed, Mr. Speaker, I wish to take up a little of the time of the House to illustrate just what I mean. I have never had anything to do with any branch of business except the one I am engaged in, but I have had a little insight into this one particular line of business. A man with whom I was connected for some ten years and very familiar with was a shoemaker, as were his father and grandfather before him. This man had two factories employing about twenty-five hundred people and manufactured four or five different grades of boots, common men's and boys' boots. The boot from when it started with the side of leather until it reached the finished article probably passed through the hands of twenty-five or thirty men, and every man had to do his share of that work down to the twentieth part of a cent. The man who cut the leather had to furnish so many taps, so many soles and so many heels out of each piece of leather; if he did not he had to give an explanation to the foreman. The outcome of that was that they got this particular business down to a science. The man who owned this shop and showed me through it several times, told me that when they made five cents a pair net profit they were doing good business and able to pay substantial dividends. Why? Because they had a population of 110,000,000 people to sell to and could specialize. Now our boot and shoe manufacturers, with our population of 7,000,000, have to make everything from the finest lady's shoe to the brogan, and cannot specialize on anything, and that applies to every other branch of business. We are

not in a position to compete with the old-established concerns which have had this experience, specializing in every branch and favoured with a large home market; and until we reach that point it would be folly to throw down the tariff wall entirely.

I understand that the majority on both sides of the House are not in favour of throwing down the tariff wall. But why throw it down on certain articles and not on others? As I explained at the outset, the reason I am opposed to this is because of the injustice of removing the tariff from certain things and leaving it on others. That is too long a jump to start off with. If it is possible to reduce the tariff generally, let us do it. Tariff for revenue is all we need. and I think that the common sense and wisdom of the people of this country, both in the West and everywhere else, will force them to the conclusion that as members of a portion of this Empire and responsible for the debts of this country, it is their duty to contribute their fair share, and they may as well do it in the form of revenue as by the way of direct taxation.

11 p.m.

Mr. LOUIS AUDET LAPOINTE (St. James): Mr. Speaker, I did not intend to speak on this question, but I find the discussion is so interesting that I feel I ought to express my views on the subject before the House.

I am not a manufacturer nor interested in the manufactures of any commodities, but I represent a thriving constituency within the city of Montreal in which there are quite a number of manufacturing industries. I tell you honestly, Sir, that I believe it is my duty as representative of that constituency to vote against the amendment, and I shall do so. First, because I believe that this is not an opportune time to bring forward an amendment of this character. Second, because I am going to put before this House the business reasons why I believe that I should vote against it. I have just received a resolution from the Board of Trade of Montreal, which represents the trade interests of the city and knows something about tariffs and questions of commerce—

Mr. GAUVREAU: They did not vote for you.

Mr. LAPOINTE (St. James): I do not care. I have confidence in their reasons and I believe in them. I quite agree with their views on this matter.

[Mr. McCrea.]

This resolution which I have received from the Montreal Board of Trade is dated March 21, 1919:

I beg to communicate, by direction of the Council of this Board, the following resolution with regard to the adverse balance of trade it unanimously adopted on 18th inst., and to say that same has been sent to the Honourable the Acting Premier and the Honourable the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce:—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. LAPOINTE (St. James): My friends sitting beside me apparently will not allow me free speech. If any hon. gentleman does not agree with my sentiments I must just ask him to keep quiet and not interrupt.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I rise to a point of order, Mr. Speaker. The hon. member has no right to address himself to me directly; his protest must go through you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. LAPOINTE (St. James): I hope my protest will go to my hon. friends through you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The hon. member for St. James has the floor and I hope he will not be interrupted again.

Mr. LAPOINTE (St. James): I will continue my reading of the Montreal Board of Trade resolution:

Whereas, at this time when our fighting forces are returning from overseas in large numbers and they, together with munition workers, are seeking other employment, business must be stimulated to create confidence and stability in commercial enterprises, thereby providing for the maximum employment of labour,—

Whereas, values of all commodities are in process of re-adjustment, and any changes in the present fiscal policy would tend to delay the return to normal conditions, retard initiative and create uncertainty,—

Whereas, because of the heavy adverse balance of trade as between Canada and the United States, as evidenced by the continued high premium of over 2 per cent for the purchase of New York funds, importations from the United States should be kept at a minimum, more especially of such commodities as are made in Canada or as are non-essential,—

Whereas, Great Britain, France and other European countries have seen fit to restrict imports and thereby conserve their own resources and provide employment for their own people,—

Whereas, the burden of taxation must be borne by all classes, and not be sectional, it is therefore necessary that all classes, including farmers, manufacturers, merchants and workers should be fully employed, and thereby make Canada more than ever self contained and less reliant upon imports from other countries,—

Therefore resolved.—That the Council of the Montreal Board of Trade is of the opinion that until a definite tariff policy is adopted for the British Empire, the Dominion Government should exercise, during the period of reconstruction, some degree of special control over all imports, either by a license system or otherwise.

The Chambre de Commerce of Montreal, which includes many able business men and manufacturers, will certainly, at the proper time, pass resolutions similar to this. I have not yet recieved any, but I expect some, because some of my friends who belong to that organization—manufacturers of shoes, leathers and so on—are not specially in favour of too much free trade to-day. There was some difficulty in getting some of the manufacturers in my county to understand they should vote Liberal at the 1911 election; many of them voted for me from a personal standpoint. But some of them were afraid of their trade at that time. I am taking this position, reserving, of course, the right to whatever opinion I consider proper when the Government brings down its tariff proposals.

The House divided on the proposed amendment of Mr. McMaster, which was negatived on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Lavigueur,
Baldwin,	Leduc,
Boivin,	Leger,
Bourassa,	Lemieux,
Brouillard,	Lesage,
Cahill,	McGibbon (Argenteuil),
Cannon,	McKenzie,
Cardin,	McMaster,
Copp,	Mayrand,
d'Anjou,	Michaud,
Déchêne,	Molloy,
Delisle,	Murphy,
Demers,	Pacaud,
Denis,	Papineau,
Desaulniers,	Parent,
Deslauriers,	Pedlow,
Devlin,	Pelletier,
Duff,	Power,
DuTremblay,	Proulx,
Ethier,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Fafard,	Ross,
Fontaine,	Savard,
Fortier,	Seguin,
Fournier,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Gauthier,	Tobin,
Gauvreau,	Trahan,
Gervais,	Truax,
Gladu,	Turgeon,
Hunt,	Verville,
Kay,	White (Victoria).—61.
Lanctôt,	

NAYS.

Messrs.

Allan,	Lang,
Ames (Sir Herbert),	Lapointe (St James),
Anderson,	Loggie,
Andrews,	Long,
Argue,	Mackie (Renfrew),
Armstrong (York),	Maclean (Halifax),
Arthurs,	MacNutt,
Ball,	McCrea,
Best,	McCurdy,
Blair,	McGregor,
Bolton,	McIntosh,
Bonnell,	McIsaac.
Bowman.	McLean (Royal),
Boyce,	McLeod,
Brien,	McQuarrie,
Buchanan,	Maharg,
Burrell,	Manion,
Butts,	Martin,
Calder,	Mewburn,
Carvell,	Morphy,
Casselman,	Mowat,
Chabot,	Munson,
Chaplin,	Myers,
Charters,	Nesbitt,
Clark (Red Deer),	Nicholson (Queens, P.E.I.),
Clarke (Wellington),	Nicholson (Algoma),
Clements,	Nickle,
Cockshutt,	Paul,
Cooper,	Peck,
Cowan,	Redman,
Crerar,	Reid (Grenville),
Cronyn,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Crothers,	Richardson,
Crowe,	Rowell,
Cruise,	Scott,
Davidson,	Sexsmith,
Davis,	Shaw,
Douglas (Strathcona),	Sheard,
Douglas (Cape Breton S. and Rich.),	Simpson,
Edwards,	Smith,
Fielding,	Stacey,
Finley,	Steele,
Foster (York),	Stevens,
Fraser,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Fripp,	Stewart (Lanark),
Fulton,	Sutherland,
Glass,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Green,	Thompson (Hastings),
Guthrie,	Thompson (Yukon),
Halladay,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle)
Harrison,	Tolmie,
Hartt,	Tweedie,
Hay,	Wallace,
Henders,	Whidden,
Hughes (Sir Sam),	White (Sir Thomas),
Johnston,	Wigmore,
Keefer,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Knox,	Wright.—115.

PAIRS.

(The list of pairs is supplied by the Chief Whips.)

Messrs.

Sifton,	Lapointe (Kamouraska),
Doherty,	Marcil,
Kemp,	Lafortune,
Foster, Sir George,	Lemieux,
Borden, Sir Robert,	Sinclair (Antigonish & Guysboro),
Tremaine,	Chisholm,
Bristol,	Kennedy,
Porter,	Prevost,
McGibbon (Muskoka),	Marcile,
Charlton,	Bureau,
Burnham,	Vien,
Marshall,	McCoig,
Middlebro,	Robb,
Spinney,	Boyer,
Meighen,	Béland,
Ballantyne,	Casgrain,
Elkin,	Jacobs.

Mr. J. H. SINCLAIR: I was paired with the Prime Minister (Sir Robert Borden). Had I voted I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. E. LAPOINTE: I was paired with the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. KENNEDY: I was paired with the hon. member for Centre Toronto (Mr. Bristol). Had I voted, I would have voted for the amendment.

Mr. MARSHALL: I was paired with the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig). Had I voted, I would have voted against the amendment.

SUPPLY—INTERIM VOTE.

Motion (Sir Thomas White) agreed to, and the House went into Committee of Supply,—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The present fiscal year ends on the 31st of the present month. I have spoken with the leader of the Opposition (Mr. D. D. McKenzie) with a view of obtaining, as is usual, an interim supply of two months. With his concurrence, I desire to move:

Resolved, that a sum not exceeding $52,310,026.12 being one-sixth of the amount of each item set forth in the Main Estimates for the year ending 31st March, 1920, laid on the Table of the House on the 19th instant, be granted to His Majesty for the year ending 31st March, 1920.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Did I understand the Acting Prime Minister to say "with the consent of the leader of the Opposition," or "with the consent of the House."

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I stated "with the concurrence of the leader of the Opposition," and I assumed that the other members would also concur.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I just wished to know whether there were any other members in the House than the two leaders.

Mr. McKENZIE: What the leader of the Government says, namely, that so far as he and myself can concur in this resolution, we have done so, is quite true, but, of course, that was with the expectation that the House would concur. I wish nevertheless to reserve certain rights which the members of the Opposition have in connection with all the items as they come up for consideration later on. Rule 17 (c) of the Rules of the House reads:

On Thursdays and Fridays when the Order of the Day is called for the House to go into Committee of Supply, or of Ways and Means, Mr. Speaker shall leave the Chair without putting any question, provided that, except by the consent of the House, the Estimates of each department shall be first taken up on a day other than Thursday or Friday.

[Mr. Sinclair.]

It might be argued later on that all the items were taken up on this resolution, and that consequently this rule did not apply. I want to reserve the right that this rule will be regarded as in force in connection with the Estimates of any department that may come up, notwithstanding that we are consenting by this resolution to one-sixth of the Estimates of all the departments being passed, and also to reserve to ourselves, or to any member who may so desire, the right to criticise any particular item of the Estimates of any department.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend's request is entirely reasonable and I have much pleasure in agreeing to it.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

WAYS AND MEANS.

On motion of Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister) the House went into Committee of Ways and Means, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

Sir THOMAS WHITE moved:

Resolved that towards making good the Supply granted to His Majesty, on account of certain expenses of the public service for the financial year ending 31st March, 1920, the sum of $52,310,026.12 be granted out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund of Canada.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time, and concurred in.

SUPPLY BILL—INTERIM VOTE.

Sir THOMAS WHITE thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 32, granting to His Majesty certain sums of money for the public services for the financial year ending March 31, 1920.

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

SUPPLY.

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

Civil Government—Department of Railways and Canals—Salaries, $189,300.

Progress reported.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 11.50 p.m.

Wednesday, March, 26, 1919.

The Speaker took the Chair at Two o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

FIRST READINGS.

Bill No. 33, respecting The Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Richardson.

Bill No. 34, respecting The Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Thomson.

Bill No. 35, respecting The Esquimalt and Nanaimo Railway Company.—Mr. Clements.

Bill No. 36, to incorporate Grain Insurance and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Blake.

REPORTS PRESENTED.

Volume 2 of the Auditor General's Report for the year ended March 31, 1918.—Sir Thomas White.

Annual report of the Department of Railways and Canals.—Hon. Mr. Reid.

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH.

Hon. N. W. Rowell (President of the Privy Council) moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 37, respecting the Department of Health.

Mr. PROULX: Explain.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL: This Bill is to provide for the creation of a Department of Health, to be presided over by a minister of the Crown to be named by the Governor in Council. It also contains the usual provision for the appointment of a deputy minister, to be the deputy head of the department, and for the necessary officers, clerks and employees. The powers of the minister administering the department extend to and include all matters and questions relating to the promotion or preservation of the health and social welfare of the people of Canada over which the Parliament of Canada has jurisdiction; that is the general definition of the powers of the minister. Certain particular powers are mentioned in detail covering co-operation with the provincial, territorial and other health authorities, with a view to the co-ordination of efforts proposed or made for preserving public health. The department is also authorized to deal with questions relating to the conservation of child life and child welfare generally; the inspection and medical care of immigrants; the supervision, as regards the public health, of railways, boats, ships and all methods of transportation; the supervision of federal public buildings and offices with regard to the health of civil servants and other Government employees therein; the enforcement of the regulations of the International Joint Commission promulgated pursuant to the treaty between the United States and Great Britain for the prevention of the pollution of boundary waters; and the administration of certain statutes mentioned in the schedule now being administered by other departments. Provision is also made for the appointment of a Dominion Council of Health, of which the Deputy Minister of Public Health is to be chairman; the council to be composed of the chief executive officers of the Provincial Health Departments and three other persons to be named by the Governor in Council.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

*Mr. PREVOST:

1. For what reason does the Reading Room of the House of Commons no longer contain certain publications which heretofore were therein found, namely: L'Illustration, of Paris; the Monde Illustré, of Paris; the Journal des Débats, of Paris; the Matin of Paris; the Courrier des Etats-Unis, and the Canadian Record?

2. Is it the intention of the Government to secure said newspapers and reviews for the use of the Members of the House of Commons?

Mr. SPEAKER: I am informed by the Clerk of the House, who has made inquiry, that the Paris Matin and the Canadian Record have never been on the list of publications in the reading room of the House of Commons. The other papers mentioned in the question were on the list for years, but during the war they ceased to come, for some reason, it is supposed, connected with the war. With respect to the second part of the question I shall be very happy to confer with any hon. member who may desire additional papers to be added to the reading room list.

ROYAL COMMISSION ON GEORGIAN BAY CANAL.

*Mr. PREVOST:

1. Has the Royal Commission, appointed to inquire into and report upon the commercial possibilities of the Georgian Bay Canal, on the 18th of March, 1914, completed its work.

2. If so, when will the report be submitted to the House?

3. If not, is said Commission, which was appointed five years ago, expediting its work diligently so that a final report may be presented at a very early date?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: In reply to 1, 2, and 3, instructions were given under Order in Council of 6th October, 1914, that as

much data as possible be gathered with respect to the industrial and commercial aspects of the project, and the collection of such information was entrusted to the Chairman W Sanford Evans until sufficient progress be made to enable the holding of public sittings by the Commission. Such data was compiled and three reports were submitted, printed and laid before Parliament, but on account of the war, there were no public hearings.

INTERNED ENEMY ALIENS.

Mr. McGIBBON (Muskoka):

1. Is it true that enemy aliens interned in Canada are permitted to sue and trade the same as Canadian citizens?
2. What is the amount of property held in Canada by alien enemies and is it being investigated?
3. If so, by whom and on what authority?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. No.

2. Estimated value of property reported to Custodian and Department of Secretary of State, $38,000,000.

3. Under the Consolidated Orders respecting Trading with the Enemy, persons managing or holding property of alien enemies were required to notify the Custodian thereof, and persons owing money to alien enemies which would be payable if a state of war did not exist were required to pay the same to the Custodian. Action was taken to publish as widely as possible the effect of these orders. Under the said orders the Secretary of State is authorized to make investigations where trading with the enemy was suspected, and under the provisions of the orders investigations have been made in every case where a suspicion was raised of any contravention of the orders. By Order in Council dated the 11th of November, 1918, published in the Canada Gazette of the 14th of December, 1918, the Enemy Debts Committee was constituted, consisting of: the Secretary of State of Canada, an officer of the Department of Finance named by the Minister of Finance, and an officer of the Department of Justice, named by the Minister of Justice, and that the following act upon that committee: the Under Secretary of State, Mr. J. R. Forsyth for the Custodian, and Mr. C. C. Robinson for the Department of Justice. The committee is proceeding with the investigation required by the said Order in Council, and has advertised its terms widely, asking for reports of all alien enemy property held in Canada.

3 Answered by No. 2.

[Mr. Carvell.]

CANADA REGISTRATION ACT.

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many persons, in compliance with the regulations of the Canadian Registration Act, expressed their willingness to help harvest the farmers' crops for 1918?
2. How many were subsequently notified to do so?
3. What was the total expenditure in connection with the Canadian Registration Act?
4. What was the total expenditure in connection with the previous National Registration Act?
5. How many paid officials were employed in connection with the work of Canadian Registration Act?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1 Nearly 300,000.

2. 107,000 names were supplied provincial authorities in the provinces where application for this information was made, but have no knowledge as to the number of people whom they subsequently notified.

3. $631,230.89, including cost of compilation.

4. $156,964.55, which, however, included the cost of occupational survey of the overseas forces and of Canadian industry.

Question No. 5 is not answered.

GOVERNMENT PRINTING EXPENSES.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What do the printing expenses of the Government amount to?
2. Why is not all the printing of the Government done by the King's Printer?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. For the fiscal year ending March 31, 1918, $2,569,559.73.

2. For various reasons:

(a) The flow of Government printing work not being regular at all times, gluts of work occur in some or all of the departments, and when it is felt delivery cannot be made in time, the work is sent outside.

(b) Some of the departments are under capacity in equipment, for instance, the press room; some of the work has to be sent to outside firms for execution.

(c) The Printing Bureau is not equipped to manufacture electrotypes, half-tones, line cuts, zinc cuts and engravings of all descriptions; it is not equipped to do lithographic work (maps, cheques, certificates and other commercial work, etc., etc.), or to do all of the specialty printing work. These classes of jobs have also to be sent outside.

QUEBEC MILITARY HOSPITAL.

Mr. POWER:

1. Have any complaints been made with regard to the accommodation in the Military Hospital, Quebec?

2. If so, by whom?
3. Have any Boards of Inquiry been appointed since 1915, to date?
4. If so, what has been their findings, and has any action been taken?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. There is no record of any complaints having been made.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Yes, a Court of Inquiry was held on November 8, 1918, by order of the General Officer Commanding Military District No. 5, inquiring into and reporting upon the administration and conduct of the various temporary hospitals.

4. The findings are as follows:

"The court having heard the evidence and after visiting the temporary military hospitals at the Drill Hall, Quebec, and at Levis Armouries, is of the opinion that:

"The buildings selected for these temporary hospitals were the most suitable available under the circumstances.

"The equipment, including drugs and medical supplies, were adequate.

" The food supplied was in sufficient quantity and of good quality and suitable.

"The organization of these two temporary hospitals was completely developed under unexpected circumstances, and there was no undue delay in completing this organization.

The sanitary condition of these two hospitals was at all times satisfactory.

"The A.D.M.S. M.D. No. 5, who was responsible for the organization of these hospitals, and Lt.-Colonel E. A. Lebel, C.A M.C., Officer Commanding Quebec Military Hospital, have shown much attention to the organization and administration of these hospitals, and the work of the personnel and V.A.D.'s have shown remarkable devotion in their duties and given their best endeavours to carry out their tasks towards all patients.

From evidence adduced there seems no question but that all the patients received skilful treatment, good care and nursing while under care in these hospitals, and the court finds no cause for complaint in any manner whatever."

TREATMENT OF SOLDIERS FOR INFLUENZA.

Mr POWER:

1. Have any complaints been made with regard to the treatment of soldiers stationed in M.D. No. 4 and No. 5 during the epidemic of Influenza?
2. If so, by whom?
3. Has any action been taken in the matter?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. No complaints have been received at these headquarters with regard to the treatment of soldiers stationed in M.D. No 4 and No. 5 during the epidemic of influenza.

2. Answered by No. 1.

3. Answered by No. 1.

BASE HOSPITAL, TORONTO.

Mr. POWER:

1. Have any complaints been made with regard to the base hospital in M.D. No. 2, Toronto?
2. If so, has any inquiry been made into the matter?
3. What was the result?
4. What action has been taken?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Some local complaints.

2. Yes.

3. All complaints were satisfactorily adjusted by the General Officer Commanding Military District No. 2.

4. Answered by No. 3.

EXPORT OF WOOLLEN GOODS.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How much liability has been incurred by the Government to date in connection with the export of woollen goods from Canada to Rumania?

Major-General MEWBURN: No information.

LIQUOR FOR CANADIAN SIBERIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCES.

Mr. FOURNIER:

1. Was there any liquor bought for the Canadian Siberian Expeditionary Forces?
2. If so, when was it bought?
3. From what firm or firms?
4. By whom?
5. What kind?
6. How much of each kind?
7. What was the purchase price per bottle, case or barrel?
8. What was the cost price of said liquor when delivered in Siberia?
9. To whom were said liquors delivered in Siberia?
10. Were said liquors paid for by the Canadian Government, or were they paid for by the Imperial Government?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes; all for medicinal purposes, except rum, which is issued by the Imperial Government as part of a soldier's rations.

2. September, 1918; October, 1918, and February, 1919.

3. Messrs. Hiram Walker, Messrs. Canadian Wine Vaults, Messrs. Law, Young & Co., Paul D'Aoust, Esq., Messrs. Western Canadian Liquor Company, Messrs. L. Chaput, Fils & Co., Ltd., Messrs. Hudon, Hebert & Co., Messrs. Boivin, Wilson &

Co., Gillespies & Co., Hudon & Orsali, R. P. Rithet & Co., through the War Purchasing Commission.

4. The Director of Contracts, through the War Purchasing Commission.

5. Whisky, rye and Scotch; wines, sherry and port; brandy, alcohol, alcohol absolute; rum.

6. Whisky, Scotch, 142 quarts; whisky, rye, 192 quarts; alcohol, 102 gallons; brandy, 78 quarts; wines, sherry, 173 quarts; wine, port, 148 gallons; rum, 10,000 gallons.

7. Alcohol, barrel (40 gallons), $300 (except 80 gallons purchased in bond at $3.30 per gallon).

Brandy, case, $34 (except 6 cases purchased in bond at $27.62 per case).

Whisky, Scotch, case, $27 (except 6 cases purchased in bond at $21.43 per case).

Whisky, rye, case $10.75 (except 6 cases purchased in bond at $7.29 per case).

Wine, sherry, case, $15 for 12 cases purchased in bond (balance supplied at $20.50 per case).

Wine, port, $15 per case for 12 cases purchased in bond (balance supplied at $22 per case).

Rum, 200 gallons at $4 per gallon in bond; 200 gallons at $7.50 per gallon in bond; 200 gallons at $3 per gallon in bond; 400 gallons at $2.75 per gallon in bond; 800 gallons at $4.25 per gallon in bond; 8,200 gallons at $3.40 per gallon in bond.

8. The above mentioned prices, plus cost of transportation.

9. Rum, which forms part of the soldiers' rations, was delivered to the Army Service Corps. The remainder was delivered to No. 4 Advanced Depot Medical Stores, Canadian Siberian Expeditionary Force, Base Depot Medical Stores—for the Stationary Hospital, Field Ambulance, Regimental Units, Sanitary Officer.

10. Payment for said liquors was advanced by the Canadian Government and charged to Imperial account, and will be paid for by the Imperial Government.

C.N.R. EMPLOYEES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How many employees formerly in the service of the Canadian Northern Railway Company have been appointed since January 1, 1918, to positions on the Canadian Government Railway East of Montreal?

Hon. Mr. REID: No former Canadian Northern Railway employees have been appointed to positions on the Canadian Government Railways east of Montreal, but Mr. W. A. Kingsland, former General Superintendent of Canadian Northern Railway at Montreal, has been appointed Assistant General Manager, Canadian National Railways, Eastern Lines, and his jurisdiction has been extended to cover Canadian Government Railways east of O'Brien.

Mr. Guy Tombes, formerly Assistant Freight Traffic Manager Canadian Northern Railway Eastern Lines, has had his jurisdiction extended to include lines of Canadian Government Railways west of Matapedia, Que., and Edmundston, N.B., and east of Armstrong.

PUBLIC BUILDINGS AT GUYSBOROUGH.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Were repairs made to the public building at Guysborough in 1918? If so, what was the total expenditure?

2. Who was foreman?

3. Was there a local inspector? If so, what was his name?

4. What proportion of the expenditure was paid out for labour?

5. Who was paymaster?

6. How much per thousand was paid for lumber, and what was the total quantity purchased?

7. Was any lumber sold after completion of work? If so, how many thousand feet and for how much?

8. How much coal was supplied to the said building during the calendar year 1918, and what did it cost? Was the coal purchased by tender and contract?

9. Who supplied the coal?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. (a) Yes; (b) $203.83.

2. Alfred Carroll.

3. Work was inspected by Mr. Wm. Bishop, public works inspector of Dominion buildings, Nova Scotia.

4. $142.82.

5. No paymaster.

6. (a) $25; (b) 1,492 feet.

7. (a) Yes, for the old staging that was standing, the sum of $9 was deducted from the account of Lewis Hart & Co.; (b) No information as to quantity in staging.

8. (a) 40 tons; (b) $430; (c) Yes.

9. Lewis Hart & Co.

DEPARTMENT OF FINANCE VACANCIES.

Mr. EDWARDS:

1. Did the Civil Service Commission advertise for applications for the positions of executive head and four assistants in connection with the war loans in the Department of Finance? If so, when and how many applications were received?

2. Did the Finance Department subsequently request the Civil Service Commission to make no appointments to these positions? If so, when was such request made and why?

3. Have appointments to any or all of the above positions been made? If so, when, by

whom, and what are the names of the persons appointed?

4. Were any of the applicants for the above positions or any of the appointees returned soldiers?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. Yes; August 8th, 1918; for executive head, 81; for four assistants, 232.

2 and 3. On 30th July, 1918, the department, in order to build up an organization to carry on the Victory Loan campaign, 1918, without having to lean too heavily on the department proper, wrote the Civil Service Commission to secure the services of a first class executive head and four or five accountants. The department emphasized the necessity of the immediate employment of these officials, because they must obtain a working knowledge of the arrangements to be made for the flotation of the loan.

The 1918 Victory Loan was to be issued on a very different basis from previous issues. The bonds were to be printed and furnished to all branches of the various banks before the campaign opened so that immediately on full payment of subscriptions the coupon bonds could be handed out at once to the subscribers and the fully registered bonds as soon as the required registration could be made in the books of the Finance Department.

The Civil Service Commission advertised for applications for above mentioned positions in the Canada Gazette of August 8, 1918, calling for the filing of applications not later than September 12 next but extending the time for one week for candidates from British Columbia, thus fixing the date for closing the lists as September 19, 1918.

It became necessary for the department to take very prompt action in the direction of making all preparations for the issue of a very extensive loan, the plans of the Dominion Executive Committee being so far advanced as to require a conference arranged for the 20th August between the subcommittee and officers of the department to effect final arrangements of all details. As the commission was not in a position, until after the 19th of September, to furnish officials required for this work the services of the officers of the department who directed the work of previous loans were utilized. It was eventually deemed more advisable to delegate one of these officials to take complete charge of the carrying out of such arrangements rather than rely at such a late date on the services of a new and untried appointee. To assist him in this work, the department availed themselves of the services of four expert men loaned by the Victory Loan organizations in Toronto and Montreal to, as it were, represent them in the work. These officers, whose names are as follows, were loaned to us from the organizations from the dates mentioned: Arthur Paterson, October 16, 1918; Thomas Holloway, October 16, 1918; James R. Adams, October 16, 1918; George E. Elliott, October 24, 1918.

Their services will be required until the final adjustment of the loan. They receive remuneration from the department at the rate of $2,500 per annum each, being the amount of remuneration offered for assistants in the advertisement of the Civil Service Commission.

On the 5th December, 1918, the Deputy Minister of Finance wrote the Civil Service Commission in connection with the employment of the above and asked for certificates for such employment which were issued by the commission and forwarded to the department.

4. Answered by No. 3.

SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT BOARD LOANS—NOVA SCOTIA.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How many loans have been made in Nova Scotia under the provisions of the Soldiers' Settlement Board?

2. How much money has been advanced?

3. How many applications have been rejected?

4. How many applications have not yet been dealt with?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Seven.

2. $12,900.

3. Two.

4. An accurate report on the number of cases pending cannot be arrived at owing to the difficulty in making inspections during the winter season.

CABLE CENSORSHIP.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough).

1. How many cable messages were refused transmission by the cable censorship at Hazel Hill and Canso, N.S., during the period of the war?

2. Is the staff of censors and decoders at the above named stations still in the employ of the Government? If so, what are their names and the amount paid to each during 1918?

3. What was the gross expenditure in connection with this service at Hazel Hill and Canso, N.S., since the war commenced to date?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Approximately 3,600. In addition approximately 30,000 messages have been the subject of inquiry by the Censors before

being passed, while the special attention of the Censors in the United Kingdom has been called to approximately 18,000 more.

2. (a) Yes.

(b) Censor.

H. A. Rice.

	Salary received during year 1918.
	$2,915.00
Assistant Censors.	
Major G. W. Hart	2,185 00
J. M. Rutherford	2,185 00
George Self	2,185 00
T. P. Hambling	2,185 00
Deputy Assistant Censor.	
R. G. Fraser	1,640 00
Decoding Clerks.	
A. H. Macdonald	1,277 50
F. M. Keating	1,277 50
E. W. Hadley	1,277 50
J. H. Cousins	1,277 50
H. S. Hart	905 00
Typist.	
E. St. C. Smiley	684 75
Total	$19,994 75

3. $106,423.30.

MAIL CARRIERS' BONUSES.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Were the bonuses, recently given to the mail carriers of the Dominion, all of the same amount, or were said bonuses of a higher amount for the mail carriers of the western provinces than those paid to the mail carriers of the Province of Quebec?

2. If so, what were the amounts of the bonuses paid to the mail carriers of the western provinces, and of the Province of Quebec, respectively?

3. Why were the amounts less in the case of the Province of Quebec mail carriers than those of the western provinces?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. No.

2. Letter Carriers in the Western Provinces were given an allowance of $100 from April 1, 1917, and an additional allowance of $200 from April 1, 1918, making a total of $300, in addition to the allowance of $180 which they have been receiving for a great number of years, and those east of the Great Lakes were given an allowance of $100 from April 1, 1917, and $250 from April 1, 1918, making a total of $350.

3. For a number of years postal employees west of Sault Ste. Marie have been given $180 living allowance in addition to their regular salaries by reason of the presumed increased cost of living in the West, but no corresponding allowance was made to those living east of Sault Ste. Marie. When therefore, the additional allowance or bonus of $200 from April 1, 1918, was given to the letter carriers in Western Canada, a bonus of $250 was given to those east of Sault Ste. Marie, being $50 in excess of those in the West.

LAND FOR SCHOOL PURPOSES.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How many acres of land have been set aside by the Federal Government for school purposes in each of the provinces of Canada?

2. What were the conditions under which the land was set aside?

3. What is the amount to the credit of each province on account of school lands with the Federal Government?

4. What amount has been paid by the Federal Government to each of the provinces to date on account of school lands?

5. What is the average amount received per acre in each province on account of school lands?

6. What is the approximate value of the school lands unsold in each province?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Manitoba, including unsurveyed territory, approximately 7,993,600 acres; Saskatchewan, including unsurveyed territory, approximately 8,421,000 acres; Alberta, including unsurveyed territory, approximately 7,798,600 acres.

2. Under provisions of chapter 23 section 22 of the Dominion Lands Act of 1872, which reads as follows:

"And whereas it is expedient to make provision in aid of education in Manitoba, and the Northwest Territories, therefore sections eleven and twenty-nine in each and every surveyed township throughout the extent of the Dominion lands, shall be and are hereby set apart as an endowment for purposes of education.

"1. The sections so dedictated shall be thereafter dealt with in such a manner as may be prescribed by law, and the same are hereby withdrawn from the operation of the clauses in this Act relating to purchase by private entry, and to homestead right, and it is hereby declared that no such right of purchase by private entry or homestead right shall be recognized in connection with the said sections or any parts or parts thereof:

"2. Provided, that on a township being surveyed should such sections, or either of them, or any part of either, be found to have been settled on and improved, then and in such case the occupant or occupants, conforming to the requirements of this Act shall be confirmed in such possession, and the Secretary of State shall select a quantity equal to that found to have been so settled on

from the unclaimed lands in such township, and shall withdraw the land so selected from sale and settlement, and shall set apart and publish the same as school lands, by notice in the Canada Gazette.

The Act has been amended from time to time to meet existing conditions, and these lands are now administered as provided for in sections 39, 40, 41 and 42 of the Act as amended in 1918.

3. To 1st March, 1919.

Manitoba	$4,786,982.40
Saskatchewan	7,478,298.49
Alberta..	4,732,052.72

4. To 31st March, 1918.

Manitoba	$2,576,568.52
Saskatchewan	2,397,978.45
Alberta..	2,108,440.35

5.

Manitoba..	$ 9.72
Saskatchewan	69,672,000
Alberta..	13.54

6. Including the unsurveyed territory and estimated at $7 per acre in Manitoba, $10 in Saskatchewan, and $9 in Alberta, which is considered a fair valuation, the approximate value of unsold school lands in each province is as follows:

Manitoba..	$49,778,000
Saskatchewan	69,672,000
Alberta	55,408,000

C.E.F. IN IRELAND.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Is the Government aware that, at this very time, soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force are being made use of for police duty in Ireland with a view to preventing a Sinn Feiners' insurrection?

2. If so, is it the intention of the Government to recall these troops from Ireland and to repatriate them as soon as possible?

Hon. Mr. MEWBURN:

1 and 2. This information is not available in Canada, but a cable has been sent overseas for the desired information.

TELEPHONE LINES IN DORCHESTER.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the Government constructed a telephone line in the parishes of Saint-Louis de Gonzague, and St. Cyprien, in the County of Dorchester?

2. If so, upon whose request, when, and by whom?

3. What is the cost of said construction?

4. Is said telephone line now operated by the Government?

5. If not, has the Government authorized anyone to operate said telephone line?

Hon. Mr. CARVELL:

1. Yes.

2. (a) On petition of the residents of the district; (b) 1917; (c) built by A. Martineau.

3. $4,211.68.

4 and 5. Both lines have been combined with the system of the Dorchester Telephone Company, which is operating them under agreement with the Government.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

1. What is the amount spent by the Government for each of the canals of Canada since Confederation?

2. What has been the cost of the upkeep of each of these canals, and what receipts have been received from each of them?

Mr. STEVENS:

1. Who is Director of Vocational Training? What is his salary? What is his profession? What special training had he to fit him as "Director of Vocational Training"?

2. How many units for Vocational Training are there in Canada? How many officers in each unit, and at what salary? What is their profession or training?

3. What is the cost of administration, (a) at Ottawa; (b) at each unit? What is the cost for maintenance? What was total cost per year? What is estimated cost for coming fiscal year?

4. How many applications for training have been received? How many from boys under age? How many have been refused training because they have been under age?

5. Does Vocational Training Branch give an agricultural course? Does Land Settlement Board give an agricultural course?

Mr. CANNON:

1. What amount have been paid for travelling expenses to the different members of the Government since 1st of November, 1911?

2. What are the names of the ministers who travelled, and the names of places to which they travelled?

3. What was the object of such journeys?

4. What amount was paid to each minister, and what was the date of payment?

UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

For a copy of the Report of the Military Service Council on the Administration of the Military Service Act, 1917, of April 4, 1918.

Mr. CHISHOLM:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, correspondence, and documents of all kinds in the Post Office Department, referring in any way to charges against the present postmaster of Brook Village, Inverness County, Nova Scotia, during the last four years.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Queens):

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, petitions, or other documents on file with the Post Office Department received since January 1, 1912, relating to the keeping open or closing of the Post Office at Sea View, P.E.I.

PAYMENTS TO SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the amount of $5,000 received by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick for the fiscal years 1915-16 and 1916-17 to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, should be returned by the said Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to the Treasury of Canada forthwith.

He said: Mr. Speaker, may I be permitted to recall the circumstances to the minds of hon. gentlemen who were present last session when a discussion took place on this subject? The circumstances in connection with this motion, the payment of $2,500 to cover the expenses of the Chief Justice of Canada in connection with attending meetings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, dates back to 1897, I think, when, at the suggestion of the then Minister of Justice (the late Sir Oliver Mowat) that amount of money was placed in the Estimates for the specific purpose of meeting the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice when performing the journeys referred to. From 1897 until a few years ago the item always appeared in the Estimates in exactly the language which I have stated. No variation was made in that language until the fiscal year 1915-16, when the wording was somewhat changed. Previously the vote had invariably read "Travelling expenses attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council." In the fiscal year 1915-16 the wording of the vote was made "Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council." I am aware that apologists for the respectable raid which has been made on the treasury to the extent of $5,000 will find in the wording of the vote—in its technical or legal phraseology—a loophole for an excuse for the payment of this money. I submit, however, that there can be no doubt that the express object for which this money was granted was to cover the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. If the Chief Justice did not attend these sittings he would incur no travelling expenses, and there would be no justification for his taking advantage of this vote. The Chief Justice rather seems to have held that view himself at one time. When I first brought this matter up in the House on 13th May, 1918, the Ottawa papers the next morning contained an interview in which Sir Charles Fitzpatrick characterized my statement that he had received this money when he did not go overseas as absolutely untrue. In the interview in question that gentleman used these words, as reported in the press:

When I do not go to London of course I do not receive the money.

I proceeded then to show from the Auditor General's Report that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had received money for travelling expenses, although he had not gone overseas in the two years referred to. On the 15th May, 1918, the Prime Minister without comment read to the House a statement which he announced had been placed in his hands by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. The statement drew attention to the fact that the wording of the vote in the fiscal years 1915-16 and 1916-17 had been changed to "Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council," instead of reading as formerly "Travelling expenses for attending sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council." I hold myself responsible, as a member of this House, for allowing this vote for this purpose to pass for the two years in question. In common with very many other members of the House I was present at that time, but I excuse myself for not raising objection to the vote on the ground that ever since 1897 this money had been voted without dispute, and the purpose of the vote was taken for granted. But, Sir, after I found out that the gentleman concerned had not gone overseas and had not performed the service for which the money was undoubtedly voted, after I found out that we had made a mistake in passing this vote in those terms, I do not feel like adding to my mistake an offence; because if I were to allow Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to retain, without question on my part, money for which he had given no service whatever to the country, I should be condoning what I regard as absolutely wrong. I do not propose to do that, consequently, I am making the present motion.

But, Sir, I did not think it would be necessary to bring this matter up in this House at all after what transpired last session. When we were in Committee of Supply, as will be found by reference to page 2507 of last year's Hansard, I asked if the Chief Justice had repaid, or would do so, this $5,000. The Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George E. Foster) who was overseeing the Estimates, said that an answer would be given later in the evening, and for the time being the item was allowed to stand. Later on the same evening the Minister of Trade and Commerce

brought the item forward again, but at my request allowed it to stand until the statement which he had promised was produced. I said in explanation of my request:

> But the fact that, in my judgment, five thousand dollars of the money of Canada has been taken out of the treasury by a man who happens to be Chief Justice of the Dominion of Canada, warrants me in saying that I will not consent to the passage of another item of $2,500 to that gentleman until I know that the money—

—that is, the $5,000 in question—

> —will be refunded.

Again the item stood, and when we came back to it a little later the right hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce gave a summary of the statement which he had promised earlier in the evening to give, and which I take it from reading Hansard he was authorized by the Chief Justice to give. I commend to your consideration a portion of that statement, the full text of which will be found on page 2536 of Hansard. The Minister of Trade and Commerce said:

> Sir Charles Fitzpatrick contends that he was entirely justified under the circumstances in accepting the allowance for the two years during which he visited London.

That is entirely true.

> But with reference to the last two years—

That is, the fiscal years 1916 and 1917.

> —as it appears to be the wish of the House that these amounts should be returned, he says—

That is, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick says,

> —that he is quite willing to return them.

I thought, Sir, when I had that statement from the Minister of Trade and Commerce expressing the words of the then Chief Justice of Canada, that I had an assurance which would make it unnecessary for me to refer to this matter again.

As soon as I received that assurance from the Minister of Trade and Commerce I withdrew any objection to the voting of the $2,500 for the next fiscal year. That is to say, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, having given the assurance of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick that this $5,000 would be returned, obtained $2,500 from this House for the purpose of paying the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice when he went overseas. Now, Sir, I am informed that that $5,000 has not been returned.

I am not a lawyer, Sir, and therefore am at a great disadvantage in arguing a case of this kind where a lawyer is concerned; but I think I have heard of such a thing as getting money under false pretences, and I do not know but what I will have the right to have the Minister of Trade and Commerce arrested for obtaining money under false pretences, because the committee did not consent to the $2,500 being voted until he had given the assurance from the mouth of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick himself that the $5,000 would be returned.

Now, Sir, the late right hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier in discussing this matter in the House on that occasion used these words:

> This item goes back to 1897. It was for travelling expenses. It appeared in the Estimates in that form until 1915 or 1916, when the item was changed from "travelling expenses" to "special allowances." Under this the Chief Justice received his travelling expenses to attend the court, when, in fact, he had not attended the court.

Of course, we are all aware of the fact that about the time that wording was changed it was not quite so healthy to travel across the seas as it had formerly been; the submarine menace was growing all the time. I do not know whether the former Chief Justice of Canada was a good swimmer or not, but at all events he apparently found it safer to stay on this side of the water—and he did stay on this side of the water. My contention is that, having stayed on this side of the water, he should not have drawn the $5,000 which he did draw, and which I say this House voted with the intention that it was to cover his expenses when he went overseas.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not want to use any strong language in referring to this matter; perhaps if I did Bourinot would step in and guarantee immunity to the gentleman to whom I refer. Bourinot does step in as a guarantor of immunity to certain men when they happen to occupy exalted positions in this country. There is more in this matter, Mr. Speaker, than the sum of $5,000. If there was one person more than another in the Dominion of Canada whose every action should have been beyond the slightest question, that person was the one holding the highest judicial position in the gift of the Dominion of Canada. I regret very much that the former Chief Justice of Canada has not lived up to his intention of last session as announced to this House by the Minister of Trade and Commerce. I do not know why he has not done so, but I can only come to this conclusion, that he must be in some doubt as to whether the members of this House think he should hand this money back, and the only way that I know of to remove that doubt is to get an ex-

pression of opinion from the members of the House on this motion, and that is what I propose to do this afternoon.

How can we as representatives of the people go back to our constituents and say that we have acted here in their interests in endeavouring to put down corruption or graft of whatever form or from whatever source, if we allow a man who occupies an exalted position in the country to pocket $5,000 for which he has never given one dollar's worth of service.

A short time ago we were told in this House that the prison doors were yawning to receive the profiteers and grafters of Canada. Yawning precedes sleep, and I suppose that this yawning is the physical manifestation preceding a somnolent condition. We must be asleep when our money is taken improperly by some one holding a high position. We have to answer for this to our constituents. Whether a man be the Chief Justice of Canada or a peasant, he has no right to receive money for which he has given no service. What service has Sir Charles Fitzpatrick rendered to Canada for the $5,000 which he received in those two years? Some members of the Government may deem it their duty to attempt to justify the receiving of this money by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick on the ground that it was voted by Parliament. I do not think that that would be good ground for the Government to take. Why not be fair with the general public? One does not add to his status as a man by refusing to acknowledge a mistake after he has made it; he certainly does not improve his position if he converts that mistake into an offence, and that is what I would feel I was doing if I permitted this gentleman to retain $5,000 for which he has given no service to the country.

This money was voted year after year for the purpose of paying the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice of Canada when he attended the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. No objection is made to his receiving that money during the years that he did go across the seas, but during the years that he did not go, he should not have received the money. I believe that the great majority of the people will support my view that, having received the money, it is his duty to return it to the treasury of Canada.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): Mr. Speaker, I intend to support the resolution, because if men holding high positions in Canada who get money that they did not earn or obtain money under false pretences are allowed to hold the money and go scot-free, how shall we prosecute the poor man, woman, boy or girl who steals because he or she is cold or hungry? I hope the Government will not condone any such action simply because the man in question holds a high position. Much of the unrest in Canada to-day is caused by just such actions as this. The poor man and the poor woman have the idea that because a man holds a high position he can get away with any amount of money. I hope the Government will see that this money is returned, as it should be if it was not earned.

Mr. PROULX: The member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) said that the wording of the resolution appropriating these sums of money was changed in 1915. Was that change made by the Government on its own initiative, or at the request of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick?

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN: (Acting Minister of Justice): The resolution which the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has brought to the attention of the House is of a character not only unusual, but involving upon this House a very deep responsibility. The adoption of the resolution unquestionably would very seriously challenge the personal honour of a citizen of Canada, and I am sure that no hon. member will feel like supporting it unless he is convinced that the necessity for the passing of the resolution is based upon the demands of reason and of justice.

The citizen involved is a man distinguished in our public life, I do not argue that on that account his honour should be any more jealously guarded against unjust aspersion by the House than should the honour of the most humble citizen of our country. But he is a citizen of Canada, and only upon the gravest cause should we take any step which would impugn his honour as a public man and as a citizen.

In order that the House may decide whether or not there is behind the resolution that principle which compels its adoption, that is whether or not the resolution is fair, just and right, it is necessary that I should review very hurriedly and briefly the circumstances connected with this matter. As I do so, what I say will be an answer to the question just addressed to the House by the member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx).

For some years the Appropriation Act of this Parliament contained a provision under which this House appropriated out of the Consolidated Revenue Fund, $2,500. I ask the House to note the exact wording of the resolution making this appropriation:

Travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attending sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.

In 1913-14 and 1914-15 the vote was put through in that form, and my information is that in those years the moneys were drawn by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick only when he actually attended the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, and not otherwise.

In the Appropriation Act of 1915-16, the words employed were as follows:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.

Precisely the same words were employed in the succeeding year, 1916-17, but for the following year, 1917-18, they were changed to read as follows.

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses when attending the sittings of the judicial committee of the Privy Council.

The House will observe that all three wordings are different. In the first, the word "allowance" is not used at all. The words employed are:

Travelling expenses . . . . attending sittings of the judicial committee.

In the second:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with—

And in the third:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses when attending—.

It is of the utmost importance that the House should have clearly in mind the three distinct wordings which the Parliament of Canada employed in voting the money in question. Under the first wording, while that was the language of Parliament, the money was drawn by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick only during the years that he attended the sittings of the judicial committee. Under the second wording, during those two years when it read simply: "to cover expenses in connection with—" Sir Charles Fitzpatrick drew the money although, as I am informed, he did not actually attend the sittings of the Judicial Committee. I am not sure what actually occurred in the succeeding year, but in that year he would clearly not have been entitled to draw the money unless he attended the sittings, because the wording is:

When attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Parliament is now requested to pass a resolution calling upon Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to return the money which he drew for the years 1915-16 and 1916-17. I am using only the language of moderation when I say that the House could not justify such a resolution upon any ground of its own mistake, upon any ground of wrongdoing whatsoever, unless that wrongdoing is attributable to the party who is to suffer. I am neither admitting nor denying mistakes on the part of this House. Parliament may have been mistaken, but the country must pay for the mistakes of Parliament—not a single individual. It is to the country we are responsible.

Mr. BURNHAM: Does the minister think the Chief Justice should profit by the mistakes of Parliament?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If my hon. friend will permit me to finish with the subject I am discussing, I will deal with that in a moment. Parliament has, in the history of this country, made many mistakes, as has every Parliament in the history of every country. Parliament has often voted money for which the country has not received the full equivalent in value. Sometimes Parliament has undoubtedly voted money for which the country has received no equivalent in value, and many instances could be cited of votes and actions on the part of this House where the country has not received full consideration for the money voted. We might, for example, go back to contracts made by this country in days gone by, contracts which to-day would, I think, by any dispassionate observer, be freely declared to have been improvident contracts on the part of this country, contracts by which this country suffered and in respect of which this country did not receive anything like the equivalent in value, and there have been instances in which no value whatever was received for the money voted. But in those cases I do not think Parliament would, for a moment, consider visiting the injury upon those who were parties to the contract. Suppose, for example, we were to go back to a contract made in 1903 and refuse to-day on behalf of the citizens of this country to recognize the legal rights that arose by virtue of that contract, such a course would be indefensible. I think, therefore, I am on safe and impregnable ground in asserting that whether Parliament made an error or not is not the question now. The question now is whether or not Parliament is justified in asking a man who, as a result of this appropriation, received money from this country, to return that money to the

treasury of Canada. Parliament could pass such a resolution and could take that position only if the party receiving the money should not in honour have taken it, was not entitled to it, or used any dishonourable means to get it; if, in a word, circumstances of dishonour attached to the receiving itself. Is that the case here? What was the intent of Parliament in voting the money? What must Parliament now say frankly was its intent in voting the money in these words? It is to be noted that a change was made in the wording. The old language which made the resolution apply only if Sir Charles attended, and only for travelling expenses, was abandoned, and Parliament, rightly or wrongly, employed other language instead, voting that money as a special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee. Parliament has, in other cases, employed similar language. Parliament employed similar language even in the case of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick himself, in connection with his duties as administrator in the absence of the Governor General. The language in that case is:

Special allowance to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court of Canada to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as deputy to His Excellency the Governor General.

My information with regard to the paying out and receiving of the latter money voted is that such was done in exactly the same way as in the case of the money paid out and received in connection with the appropriation now under discussion. My information is further that that language was employed in connection with the appropriation in question prior to the use of it in the present case. The question arises: Must Parliament now take the position of saying that, in changing its language and in using the language there employed, it did not intend that money to be drawn in the same way as in the previous case when the same precise words were used, but only when actual attendance on the Judicial Committee took place?

Mr MORPHY: Had Sir Charles Fitzpatrick any other duties than going overseas in connection with the Privy Council?

Mr. MEIGHEN: I did not hear the question of my hon. friend.

Mr. MORPHY: Had Sir Charles Fitzpatrick any duties that he could perform otherwise than by going overseas for the purpose?

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. MEIGHEN: I am not aware that he had. I see the point my hon. friend is making. The information given to me by the Department of Justice is that this allowance in connection with acting as deputy to the Governor General, has always been paid without inquiry at all as to whether any expenses were in fact incurred. This appropriation was in the same language, and evidently
3 p.m. was intended by Parliament in the same way. As to whether in the present instance consideration for the appropriation was actually given or not, it is quite true the same consideration could not be said to have been given as if Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had attended. But similarly, under the other vote, it is quite clear there might be cases,—I do not know whether there were or not,—in which it was not actually necessary for the Chief Justice of Canada to act as administrator of this country. It must, however, be kept in mind that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had to hold himself in readiness to go overseas, and it can quite forcibly be argued that the intention of Parliament was that an allowance should be made to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick either for attending, or in years when he did not attend, for holding himself in readiness. Before Parliament could be justified in passing a resolution which challenges the honour of a respected citizen of this country, Parliament should be fully convinced that there was moral wrongdoing on the part of the receiver of that money in taking the money so voted by Parliament under that wording, and it must remember that the same wording had been employed in other cases; and that no such course has ever previously been pursued.

Mr. BEST: Was the wording under which this money was paid out changed previously to the first year that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick did not attend the sittings, or at the end of the first year that he did not attend?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My information is that the first year that he did not go, but accepted the money, was subsequent to the change in wording. I am concerned with the legal aspect alone. My duty merely is to state the circumstances, and to ask Parliament to consider the principle which should inspire us in determining this question, and to point out that we should not be swerved from that principle by any but vital considerations, because, if there is one thing more vital than another it is that the Parliament of this country shall not lightly

and for insufficient cause challenge the integrity of a citizen of this country.

Mr. DENIS: The minister has pointed out the three different wordings in the Estimates. I should like to know whether the money was voted, no matter what the wording may have been, with the specific object and intent of paying the travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The intent of the vote must be gathered from the wording of the vote itself. The intent in other cases of similar wording has been as actually shown by the result—the paying of the money, although the attendance did not necessarily take place.

Mr. PROULX: I think it is merely playing upon words to say that the Chief Justice should have drawn the money when he was not put to the expense of attendiing the sittings of the Privy Council. It seems evident from the three wordings that this money was voted for the specific purpose of defraying the expenses of the trip overseas and the stay in London of the Chief Justice, in order that he might attend the sittings of the Privy Council. I think it would have been preferable if the Chief Justice had been obliged to file a monthly account of his expenses, just as the judges have to do under the Judges' Act. However, Parliament decided to vote a lump sum, but it was certainly the intention of Parliament that this sum was for defraying the expenses of the Chief Justice while attending the sittings of the Privy Council, and the Chief Justice should have known that that was the intention of Parliament. I should like to know whether the wording of the resolution was changed by the Government with or without a request from the Chief Justice.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I know of no request.

Mr. CHAPLIN: What explanation has the minister to make with regard to the statement of the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) that this money would be returned by the Chief Justice?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Perhaps I should read his exact words. On Page 2479 of last year's Hansard, in answer to a question, the Minister of Trade and Commerce read a letter from Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, the last paragraph of which reads as follows:—

> If, however, it is now considered that the intentions of Parliament have been misunderstood I can only say that I shall be prepared to return the amount of the allowance received during the two years in question. My first object is to avoid all personal embarrassment to you.

In effect, that means that if Parliament —or the Government, I presume, to whom he was addressing the letter—considered that he had drawn that money against the intention of Parliament he was prepared to return it.

Mr. EDWARDS: That is not the paragraph to which my hon. friend from Lincoln (Mr. Chaplin) refers.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order. I must remind hon. members that the House is in committee, and that the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) has the floor.

Mr. PROULX: The resolution in the Estimates of 1915-16 uses the word "expenses." It says: "Special allowance to cover expenses in connection with the sittings of the Privy Council." The wording of the resolution of the following year is a little different, because the words "when attending" are added. But both resolutions contain the word "expenses." I say that if the Chief Justice did not attend the sittings the money should not have been paid; I think the Department of Justice was negligent in not requiring a certificate showing the expenses incurred before paying the money.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The Department of Justice does not pay the money.

Mr. PROULX: Under the Judges' Act, the cheques are paid by the Justice Department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. PROULX: The certificates, at all events, go to that department.

Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

Mr. PROULX: Do they go to the Auditor General?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes, the cheques.

Mr. PROULX: Then the Auditor General should have required a certificate that the Chief Justice had attended the sittings of the Privy Council. We have been paying money for which we have received no consideration. According to law, there must be consideration in every contract. If you give a promissory note, and no consideration passes, and you are sued for non-payment, you cannot be made to pay because there was no consideration. In this particular case, there might be difficulty in getting back the money. The minister says that Parliament made a mistake. I do not

admit that Parliament made a mistake. I think the intention of Parliament was clearly expressed by the word "expenses," and I say that the Government was negligent in paying this money. I understand that last spring Sir Charles Fitzpatrick offered to return the money, and I certainly think it is the duty of the Government to request a refund of the amounts paid for which there was no consideration given. The Government are the trustees of the people, and they should take care of the people's money which is entrusted to them.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I quite agree with the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen), that the House should give most earnest consideration to this matter and have all the facts before it so far as possible, before supporting this resolution. I have given the question some attention by way of making careful inquiry in my own department and in the Department of the Privy Council with a view to ascertaining precisely what happened in connection with the changed wording in the Estimates of 1915-16. The Acting Minister of Justice has referred to the payment of the special allowance by the Finance Department upon the requisition of the Department of the Privy Council, of which the Prime Minister of Canada is the head.

As a result of my inquiry I have come to the conclusion that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick accepted this money in entire good faith, and I feel bound to say so to this House. I asked the Deputy Minister of Finance (Mr. T. C. Boville) for a statement of the matter which he has presented to me in a memorandum that reads as follows:

Department of Finance,
Ottawa, Canada, March 26, 1919.

Memorandum respecting Sir Charles Fitzpatrick.

In 1912-13 the sum of $2,000 was voted under the heading "Miscellaneous" for

"Travelling expenses to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council."

The sum of $2,500 was voted in each of the years 1913-14 and 1914-15 in the same wording for the service in those years.

The amount for 1912-13 was paid in two sums.

In 1913-14 the vote was not expended.

The amount in 1914-15 was paid in one sum on June 15, 1914.

In these three years it will be noticed that the allowance was to cover the travelling expenses of Sir Charles when attending the sittings of the committee.

When the estimates for 1916 were being prepared the wording of the item was changed so as to read,

"Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council."

This change in the wording of the vote was conveyed to the undersigned in January, 1915, by the Secretary to the Prime Minister who asked that the vote be amended to read in the same way as the vote for expenses in connection with the services of the Deputy of the Governor General, which, being in the nature of a special allowance, was paid monthly.

The effect of this change in the wording of the vote was to convert what had hitherto been a vote for travelling expenses for Sir Charles when attending the Committee into a grant which might be paid to him apart altogether from his attendance on the committee.

The expenditure of the vote naturally fell under the administration of the Privy Council Office, and was applied for month by month by that office in the ordinary process through the office of the Auditor General, who interpreted the vote as above, and authorized the payment month by month. The allowance was so paid during the years 1915-16 and 1916-17. Thereafter it was changed to read,

"Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses when attending the sittings of Judicial Committee of the Privy Council."

(Sgd.) T. C. Boville.

Now, a question has been raised as to what was the intention of Parliament and of the Government in this matter. I do not recollect distinctly concerning the change that was made; it is not in my memory that the matter was specially called to my attention at that time. I cannot say what the intentions of Parliament were, but of course those intentions would be gathered from the language in which Parliament expressed itself; and that language was contained in the Estimate, which my deputy points out was handed to him by the private secretary of the Prime Minister. I think it must be admitted that the deliberate change in the wording must have been intended to have some significance, else why would it have been made? I would ask the House to note that the item deliberately omitted the words "attending sittings," which had appeared in previous years as a limitation on the use of the amount, and also the qualifying word "travelling," which had formerly appeared in connection with the word "expenses."

Mr. PROULX: I would like the minister to observe that in the year 1916 the word—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member may rise to ask a question with the permission of the hon. member who has the floor, but for no other purpose.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The memorandum which I have for the year 1916 is this: "Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses—"

Mr. PROULX: Is it for the next year?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The question is raised whether, if the word "expenses"

occurred in the item, the money could be paid unless the expenses had been actually incurred and vouched for. On a certain assumption it undoubtedly could. It might have been the intention of those responsible for the change in the item that the vote should be an average vote of $2,500 per year for expenses. If the expenses exceeded the amount the Government would vote no more, and if they fell below the amount it would still be paid. Now, I would draw the attention of the House to what the late Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier said respecting this matter during last session. He was dealing with the question of a vote which purported to cover expenses and yet which was paid to the party to whom the money was voted, irrespective of whether or not the actual expenditure had been incurred. At page 2599 of last year's Hansard (unrevised) the late leader of the Opposition is reported as follows:

> This special allowance to the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court to pay his travelling and other expenses while attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council goes back to the days when Sir Oliver Mowat was Minister of Justice. At that time the then Chief Justice, Sir Henry Strong, went to England, to sit as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council under an Act which had been passed by the Imperial Parliament inviting judges of colonial courts to sit with the members of the Judicial Committee. Their services were required especially for colonial cases. The Government of that day, at the instance of Sir Oliver Mowat, placed an item in the Estimates of $2,500 to cover the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice. I do not remember the exact wording of the item, but it was to pay the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice while attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, or some such wording as that. This item goes back to 1897. It was for travelling expenses. It appeared in the Estimates in that form until 1915 or 1916, when the item was changed from "travelling expenses" to "special allowance." Why this change was made from "Travelling expenses" to "Special allowance" I do not know.

Then further on the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier said:—

> It so happened that in one or two years the Chief Justice was not called upon to attend a sitting of the Judicial Committee, and in those years he had received the money. If the item had been left as it was before with the wording "travelling expenses" the money could only have been paid when there were travelling expenses, but it was changed to "special allowance," and there the matter stands to-day.

The position therefore is that the Government, which is responsible for the bringing down of the Estimates, changed the wording which had prevailed up to 1915-16, and which covered the travelling expenses of the Chief Justice when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council to special allowance to cover expenses. I am advised, and believe, that the payment which was made by the Finance Department was legally and regularly made. That was the view of the Auditor General, who authorized the payment, and it was the view of the Privy Council officials who obtained the money from the Finance Department. My own view is—although I do not recollect the matter distinctly, I have had a good deal on my mind since 1915—that it was the intention that that language should be changed so as to authorize the payment to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick month by month. I do not pretend to say what was in the minds of other members of the Government, but reviewing the situation in the light of what I am informed by the responsible officials was done—the change in language which was made at the instance of the private secretary to the Prime Minister—I am of the opinion that the intention was to assimilate, or practically assimilate, this to the language of the vote to the Deputy Governor, and that the money was paid out by the Government and received by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick on that basis. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick received those payments monthly. He might have gone overseas in September, having received monthly payments from the end of March, or the first of April rather, the beginning of the fiscal year, up to that time, and continued to receive the monthly payments after that. His expenses might have been more than $2,500. If they had been, he would not have been entitled to receive any money in excess of the $2,500 which was specially voted. If, on the other hand, he did not go Overseas, then he was not to account for the money. Now, I do not say that that was the intention of the Government, or of any members of the Government, because my recollection of the circumstances is imperfect, but it is a possible explanation; and I cannot understand why the language of the item was changed from what it was in 1914-15 to what it was in 1915-16 unless there had been the intention to make a change. Why would the change have been made in the language if there was no intention of change? I am driven to the conclusion—

An hon. MEMBER: To get the appropriation.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am not speaking about the actual expenses incurred in attending the meetings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council; what I am talking about is the change which un-

doubtedly took place in the language of this item.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): I can explain that to the Acting Prime Minister.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend will have an opportunity of explaining it later. The hon. gentleman will pardon me, I have no desire to prevent him from asking me a question.

Mr. GAUVREAU: When the hon. gentleman has concluded I will give my explanation.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Now I have received this telegram from Sir Charles Fitzpatrick:

Quebec, March 25, 1919.

Sir Thos. White,
Actg. Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

You are at liberty to state when Mr. Edwards moves his resolution that I adhere to the explanation given in my letter to Sir Robert Borden and which was read in the House last session in answer to Mr. Nickle's questions. I then offered to return the money and I now repeat that if the Government or any of the officials through whom the money was paid will say that there is any doubt as to the regularity or legality of such payments I am prepared to return the money.

C. Fitzpatrick.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): That is not what he said last year

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have simply read the telegram which I received this morning.

Sir SAM HUGHES: To what officials does Sir Charles Fitzpatrick refer in his telegram?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I presume he would mean the officials who had to do with the paying out of the money, including the Auditor General. Now, permit me to make my position clear. I have stated that I believe that this money was paid out legally and regularly. I have also stated that I believe the money was received in good faith by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. I cannot speak as to what the intentions of Parliament were, except in so far as can be gathered from the language of the item which was passed by Parliament. It is for Parliament to say what its intentions were, if it so desires, with respect to this matter. I have endeavoured to make a clear statement of the facts, as I understand them, because I think the facts should be before Parliament, and if any of my statements are in error, or if there are other facts which I have not been able to ascertain by inquiry, and which are in the possession of any hon. member, I shall be only too glad if he will bring them forward for the information of the House in coming to a decision, because it is for Parliament to decide, on this important subject.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): I understood from the memorandum which the Acting Prime Minister read that the wording of this vote was changed in 1911?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: In 1915-16.

Mr. BEST: If Sir Charles Fitzpatrick drew money from the first of April, 1915, to the first of April, 1916, he did so for at least one year under the old wording?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I think not, because the Estimates are voted in advance.

Mr. C A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouta): When the Chief Justice of Canada was empowered to sit on the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council the wording of the estimate to cover his expenses was "travelling expenses." It was discussed between the Minister of Justice and Sir Charles Fitzpatrick that perhaps some day he would not be obliged to go, but that he would like to draw the money all the same. Then it was understood that the Minister of Justice would change the phraseology of the item under which, instead of "travelling expenses" the word "allowance" was used. The Minister of Justice adopted that word because he was a little scared that some of his best friends, like the hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) would kick against the vote. Thus under the term "allowance" even if the Chief Justice did not attend the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council he could draw the money voted. This is the explanation I have to give to the House.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with what the Acting Minister of Justice says, that the matter under discussion this afternoon should be approached with all the seriousness that this House can muster, because if the House should decide—and certainly no matter whether the House decides or not—that this money should be repaid, there is a certain reflection on the former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court in the fact of this discussion taking place this afternoon. The Acting Minister of Justice says that we should be particularly careful because the reputation of a man who occupies, and has occupied, a particularly high place in Canadian national life is under review. But I would draw the attention of the hon. gentleman to the fact that it was thought that Cæsar's wife should

be beyond suspicion because she was Cæsar's wife, and those who occupy high positions should be particularly careful to see that not even the shadow of a suspicion is cast over their lives, and certainly the fountain of justice should be careful to see that the waters of justice are in no way discoloured.

I do not agree with the Acting Minister of Justice when he says that the passing of this resolution will necessarily mean that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick committed a moral wrong when he took the money. I am sure the Acting Minister of Justice feels, as does every member of this House, that it would be a ridiculous contention, a contention that no court would uphold, that no lawyer would endeavour to sustain, that the misreading of an Act of Parliament—not intentionally misread, but misread in an honest belief—would be considered as fraudulent intent as distinct from misapprehension I am quite prepared to admit that if the former Chief Justice of the Supreme Court knew that the estimate, which is in effect a statute, did not and could not have carried the meaning that he put into it, then it was a fraudulent thing for him to have taken the money, and morally wrong. But if the Chief Justice believed that he had a right to take the money, then this House in asking him to return it is not saying that he did that which was in itself morally wrong, but is taking him at his own word when he told us in the letter to the Prime Minister, read by the Minister of Trade and Commerce last session, that if his view of the intention of Parliament was mistaken he was prepared to return the money to this House and to the country. And it is on that argument in part that I purpose this afternoon to direct my remarks.

What was the intention of Parliament? The Acting Minister of Justice says that that is the test which must be applied in discussing and deciding this matter. The Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) takes practically the same point of view. Now, what was the intention of Parliament, and how are we to reach a conclusion as to what it was? I would like to direct the attention of the House to this matter in some detail, because, as I said, Sir, in rising, this is an important matter—it is a matter that probably will have a wider bearing than those of us who are taking part in this discussion this afternoon have any idea. For I am satisfied that from one end of the country to the other the public have their eye on this discussion and on this vote. That is the conclusion I have reached from what I have heard in my own constituency and the questions that have been asked me in reference to the matter.

The late Sir Wilfrid Laurier told the House that in 1897—if my memory of dates does not fail me—the original vote was passed for the purpose of allowing the late Chief Justice Strong of the Supreme Court to go to England and attend the Privy Council. Regardless of what the original intention of the vote was, the vote from 1907 until 1914 was couched in this language:

Travelling expenses of Sir H. E. Taschereau—

Or Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, as the case might be.

—attending sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

That contemplated a journey being taken by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, and it contemplated his expenses being paid in reference to that journey. In 1911 that was the form of the vote, in 1912 it was the same, the same again in 1913, and the same language was used in 1914. In 1915 the vote was made to read as follows, and it will be found as item 320 of that year's Estimates:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

There was a change in the language, certain words were omitted from this vote, as the Acting Minister of Justice has said, and there was a change in the phraseology in that the words "attending sittings of the Judicial Committee" were left out.

How are you going to judge what was the intention of Parliament when that vote came before it? Now, Sir, the position I am taking this afternoon I am taking as having been a member of the House when that vote went through. If it went through and I misunderstood what the House meant, then I am prepared to take the responsibility that must be mine, because even if I were desirous of doing so I cannot evade it. But as the Acting Minister of Justice says, the question is: What was the intention of Parliament?

You can tell the way the wind blows very often by the direction of the smoke from the chimney tops, and you can tell the direction of the current by the straws that float upon the surface of the water, and I would draw the attention of this House to the fact that in the Sessional Papers of 1915 at page 92 this language is found:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Then there follow two perpendicular parallel columns, the first column headed 1914-1915 and below that the sum of $2,500; and the next column headed 1915-1916 and below it another sum of $2,500. That means to you, Sir, and to me and to every member of this House that when these Estimates were brought in the apparent intention was not that there was to be a new vote for a totally different thing, but that the old vote was being revoted and the purpose of the vote for 1914-1915 was being carried forward in 1915-1916.

But, Sir, I am not going to stop at that. The hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) often asks questions. In 1915 on the 19th day of March when he asked a question in this House, I very much doubt, Sir, if he understood how much light it might throw on the discussion that is taking place this afternoon. In column 1250 of Hansard for 1915 the following appears:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, $2,500.

Mr. PROULX: How many trips to London does the Chief Justice make each year?

Sir ROBERT BORDEN: He usually goes twice, so far as my memory serves me.

Notice the language, Sir. In answer to that question the right hon. the leader of the Government did not say that Sir Charles Fizpatrick went twice; the member for Prescott did not ask how many times Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had been in the habit of going to London, he asked the Prime Minister: "How many trips to London 'does' the Chief Justice make each year." "Does" is the present tense; it means something that is or is to be done. Sir Robert Borden answered: "He usually goes twice, so far as my memory serves me," That implied that the practice had been that the Chief Justice went twice to England, but the question of the member for Prescott and the answer of the Prime Minister, taken in conjunction with the fact to which I have just referred, certainly meant that this House had reason to suppose—and I as a member of this House did suppose—that that $2,500 was being voted for identically the same purpose as the votes which had been passed from 1911 until that year—and these are the years that I have been in this House.

Let us go further. I realized that it was a question that should be considered seriously, and after the member for Frontenac first introduced the subject into the House I was not satisfied with the answers given by the members of the Government who replied to the question or with the answers given to the public by the Chief Justice through the press. I placed on Hansard a series of questions, which I propose to read to the House, together with the answers given by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). If you turn to Hansard of 1918, pages 2478 and 2479, you will find the following:

Mr. NICKLE:

1. Is it the intention of the Government, in the event of voluntary repayment not being made by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick of the $5,000 paid to him to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council for the fiscal years 1915-1916 and 1916-1917, and not incurred nor disbursed, to take steps to recover this amount?

To which the answer was:

1. No. In view of criticism made in the House of Commons, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has offered to return the amount mentioned although he strongly urges that he is legally entitled thereto under the Act of Parliament which authorized the payment. In this opinion the Department of Finance and the Auditor General concur.

The second question was: "If not, why not?" To which the answer was: "Answered by No. 1." The third question was:

3. Does the explanation given by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in the memorandum read to the House by the Prime Minister on May 15, for the acceptance of the said sum, express the practice and policy of the Government?

To which the following answer was given:

3. The explanation referred to as given by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick does not purport to express any practice or policy on the part of the Government but merely the views of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick as to the effect of the legislation governing the payment of the allowance and his rights thereunder. In this connection the following additional letter has been received by the Prime Minister from Sir Charles Fitzpatrick:

"My Dear Prime Minister,—May I trouble you again with reference to the payments made to me as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council and as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General, to which objection has been taken by two or three members of the House of Commons as having been accepted by me contrary to the terms of the Parliamentary appropriation which authorized them.

"Dealing first with the 'special allowance to the Chief Justice to cover travelling and other expenses in connection with his services while acting as Deputy to His Excellency the Governor General'; as you are aware, during the early years of Confederation, the rule assigned to the Administrator one-half of the Governor General's salary. Subsequently this provision was considered neither just nor advantageous when applied to a Governor General when absent from his Government for a brief period either on leave or on the public service. As a result the emolument was reduced, about 1875, from one-half to one-fourth. In 1906 the question was again reconsidered and it was then decided that it did not comport with the dignity of the high

office of Representative of the Sovereign in this country to make abatements of his salary and the regulations which authorized them were revised so as to provide that in case the Governor General of Canada was absent for a period of thirty days consecutively there should be no reduction of his salary for reason of such absence. In 1907, another change was made which provides that in any case of absence although exceeding thirty days no deduction should be made for the period of twenty-nine days.

"Subsequently it was thought proper that the Administrator should receive a fixed sum of $2,500 in lieu of those allowances. At a later date the Government thought proper to increase this allowance from $2,500 to $5,000. That this latter amount was voted with the sanction and approval of Parliament cannot be doubted. For two years, the amount was put in the estimates and voted in the regular way and paid without protest. In the estimates for 1917-18 as originally brought down that special allowance was reduced to $2,500, but on the 19th September, 1917, as will be seen on reference to Hansard, p. 6049, an item was introduced in the supplementary estimates 'to complete the special allowance for the Chief Justice so as to make it equal to that allowed the previous years, $5,000.' This did not pass unnoticed. Mr. Edwards, M.P., drew attention to this increase and asked for an explanation, which explanation was given by Mr. Reid, the minister in charge of the estimates, who said it had always been the custom to pay this amount to the Chief Justice, 'and the Government feel that as he has been receiving $5,000 for the position it is hardly fair to reduce it at the present time.' It was also intimated that the payment was made partly for the purpose of implementing the salary of the Chief Justice. Although the allowance is made to me personally I have always paid over the proportion due to the senior puisne judge of this court who has acted as administrator during my absence.

"Dealing now with the two payments of $2,500 each, made to me as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council, one during the fiscal year 1915-16 and the other during the fiscal year 1917-18.

"The amounts in question were voted by Parliament as 'special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council'—the provision in regard to 'travelling expenses' attending sittings of the Judicial Committee, which was a condition of payment in previous years, having been intentionally omitted—and were paid in monthly instalments on application from the Privy Council office to the Auditor General who evidently certified in the usual course that the cheques asked for might be properly issued by the Finance Department.

"I perhaps never gave the matter as much consideration as I ought to have done but my view was that an allowance to cover expenses differed from the payment of actual expenses and was at any rate not dependent on their being incurred in any particular period."

Just a comment in passing. If the late Chief Justice of the Supreme Court admits that there was a condition precedent that the expenses should be incurred in some particular period, then, to use a slang expression, it was up to the Chief Justice to show that he incurred expenses at some particular time that exhausted the money for which this vote was made. The letter continues:

"The expenses of attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee must always vary with the length of the sittings and of course attendance is not necessarily confined to one sitting in the year. If there were more than one attendance in any one year the expenses would certainly exceed the allowance.

"The war has brought about an exceptional state of things. Though I have offered each year to go over to assist at the sittings of the committee I have been advised that it was not considered necessary to ask me to do so under the conditions actually obtaining.

"The fact that this exceptional position had continued for two years no doubt properly called for an alteration in the vote and this was made for the fiscal year 1917-1918.

"I do not think that any representation of mine can be responsible for the view which I suppose both the Auditor General and the Finance Department must have held that the payments could be properly made.

"If, however, it is now considered that the intentions of Parliament have been misunderstood—

I commend this remark to the careful consideration of the Acting Minister of Justice and of the Acting Prime Minister. I shall read it again from the beginning, so that it may not escape their attention:

"If however, it is now considered—

"Now" must mean the present time. (Reading):

—"that the intentions of Parliament—

That is, the intention of this institution, which is made up of its components parts called "members."

—"have been misunderstood—

That is, if the intention of members of Parliament have been misunderstood.

—"I can only say that I shall be prepared to return the amount of the allowance received during the two years in question. My first object is to avoid all personal embarrassment to you.

"Yours very truly,
"C. Fitzpatrick."

The next question I asked was:

4. Are payments of the nature of those referred to in the statement of Sir Charles made without the concurrence or consent of the Auditor General?

To which the answer was:

No. The allowances in question were drawn with the concurrence of the Auditor General of the Department of Finance.

The last question was:

If so, why?

The answer was:

Answered by No. 4.

As I have said, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has, in that letter, offered to return the money if the intention of Parliament has been misunderstood, and, I think, I have shown on general principles that the intention of Parliament was misunderstood in this respect, that the answer of the Prime Minister to the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx) indicated the members believed the vote was for expenses to be incurred. I think it is also abundantly clear, from the manner in which the vote was put in the Estimates, that the intention was not to direct the attention of Parliament that this was in any way a different appropriation. I want, however, to go just a little further than that. I want to endeavour to deal with this question as a matter of law. There is a fairly celebrated case from British Columbia called Rex versus Clement, where a judge, Mr. Justice Clement, got into considerable difficulty because he took a travelling allowance to which he was found not to be entitled, and as far as my inquiry has enabled me to find a precedent as to the meaning of the word "allowance," that case is the best guide I have been able to secure. I want to be quite frank with the House. As I said in rising, I approached this question from the point of view of a member of Parliament sincerely desirous of doing his duty. My first angle of approach was this—and I do not want to make myself out as being any better than any other man, because the chances are I am not,—I wanted to catch the spirit of the House, and I said to myself: What would I have done if that money had been offered to me? And I am not going to answer that question. Then I said: What would other members have done if that money had been offered to them? And I have asked, not one, but half a dozen members of this House, some professional men, some business men, some men on the farm, and they have all said: We do not think we should have taken it; the intention was that the Chief Justice should have attended the sittings, or else not have drawn the money. Satisfying myself, therefore, as to what I might call the common-place point of view of the ordinary man on the street, I turned to this question: What is the law on the matter? What are those special allowances? Are they increases in emoluments or are they indemnities? Are they intended to add something indirectly to a man's salary, or was it the intention to defray

4 p.m. expenses honestly incurred? I set out to find a precedent, because, as you know, Sir, when lawyers are in doubt on a point, they endeavour to find a case to elucidate their arguments. I found the case which I have mentioned, Rex versus Clements, heard in the Exchequer Court of Canada, as reported in the Canada Law Journal, volume 50, at page 67, and on appeal, taken to the Supreme Court by Mr. Justice Clement, the Supreme Court sustaining the findings of the court below, as to the meaning of allowance.

Mr. STEVENS: Sir Charles Fitzpatrick was a member of the Supreme Court.

Mr. NICKLE: While it is quite true that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick was a member of the Supreme Court at the time that judgment was given, my recollection is—and I want to be quite fair to His Lordship—that he did not give a judgment. The case was apparently argued before the other members of the court. As regards the interpretation of the law; the provision in the Judges' Act is not on all fours with the provision in the Estimates. The provision in the Judges' Act to which I have referred reads:

> There shall be paid for travelling allowances—

In the Estimates of 1915 the wording is "special allowances"—

> —to each judge, whether of a superior or county court, and to each local judge in Admiralty of the Exchequer Court, except as in this section otherwise provided, in addition to his moving or transportation expenses, the sum of six dollars for each day, including necessary days of travel going and returning, during which he is attending as such judge in court or chambers at any place other than that at which he is by law obliged to reside: Provided that:—
>
> (a) No judge shall receive any travelling allowance for attending in court or chambers at the place where he resides.

The facts are briefly these. Mr. Justice Clement had been living at Grand Forks and he moved to Vancouver. When the question arose as to where his residence was, he alleged that he had a technical residence at Grand Forks, but the court held that, in the terms of the statute, his residence was at Vancouver, and that he was, therefore, not entitled to the $6 a day mentioned in the statutes. But I want to emphasize this, that there was the "tail," if I may so express it to the section of the statute, stating definitely:

> No judge shall receive any travelling allowance for attending in court or chambers at the place where he resides.

This made it abundantly clear that if a judge resided in the place where he at-

tended court, he could not draw the $6 a day. But I quote from the case—and I do not want to obscure my argument—for the purpose of giving a judicial interpretation to the word " allowances." The case came first before Mr. Justice Cassels of the Exchequer Court, and He said:

> Now it seems to me too clear for any reasonable doubt that this statute only contemplates an indemnity to the judge for expenses he is put to in travelling from and to his place of residence. It never could have been intended as a statute to augment the salary prescribed by statute. The sole legal question is where was the place of residence of the defendant as contemplated by the statute during the time the charges in question were made?

Mr. Justice Cassels found that the place of residence was Vancouver, and he, therefore, disallowed the charge of $6 a day. The case went to the Supreme Court (see Western Weekly Report, Vol. VI, page 414), and Mr Justice Duff, Mr. Justice Anglin and Mr. Justice Idington gave a decision. Mr. Justice Anglin —see Western Weekly Report, Vol. VI, page 428—said:

> I agree with Mr. Justice Cassels that the purpose of this section was not to augment a judge's salary, but to indemnify him for outlay occasioned by travelling and absence from the place where he resides in the discharge of his duties.

The Supreme Court gave judgment confirming the point that the allowance was an indemnity for travelling expenses incurred, and that His Lordship, Mr. Justice Clement, was not entitled to draw his $6 a day during the time that he was in Vancouver. I, therefore, think that authority proves quite conclusively that the word "allowance" as used in a statute means compensation for something done or to be done on indemnity against expenses. I am forced to the conclusion that the expression "special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council," as used in the Estimates of 1915, and taken in conjunction with the method of the vote, as well as the remarks of Sir Robert Borden as elicited by the questions of Mr. Proulx, means that the allowance was given in condition that the expenses were incurred, and that His Lordship attended the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Mr. McKENZIE: Will my hon. friend tell me how proceedings in the Clement case were instituted?

Mr. NICKLE: Speaking from memory, a motion was passed in the Legislature of British Columbia, of which the Dominion Government apparently took notice, and an action was launched to recover from Mr. Justice Clement the money which it was alleged had been improperly paid to him.

Mr. McKENIE: Does my hon. friend not think that precedents are good procedure, as well as law?

Mr. NICKLE: If the hon. member will give me the opportunity I hope to prove to him before I get through why the procedure he suggests is not wise. The hon. leader of the Opposition is an ex-judge, with a reputation of knowing the law. He ought to know, and does know, that we lawyers make a very sharp distinction between mistakes in law and mistakes in fact. I do not believe he will dispute my law this afternoon when I state that if a mistake at law is made, you cannot recover money from a man to whom it has been paid through that mistake. My hon. friend nods his head; I therefore assume that he assents to the proposition that I have enunciated. But if a mistake in fact has been the cause of money being paid out in error, then the money may be recovered. Now the question is, was there a mistake in fact in this case? Was this money paid to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick under a mistake as to the facts underlying the payment? Were those who paid over the money under the impression that the Chief Justice had been to England? The Acting Prime Minister has told us this afternoon that those who paid over the money were under no mistake as to the facts; they knew Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had not been to England. There was no misrepresentation on the part of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick; he did not pretend he had been to England; it was known that he was in Canada. And the leader of the Opposition has the temerity to rise and ask me: Is not legal procedure just as good in this case as it was in the Clement case? He knows perfectly well that if an action were launched in the courts it would be ineffectual, because this Parliament, represented by the Department of Justice, would be compelled to admit that they knew that the Chief Justice had not been overseas; they could not show that any representation to the contrary had been made, and on the very principle of law which I have just enunciated and to which my hon. friend has assented, the money could not be collected as a matter of law. We are not discussing these votes in any narrow, legal way, but on the broad ground of national honesty and righteousness, if I may say so.

I wish to direct a few remarks to another phase of this question. I want to say that whoever drafted Sir Charles Fitzpat-

rick's letter is a marvellous draughtsman. It is as subtly drawn a document—I did not say corruptly—as the pen of a man could draw. I want to read my questions and the answers again, because the leader of the Opposition has directed my attention to a certain point:

1. Is it the intention of the Government, in the event of voluntary repayment not being made . . . . . to take steps to recover this amount?

Sir GEORGE FOSTER:

1. No. In view of criticism made in the House of Commons, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has offered to return the amount mentioned although he strongly urges—

Strongly urges what? Not that he was entitled to receive the money, but:

—that he is legally entitled thereto.

What does legally entitled thereto mean? It has a double-barrelled meaning. It may mean, entitled to receive or entitled to retain. I am quite prepared to admit that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is legally entitled to retain the money, because possession is nine-tenths of the law, and self-possession the other one-tenth. But the Chief Justice does not say that he is entitled to the money. He qualifies his answer by saying "he is 'legally' entitled thereto." What does "legally entitled" mean, to the man who knows his law? It means that if you enter the courts of law, with their rules and precedents, you could not recover the money as there had been no mistake of fact influencing payment. He qualifies the word "entitled" by the word "legally," and the hon. member knows that the Chief Justice is legally entitled to retain that money because he has got it, and we cannot show there was any mistake in fact.

Let us look a bit further. I was not as subtle in drawing those questions as I should have been, but I have learned since. One question I asked was this:

Are payments of the nature of those referred to in the statement of Sir Charles made without the concurrence or consent of the Auditor General?

I made a slip when I used the word "concurrence." I should have used the word "certificate," but I did not. In answer to my question Sir George Foster replied:

These moneys were paid in monthly instalments on application from the Privy Council office to the Auditor General, who evidently certified—

He does not say "who certified in the usual way," but he uses the word "evidently." Evidently from what? Evidently because the money was paid over. I understood the Acting Prime Minister to say this afternoon that the items were never certified but went through the ordinary course, and the Acting Minister of Justice says: This House is estopped this afternoon because the payments went through in the ordinary course. I ask him, what do we private members know as to how items are paid?

Mr. MEIGHEN: My hon. friend will please quote me correctly. I never made any such statement.

Mr. NICKLE: I have no desire to misquote him. If my hon. friend did not say that, I must have taken down incorrectly what he said. If we were estopped, it would mean that we were absolutely prevented from going further at law. But I say this House is not estopped—and I am using the word not in its narrow, legal sense, but in a different sense altogether—I say we are not reasonably prevented in common sense and decency from inquiring into this matter—

Mr. MEIGHEN: I say the same too.

Mr. NICKLE: —and taking a vote on it, simply because payments were made in the ordinary course of which we knew nothing.

There is one other point to which I wish to draw attention. I am going to vote for this resolution for three reasons: First, because as a member of Parliament I certainly never intended, and I do not think Parliament intended—I do not know what the Government intended—to increase Sir Charles Fitzpatrick's salary by $2,500 in the years 1915, 1916 and 1917, when we were preaching economy and thrift from the housetops. If the House did intend that, the members who were present in 1915, 1916 and 1917 must testify their intention by their votes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: What is his salary?

Mr. NICKLE: I am not discussing his salary. I do not care whether his salary is $100,000 or $100. It is purely a question of principle, and I approach it from that standpoint.

The Acting Prime Minister read a telegram this afternoon which purported to be a repetition of the offer made by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to this House through the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) in 1918, and I shall show how vastly different are the two messages of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, and what a wide divergence there is between the principles enunciated in 1918 and those enunciated by telegraph this afternoon. If those hon. members who are not lawyers will listen

carefully and bear in mind what I said a few moments ago as to the difference between a matter of law and a matter of fact, they will perceive the subtlety that lurks in the message which we have heard this afternoon. In the year 1918 Sir Charles Fitzpatrick said this: "If, however it is now considered"—Let us give the benefit of the doubt, Mr. Speaker, he may mean, considered by the Government, or by the House, but he admits that the intention of Parliament should be accepted—"if it is now considered that the intentions of Parliament have been misunderstood, I can only say that I shall be prepared to return the amount of the allowance received during the two years in question." That, I take it, is tantamount to saying: "If Parliament says the money should be returned I bow to the judgment of those who voted the money and return it to the country, as Parliament thinks it should be returned; I took the money believing I had a legal right to it, but if Parliament thinks otherwise, I am prepared to accept its decision."

The Acting Prime Minister read a telegram this afternoon in which Sir Charles Fitzpatrick says: "You are at liberty to state, when Mr. Edwards moves his resolution, that I adhere to the explanation given in my letter to Sir Robert Borden and which was read in the House last session in answer to Mr. Nickle's questions." What does he adhere to? He adheres to his explanation; but he makes a radical departure from his offer of 1918 to return the money if Parliament asked for its return. On March 26, 1919, there is no such offer. The offer now, I repeat, is in effect this: That if the Government, or any of the officials through whom the money was paid will say that there is any doubt as to the regularity or legality of such payment, he is prepared to return the money. In one case he gives the positive assurance that he will return the money if Parliament expressess a desire that it shall be returned owing to a misunderstanding of its intentions. In the other case he falls back on the narrow legalism, "I will return it if you can show by law that I should not have received it or retained it." The two positions, Sir, are as far apart as the poles.

Now, I have spoken longer than was my intention, and I should not have gone as fully into the matter as I have done had it not been for the objection of the leader of the Opposition. I think that this is a question on which we should have a vote this afternoon entirely on principle. The hon. member will either vote this afternoon that this money shall be returned because Parliament never intended that it should have been received by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick unless the expenses for which it was intended to be voted had been incurred, or he will endeavour to side-step the issue. I, Mr. Speaker, am going to vote for the resolution because I believe the intention of the members of Parliament was that the money should not have been paid unless the expenses were incurred. I am of opinion that that was the intention of this House in the broad way in which Parliamentary intentions should be construed. If I took the narrow legalistic view and argued from the standpoint of precedent I should conclude that the money ought to be returned; and I say frankly, as a lawyer and on my reputation as such, that I do not believe this money could be recovered in a court of law, for the reason that I have given, the money having been paid over without a mistake in fact. But I am going to vote for the motion for another reason,—and I am sorry that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick did not pay the money back in 1918.—I am going to vote for it because I believe this will be an object lesson to those who occupy high positions, that they must stand out fearlessly before the people and show by conduct that they are above and beyond the temptations that they condemn in others.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I must say at once that I am not rising to speak on this question as the leader of the Opposition, nor a partisan Although I may have a poor reputation in many respects, I think that in this House at least I am reputed to be a good partisan. But it is not as a partisan that I shall speak. I shall address myself to the observations of the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). He did not understand my question or he would not have taken any exception whatever to what I said. The hon. member was quoting a precedent in law—the case of Rex vs Clement. That case was one in which Government money was obtained by a judge who, it was contended, should not have received it, and it was considered by the authorities that that money should have been refunded. From that case the hon. member quoted authoritatively the judicial definition of "allowance." I ask him the question: If he is quoting good law from that case as to what allowance is, is not the manner in which the Government went about getting that money back a question of precedence that we should follow in this

case as well? If that case is light and guidance as law, is it not also light and guidance as to procedure? I do not think there is anything offensive about that question. My hon. friend said the leader of the Opposition had the temerity to state that fact in this free Parliament. If that is a matter that requires extraordinary temerity, or temerity of the most ordinary kind, I do not understand my position in this House; and I think my usually perfect and complete friend should rather apologize for the way in which he construed my remarks. I did not intend to interrupt the hon. member, but simply to suggest that this House, although the highest tribunal, and nominally the highest court in the land, is in the broadest sense of the word, not a court at all. Consequently, if a case which has run the gauntlet of the Exchequer Court of Canada and the Supreme Court of Canada, is quoted to this Parliament as an authority on any question, the whole case, I contend, must be applied to the subject under discussion. And if in the case of Judge Clement it was proper that he should be haled into the court before his peers—according to the procedure provided by our constitution and the British constitution, which recognizes the fact that no man can be affected in his person or property except by fair trial before his peers—will the hon. member for Kingston say that this Parliament, because of its high prerogatives, should adopt a different course and try a person in his absence?

Mr. NICKLE: May I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McKENZIE: Certainly.

Mr. NICKLE: Does my hon. friend suggest that if a man elects to be tried in a certain forum, that forum has no right to take him at his word?

Mr. McKENZIE: I certainly say that a man's choice of tribunal does not confer jurisdiction upon that tribunal. I may be charged with murder and, knowing a friendly magistrate somewhere in Hull or in Ottawa or elsewhere, I might admit to the sheriff my guilt in the matter but request to be tried at the place I might designate.

Mr. NICKLE: May I ask another question? Does not the hon. member's parallel fail, in that trial of murderer is regulated by statute, whereas the recovery of any amount paid by Parliament is not so regulated?

Mr. McKENZIE: We have a precedent—

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Mr. NICKLE: Not precedent; what is the law?

Mr. McKENZIE: We have a precedent.

Mr. NICKLE: Not a precedent.

Mr. McKENZIE: Yes, we have a precedent, which is the law. That is the famous case of Rex versus Clement. If my hon. friend from Kingston will please listen to me, these moneys which are paid as allowances are voted every year by Parliament. Allowances are paid out by the authorities to the judges, and if they are paid in a place where they have no right to be paid they are in exactly in the same position as the moneys which were paid to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick from a vote of this House—it is a vote of the House in both cases, and in both cases the money paid out by the officers of the Government.

Mr. J. H. BURNHAM (Peterborough West): Will the hon. gentleman give us his views about the failure of a "consideration"?

Mr. McKENZIE: I might well have expected that the rapid, running mind of my friend from Peterborough would get so far ahead that I could not hope to answer him. By this time next week I may catch up to the hon. gentleman.

I was saying, Mr. Speaker, when my old-time interrogator came to his feet, that these cases could not be more alike. I want it understood at once that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick does not require, or claim, any defence from me, nor am I here to act in any capacity of the kind, but I want to make this perfectly clear: That the moneys paid out to Judge Clement, and the moneys paid out to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick are identically in the same position—they are public moneys paid out to a judge in the one case, and public moneys paid out to a judge in the other. Now, the Clement case in an older one—that is to say, the initiation of the procedure to get the money back is of an older date. What was done in that case? I presume that a fiat was obtained by somebody from the Crown, proceedings were commenced in the Exchequer Court in behalf of the Crown, and the case was tried out properly in court. Let me say to my hon. friend from Frontenac, or to anybody who is interested in this matter, that those proceedings having been established by the authorities, the course taken in the Clement case was the proper one to follow. Why depart from it and ignore the Exchequer Court, ignore the Supreme Court of Canada, ignore the Supreme Court of Ontario—this proceeding having happened in the province

of Ontario, and come under the jurisdiction of the Ontario courts? I say that it is entirely irregular, at all events it is entirely a departure from the precedent that was established in the case of the Crown against Judge Clement. In that case, Judge Clement, I am sure, had the opportunity of coming before the court and making the best explanation he could, and the issue was tried out; the pros and cons having been heard. But a forum is selected here at which Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is not present, and at which he is not given a chance to tell his own story or to put up his defence. That being the case we are not within the safeguards and bulwarks which are given to every British subject, and which provide for a man being heard by his peers before any judgment is given against him which affects either his person or his property. That is the position which I take as to the matter of procedure.

Now, my hon. friend from Kingston (Mr. Nickle) is not happy in his reference to the facts. The hon. gentleman says that this is a case in which the money was paid by a mistake of law, and that being so we cannot go into a court of law to recover it. That is perfectly good law as far as our courts are concerned. But if the money has been paid in consequence of a mistake of fact, of course we can get it back. But the hon. gentleman, however, says that there was no mistake of fact, that we knew all about it; consequently we cannot plead ignorance of the facts. Well, the Prime Minister of this country is supposed to speak for the Government, and when we get a statement of the facts relative to a Government transaction from the Prime Minister, I am not aware that there could be any higher authority, and I submit that we have a right to accept the facts as stated by him. The hon. member for Kingston read an answer from Hansard, in which the Prime Minister gave it as his opinion that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick went twice a year to attend the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. Now, that is the knowledge of the Government on this matter. Well, if it turns out that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick did not go, and that he got the money under a mistake of fact,—the Prime Minister having stated that the Chief Justice was going to the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council twice a year, whereas he did not go at all, and the officers of the Government, under the belief that he was going, paid him the money,—then there is clearly a mistake of fact, and the law which my hon. friend from Kingston quoted does not stand in the way of going to the Exchequer Court, having the facts determined, and the case properly tried. There is another thing that I wish to submit: This is the High Court of the Parliament of Canada. We are here sitting—those of us who are not burdened with the responsibility of judicial office—like the jurors in court, and those hon. gentlemen who are familiar with court practice know that the jurors must take their law from the judge. He may be absolutely wrong, but the jurors sitting there, having heard the facts of the case, must take their law from the judge; he tells them what the law is. I regard myself as a layman and a juror sitting in this House to-day. I hear such facts as are presented, and I am bound to receive the law from the Minister of Justice. I must apply a logical, clear-cut analogy to my position here to-day as to my position if I were sitting in court, under a judge, as a juror. The Minister of Justice in this case gives us the law, and he tells us that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick was entitled to receive this money, that he got it absolutely honestly under the prevailing rules.

Mr. NICKLE: Did not the Minister of Justice use the expression "legally entitled?"

Mr. McKENZIE: He said Sir Charles Fitzpatrick got the money properly.

Mr. NICKLE: Did he not use the expression "legally entitled?"

Mr. McKENZIE: I am not aware that he said any such thing. I do not know how a man gets a thing properly unless he gets it legally.

Mr. NICKLE: Don't you?

Mr. McKENZIE: No, I do not. I must admit that I am not up to trisecting things like the hon. member for Kingston, but I thought that legally, honestly, and properly were concomitant and conjunctive terms and went together.

Mr. NICKLE: Not overlapping.

Mr. McKENZIE: But now it appears we can get a thing legally and justly which is not properly got. If that were so we would not have the same high opinion of our laws that we have to-day. But whatever the interpretation the Minister of Justice puts upon the case, he tells us this money was legally obtained, and, as far as I am concerned, taking the law from him, and I have nothing to do but with the facts, I

think we have to stop there. Let us transfer ourselves for a moment to the House of Commons in England, and consider a question of this kind coming up there. In England, perhaps, the officers of the law fill a higher position in the estimation of Parliament than they do with us. Whether they do or not the functions of the law officers are the same. If a question of this kind comes before the British House of Commons, where questions of law and fact are involved, the Parliamentary officers of the law hand down a certain decision upon the point and that is the end of it: Their decision is accepted and there the matter stands. Now, we have the decision of the officers of the law of this Parliament to the effect that this payment is all right, and that we have nothing to do with it—that it is the payment of a mere indemnity to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, just the same as the indemnity that he received as Deputy Governor.

Mr. BURNHAM: Is the hon. gentleman aware that the Acting Minister of Justice said this afternoon that this was not a legal question at all?

Mr. McKENZIE: I was not aware of that, otherwise I would not have said what I did.

Mr. MEIGHEN: I never made such a statement. I said I thought a question of law was involved, and I also said that the honour of a citizen of this country was involved.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is worth while to find that the hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Burnham) is wrong for once. It is worth while to discuss the whole thing to obtain that knowledge.

I was just saying that this was according to the interpretation that was put upon it by the officers of the law, that it was by way of indemnity to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick just the same as the allowance that was made to him as Acting Governor General. If that is the interpretation, I do not think we have anything further to say about it.

One more word, Mr. Speaker, my hon. friend from West Peterborough asked me whether there was any consideration for this money. I think that the duties thrown upon Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, or upon any other Chief Justice of this country attending the sittings of the Privy Council, are very onerous indeed, and that it would be absurd that merely his travelling expenses should be paid. Every professional man in this House who has special responsibilities will understand that he must have certain qualifications and make special preparations for those duties which he has to perform. If a judge of one of the Ontario courts is going on circuit he has to prepare himself for that duty, and for that duty only, and for that duty he is paid; but if he is asked to go and sit in the Privy Council, what has he got to do there? He has got to know something about the laws of Australia from which appeals come, something about the laws of New Zealand from which appeals come, something about the laws of South Africa, India, and every other colony,—he must acquaint himself with the laws of all these different countries, otherwise he is rather an impediment and a nuisance and a danger to that court than a help.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Might I ask the hon. member a question?

Mr. McKENZIE: Certainly.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Does the Canadian representative on the Privy Council have anything to do with colonial cases other than those from Canada?

Mr. McKENZIE: As far as I understand it, he sits upon that court and he hears every case that comes before it, and cases come before it from every country that I have mentioned. For that reason he must have a knowledge of the laws of those different countries, and certainly the duties which he has to perform are very onerous. Therefore I think there was good consideration for any further compensation that might have been given him.

Apart from that, let me say at once that if the words of this vote are to be interpreted, let them receive judicial interpretation as in the Clement case. There is no question of difficulty in getting this before the Exchequer Court, from the Exchequer Court to the Supreme Court, and from the Supreme Court to the Privy Council. That is the place where this matter should be dealt with, and not in this House. Then we shall have a full and proper interpretation of what is meant by the language of this vote. If there is anything wrong, it is not traceable to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, rather it is traceable to the Prime Minister of this country—at all events, it is traceable to his office. We have heard from the memorandum handed to the Acting Prime Minister by his deputy minister. that word came to him from the office of the Prime Minister that a change was to be made in the language of the Estimates for years past so as to convert this from a matter of actual expense to an indemnity. There the fault is traceable, if fault there be, and from the

time that the Prime Minister of this country, through his secretary, passed that word down to the Department of Finance, where those Estimates were prepared, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had a perfect right to take advantage of the change of mind of the Prime Minister and of all the officials of the Government by which he was receiving this money. There is not a scintilla of evidence that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick ever asked for that change. Is it fair, without giving him a chance to be heard in one of our courts, that we should pass a condemnatory resolution in this House? I suggest to my good friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), he having heard the case now, and having had all the satisfaction that he can possibly get out of it, and knowing, as he does from this Clement case, that there is another and a proper way of getting this money back, that he withdraw this resolution.

Mr. WILLIAM S. MIDDLEBRO (North Grey): Mr. Speaker, in my opinion the whole matter resolves itself down to a question of interpretation. It is a fundamental rule of law that the meaning of an Act of Parliament must be gathered entirely from the words in which it is expressed, and there are many cases where the intention of Parliament has not been carried out by the expressions used in the statute. I think a very good illustration of that is what occurred in this House a couple of years ago, when in passing the Act to take over the Quebec and Saguenay railway it was enacted that the Government should pay the cost of that railway as determined by the Exchequer Court, and an hon. member of this House asked a question of the Minister of Railways and Canals who then had the Bill in charge, if the word "costs" included interest paid for money borrowed during the time of construction. The hon. Minister of Railways and Canals said: Yes, cost would cover interest paid by the contractors for money borrowed during the time of construction. When the case came before the Exchequer Court, that court decided that interest paid during the course of construction did not enter into the question of cost at all as a matter of law. So that I say the interpretation of what we meant when it goes to the courts is left to the courts, and I am willing to argue this case upon that ground.

I contend that the three clauses mean practically the same. The first clause says:

Travelling expenses of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick attending sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

The next clause says:

Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

If the words "to cover expenses" had not been in there would be no doubt whatever in my mind that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick would, as a matter of law, be perfectly entitled to receive the $2,500, which would simply be an addition to his salary as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. But it is not given to him in that way; it is given to him to cover expenses. We do not require a statement as to whether his expenses are more than that amount or less than that amount, but the money is given to him for that special purpose.

The last clause says:

Special allowance—

The same words again.

—to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses when attending the sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council.

Now, I am assuming that there are no expenses in connection with his services as a member of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council unless he does go to England, and if there are not, then he is not entitled to those expenses, because I find in this memorandum prepared by the Justice Department that the word "allowance," as defined in "Wharton's Law Lexicon" which, as members of the legal profession are aware, is the standard legal dictionary, as "something conceded as compensation." If a man has incurred no expense, he cannot claim any compensation for expenses. According to the terms of the resolution appropriating these amounts, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, as a matter of law, is not entitled to the $5,000 which he received during those two years. In saying that I am not saying anything disrespectful of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. To a certain extent he was justified in taking these amounts because of the change which was made in the wording of the resolution. I do not know whether the change was made inadvertently or purposely, but whether inadvertently or purposely, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick would naturally believe that it had been made for the purpose of enabling him to get that compensation. Personally, I never intended, and I doubt whether any other member on this side of the House intended, that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick should receive $2,500 to cover his expenses in going to England when he did not go to England and did not incur any expense. For these reasons I must vote for the resolution of the member for Frontenac.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (North Perth): I have listened with a good deal of interest to the discussion this afternoon. The legal aspect of this matter has been put before the House in all its phases by the member for Kingston(Mr. Nickle), the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) and others; I desire to approach the matter entirely from the point of view of the remark of the Acting Minister of Justice (Hon. Mr. Meighen) that the honour of a citizen is involved. I do not know that my thoughts will lead to the same conclusion as his, but I do feel that the honour of a citizen is deeply concerned —more deeply because the citizen in question sat at the fountain-head of justice as the Chief Justice of the highest judicial tribunal of Canada, the summit of all law That court, above all courts in the land, and the Chief Justice of that court, of all officials, should keep clean.

Any one listening to the discussion to-day could not help but feel that there has been a lot of specious argument around the question of legality. Whether the action of the Chief Justice was legal or not, was it honourable in him to take the money? I think that is the whole question. He himself did not think that it was—at least, he had doubts, because in the letter read by the member for Kingston the Chief Justice said that if Parliament considered that he should not keep the money, he would return it. The matter is, therefore, "out of court;" he has sent it back here for the opinion of this House.

Let us see what the member for Frontenac asks us to do. His resolution reads:—

That, in the opinion of this House, the amount of $5,000 received by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick for the fiscal years 1915-16 and 1916-17 to cover expenses in connection with the udicial Committee of the Privy Council, should be returned by the said Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to the Treasury of Canada forthwith.

Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has said two things about returning this money. First, he said that if the House was of tthe opinion that he should return it he would do so. After thinking the matter over for a year, he sends in a telegram which reads:—

You are at liberty to state when Mr. Edwards moves his resolution that I adhere to the explanation given in my letter to Sir Robert Borden and which was read in the House last session in answer to Mr. Nickle's questions. I then offered to return the money—

He then offered to return the money if Parliament was of the opinion that he should. Note what he says now in this telegram, from which I quote further:—

I then offered to return the money and I now repeat that if the Government or any of the officials through whom the money was paid will say that there is any doubt as to the regularity or legality of such payments I am prepared to return the money.

I thank the Acting Minister of Justice for the phrase "the honour of a citizen is at stake." This citizen has apparently forgotten his own honour and has descended to depending on regularity and legality. There is no doubt in the mind of any one in this House that that $2,500 a year was voted to enable the Chief Justice to go overseas and perform certain duties, and if we look at the matter in a fair way we will realize that no honourable man would take that money unless he did go overseas to perform those duties. That is the whole issue; there is no legal quibble about it. The member for Frontenac wants to get the opinion of this House on the question whether it is honest and decent and right that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick should keep that money, and the opinion of the House should be given in no uncertain way. It is then up to him to say: "The House of Commons, having been asked by me to give their opinion, has declared, by a majority vote, that I, sitting as the Chief Justice of Canada, while well cared for by the Government, being in receipt of $17,500 a year in all, should return the money voted to me during two years for expenses that were not incurred, for the performance of services that were not rendered." The Acting Minister of Justice said to-day, in answer to my question, that there was no duty to be performed in this connection except that of going overseas to attend the meetings of the Judicial Committee. So that the late Chief Justice has taken $5,000 out of the treasury without having turned a hand for it. Probably he did it legally; probably he did it regularly. I am inclined to agree with the member for Temiscouata (Mr. Gauvreau) that there may have been some conversation between the Chief Justice and some one else—I would not say with the Minister of Justice. But Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is astute enough to frame up anything for his own benefit to work through somebody—in a way that people understand. The point I make is that we are not seeking to sue him for this amount. If this resolution carries, the opinion of this House will be conveyed in the public press or through Hansard to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. His question will be answered, and the honour of the citizen will be up to the man whose honour is at stake. If Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, after that opinion has been expressed, feels that it is worth his while to keep the money of Canada, I, as a citizen of Canada, will say:

You are very welcome to it, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick; you will answer to yourself and your conscience in attempting to hold on to that which you did not properly obtain.

Mr. ROBERT J. MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): Sometimes there come up for decision by members of Parliament, questions in which the easier course would be for a member to refrain from voting. I must confess I am in some doubt on this question, and I would find it a good deal easier to leave the chamber, as I felt tempted to do, so as to miss the vote if a vote takes place, but I generally do not like to run away from risks, if I may so term it. I have listened to the arguments put forward this afternoon by members on both sides of the House as intelligently as an ordinary layman can listen to the arguments of lawyers. I do not pretend to be able to follow the subtleties—that was the word used, I think, by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle)—of lawyers' minds. I have listened to the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) and the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) explaining the position, not of the Government, but of their legal advisers in this matter, and my interpretation of their remarks is to the effect that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had, at least, a legal, if not a moral, right to this money. If we take it into account that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had a legal right to this money—and even my hon. friend (Mr. Morphy), who thinks this money should be returned, admits that he has a legal right to it—and if we are demanding it back from Sir Charles Fitzpatrick simply on the moral ground, then it should be the duty of this Government, if Parliament insists, on moral grounds, on getting this money back, to investigate thoroughly the administration of the Government at the present time and to make other people who have taken money to which they have no moral right pay it back; and to go back over the record of the late Governments and make the crooked contractors pay back moneys which they had no moral right to take.

If I felt convinced that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had no right to retain this money, I would have absolutely no hesitation in voting in favour of this motion; but because I had a doubt in my mind in regard to the matter, I made it my business to chat with a few of the ministers who knew the situation and they are all of the same opinion as the Acting Prime Minister and the Acting Minister of Justice, namely, that this $5,000 should be left as it stands at the present time. One of the reasons put forward which impressed me very much was that, if this Parliament voted in favour of demanding the return of this money, that would practically be saying that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick was a thief and stole that money. I am not prepared to go as far as that. I am not, however, convinced that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had a moral right to this money, and I will tell the House, in a moment, what I would do if I were Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. I think the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) stated that if Sir Charles Fitzpatrick wanted to play the right game, he would have paid the money back last Fall. I do not know Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, I have not had the pleasure of meeting him, but in my opinion the reason why he could not pay the money back while under this cloud, was that if he did so, he would be admitting to the people of Canada that he stole it.

5 p.m.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That he took it improperly.

Mr. MANION: Possibly he took it improperly, but I do not suppose Sir Charles Fitzpatrick would care to admit that he took it improperly even if, in his inner conscience, he thought he did. I do not blame him for that. I think his proper stand would be to stand by his guns; otherwise, he would be admitting that he took it improperly, a thing which no man would care to admit. To take a thing improperly is a drawing-room phrase for stealing it. One of the ministers with whom I spoke expressed the opinion that if Parliament passed this resolution it would wipe out any reputation for honour that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has. There is a great deal of truth in that, and I am not prepared to vote away the reputation of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick for $5,000. Not only is his honour at stake, but the honour of this Government is also at stake. That is the conclusion I have reached, and I have endeavoured to give in a few words my reasons for supporting the view held by the Acting Prime Minister and the Acting Minister of Justice. If the vote taken by the House on this matter does not support Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, I suppose he will have to pay the money back; but supposing the vote supports him in keeping it, in that case, if I were Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, I would pay back the money after I was exonerated, as a doubt has been cast upon him.

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. MANION: I hear laughter from different parts of the House. I do not think that view differs from my first conclusions in this matter. I repeat what I said at the outset, namely, that every hon. member who has spoken has admitted that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has a legal right to this money. Therefore, he has not stolen it, and I do not see why he should admit he has stolen it. But as a doubt has been cast upon him, the proper course for Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to pursue, if this vote exonerates him, is to hand back this $5,000 to the people of Canada.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: If we vote for this resolution, will that defeat the Government?

Mr. MANION: I understand this has nothing to do with either a defeat or a support of the Government, and I am not, as is implied by the hon. member, tied by any chain to supporting this Government, if I feel like voting against it.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Centre Vancouver): I wish, in just two or three sentences to make my position clear on this question. I may say at the outset that I intend to vote for the resolution for reasons which are perfectly clear to my mind. I remember very well, when the items referred to were before the House, it was clear to me that we were voting from year to year this sum of money for a particular purpose, namely, to pay the expenses of the Chief Justice of Canada, whoever he might be, to attend the sittings of the Privy Council. Last year—and I use the argument I am now going to use, for the particular benefit of my hon. friend (Mr. Manion)—when the Estimates were being considered, this question was raised by several members, and a large number of members who intended to speak did not speak for the reason that they were given an assurance by the Government, on the strength of a letter from Sir Charles Fitzpatrick read by a responsible minister of the Crown, that this money would be returned. On that assurance being given to the House, opposition was at once removed and the item was allowed to pass.

Another feature of the case to which I wish to draw the attention of the House is this. The question of law has been discussed very carefully and earnestly by hon. members. One principle is accepted in all courts, namely, that where in law a phrase or a clause of a contract is in doubt, the lawyers and the judge usually look for some precedent or some action which went before which might interpret the meaning of the clause.

We have a dozen precedents for this. From the year 1897 to 1915-16 this item was in the Estimates year after year, and it was there for a particular purpose, and the money was used for that purpose. In the year 1915-16 the wording was slightly changed, but the item as it had appeared the previous year was placed alongside; in other words, the vote was interpreted in the terms of the vote of the previous year. I submit to the Government this point: If we, as private members, were to be forced to analyze in detail every item that comes before this House we should never get through the Estimates in a hundred years. Every item in the Estimates is condensed in as few words as possible, and we trust to the officers of the Crown to carry out the intention which Parliament undoubtedly has in passing these items in this abbreviated form. It was clear to Parliament what this particular vote was intended for; it was clear to Parliament last year that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick intended this House to understand that he would return the money. But a year afterwards we find that the money has not been returned. I shall certainly take the opportunity of expressing my opinion in a vote on this matter.

Mr. MICHAEL CLARK (Red Deer): If I agreed with my hon. friend from Fort William (Mr. Manion) in what he said, I should vote as he is going to vote, but the only thing he said with which I agree was that we are dealing with a very disagreeable question. I am no apologist for Government by Order in Council, but if this matter could have been settled by an Order in Council it would have saved Parliament a very ugly situation. I think, for once, I would be in agreement with my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) who seems to want it settled somewhere else than here anyhow, and we are at one in not fearing to derogate from the rights and privileges of Parliament on the present occasion. I must say I rather resent the duty of having to discuss and decide on this question; it should not have been thrown on the shoulders of Parliament. It appears to me, as my hon. friend from Perth (Mr. Morphy) suggested, that there has been some intercourse between the Government and Sir Charles on this question, and the Government should have saved Parliament from having to discuss and vote on this matter. I do not attach much

importance to the legal cobwebs that we have had spun here this afternoon. Of course, it is a long time since we ascribed first place in that particular art to my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen), but I thought this afternoon he would have to look to his laurels because the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) really made a splendid exhibition along the same lines. The leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) was willing to enter into the competition, but I am bound to pronounce him a bad third. When I listened to these gentlemen I wondered if I could lay claim to being an intelligent layman, and ever since I have been trying to persuade myself that I am a reasonably intelligent layman.

I am sorry for Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in this connection. I do not share the habit of my hon. friend from Fort William of wishing to use strong language where I can possibly avoid it, and I differ very profoundly from the attitude that he has just taken up in asserting that those who vote in a certain way in this matter will proclaim that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is a thief. I should like to warn my hon. and young friend against the use of such language; even if he thinks it, he should modify his language. It is sometimes well, it may be generally well, to call a spade a spade, but there is excuse in some circumstances for calling it a horticultural implement. In this case I neither think Sir Charles Fitzpatrick a thief, nor will I have my vote represented as indicating that I think so. I do not blame, primarily, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick for the situation. I think it should have been settled when there was a chance to settle it, without the House having to vote on this question. I have a slight acquaintance with Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, and I think he is a man who by his intellectual gifts and by his high character has been an adornment to many public positions in this country. That is all one needs to say upon such an interpretation of the vote here as was given by my hon. friend from Fort William.

While I am sorry for Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, I am sorry for myself, as a member of Parliament, in having to deal with this matter. From the view expressed by the Minister of Justice that this House is the guardian of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick's honour I sharply dissent. Every man is the guardian of his own honour; it must be so; and I refuse to assume the guardianship of the honour of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. Neither am I the guardian of the business capacity of the Government. This question has been allowed to drift into the House of Commons for settlement, and what I have to remember is what I am guardian of. I am the guardian, in the humble capacity of a single member of this House, of the public purse; that is a duty which I cannot avoid; it is put upon me by those who elected me here, and by the constitution of our country. We all know, in spite of legal contentions to the contrary, that this five thousand dollars was paid to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. I do not think any one contradicts that. That is a fact known to everybody, including the hon. leader of the Opposition. He may not know it in his legal capacity, but as I do not know what that is, I am content if he knows it in his capacity as a member of Parliament. I believe, and I want to state my belief, that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in taking that money took it under error. I will not permit myself to say of any other man what he should have done when he had committed that error—and I am using the language of straightforward sincerity. I do not know that I would even answer on my own account a question which I suppose the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) addressed to me with the other members of this House. He seemed to turn in my direction when he asked, would I have taken this money? I thought at the time, my mother was Scotch, and it is a large sum, and I am not bound to answer the question. I should be in the same difficulty if he had gone on to ask, would I have given it back, and for the reason that if I had got the sum I should not have retained it till this time, as I have not been able to exercise the Scotch quality of taking care of money too well So I have not to answer this question as to what Sir Charles Fitzpatrick should have done or what I would have done myself under those circumstances.

The money was paid by the Government to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to enable him to travel. He did not travel. It was said during the war by somebody—the Minister of Public Works, I think—that we must "work or fight," and I think that in this case the question was, "travel or return the money." That, at any rate, is the view I shall take of the matter. The money was paid for travelling expenses; travelling was not done, therefore it is due back to the country, and I say that without any reflection upon Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, but merely as indicating the way in which I shall vote. For once I was pleased to take my law—if it was law; the commonsense of it anyway—from my old friend the hon. member for Prescott (Mr. Proulx), who

was, to my mind, by far the clearest-brained lawyer who spoke on this subject in the House to-day. I have tried to put this question from the point of view of the layman, and to put before the House the reasons which shall guide me if the question comes to a vote.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (Oxford North): When I voted, as I did, for the resolution at the time the vote was taken, I believed that the money was to be paid to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick as a sort of salary, somewhat in the form of a retainer which is sometimes paid a lawyer by a corporation for the purpose of securing his services at any time if required. I might have been wrong in my view of the question at that time, and I am not saying that I was not. I have listened to most of the discussion this afternoon, and have heard a great deal of legal opinion. The Acting Prime Minister has told us that the changing of the wording was made at the request of the Prime Minister's secretary. Now, the money was paid by the Finance Department at the instance of the Department of Justice and the Privy Council, without any question, and with the sanction of the late Auditor General, who, we all know, was very capable. In these circumstances it is my opinion that the money was legally paid, and, as far as I can gather, it was honestly accepted by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. I therefore have no other recourse than to endorse the payment that was legally made by those who were in authority to make payments such as this, and to oppose this resolution.

Mr. H. E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): There is no doubt in my mind that previous to 1915 and 1916 Sir Charles Fitzpatrick would not, according to the way the money was voted then, have been entitled to it; but under the vote of 1915 and 1916 I think the money was legally paid to him and that it was accepted in good faith. There must have been some reason for the change that was made in the wording of the Estimate, and I feel I must vote against the resolution and at the same time express regret at some of the remarks that have been made concerning Sir Charles Fitzpatrick.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): It is extremely difficult to understand the attitude of any hon. member in this House who defends Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in his retention of this money. Sir Charles himself, in his letter last year, offered to return the money if this Parliament thought he should do so, and that was an absolute admission on his part that there was certainly a doubt in his mind as to the propriety of his retaining the money. One hears many legal arguments on a question of this kind, but it seems to me that the bald facts are so self-explanatory that a wayfarer, though a fool, could not fail to decide what is Sir Charles Fitzpatrick's duty in this matter. When the late Dalton McCarthy some years ago was addressing a meeting in the town of Selkirk, Manitoba, in the course of a criticism of the Government of the day in which he made some deductions that were perfectly logical, an obtrusive person in the back who was opposed to him politically asked him: "How do you know, Mr. McCarthy, that what you say is right?" Mr. McCarthy, with that dignity and strength of character that distinguished him, paused for a moment and replied, "Because I am not a damned fool." Now the people of this country are not fools—I omit the adjective—and they know that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick received $5,000 for services that he did not render. The matter has been referred to this House for decision. The people are exceedingly critical, and the average Canadian citizen regards $5,000 as a large amount of money—which indeed it is, Mr. Speaker. The people are waiting to see what attitude their representatives in Parliament will take in this matter. The money was improperly accepted. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick did not spend one farthing of it, and yet his salary is $17,500.

If you give him this additional money as an honorarium, he will have $20,000, nearly three times, perhaps more than three times, the salary of the average minister of the Crown. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick was the Chief Justice of Canada, the fountain of justice in this country. In addition to that he was the administrator representing the Governor General of Canada, and the people have a right to look to him as the fountain of honour, as he was the official fountain of honour. And yet he takes this $5,000. He practically admits he did not earn it, he did not spend it, and he had it improperly; and to ask this House to say that he should be allowed to retain the money is, in my judgment to insult the intelligence of members of the House, the intelligence of the people of this country. I did not hear the remarks of the Acting Prime Minister, or of the Acting Minister of Justice, but taking the interpretation of their remarks as I heard it secondhand from members of this House, I must confess that I am surprised that either, or both, of those gentlemen—while they may not have de-

fended the payment—should have left the impression that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is legally entitled to this money. A man may be legally entitled to $100,000, and yet not have one scintilla of moral claim. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has no moral claim on this money; and let him understand, as the reperesentative of the Crown in this country, that the Parliament and the people of Canada do not propose to allow him to go Scot free in this matter. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, by reason of his position, should be placed in the pillory, and it should be given out to the people of Canada that this Parliament does not intend to allow a man of his position, and of his supposed honour, to escape responsibility. Let the declaration of Parliament this afternoon be quite clear, so that the country will have no doubt as to the mind of the people's representatives that we propose to insist upon having this money returned. If under the circumstances, Sir Charles Fitzpatrick should wish to retain it, then on his head be the responsibility. I agree with the hon. member for Red Deer (Mr. Clark) that Parliament cannot be the keeper of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick's honour, or of any man's honour—every man must be the keeper of his own honour—and if we make an emphatic pronouncement on questions of this kind, we will have struck a strong and hearty blow for honesty and for honest public service in this country.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General): I do not take the same view of the question as is taken by my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) and quite a number of other hon. gentlemen who have preceded me. If blame attaches to any one as a result of this unfortunate matter, I think the blame should be put upon the House of Commons itself, or upon the Government administering affairs in 1915-16, rather than upon the shoulders of Sir Charles Fitzpatrick. In my judgment no stigma whatever, no degree of moral turpitude whatever attaches to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, in respect of the two payments of $2,500 each which form the subject of this resolution. Parliament must be presumed to know what it is doing when it passes its Estimates. Deliberately it changed the language which had prevailed in this House with respect to this item for years. When this vote was made in 1915, an item which stated in express terms that the money was given for travelling expenses was changed. We assume that it was done deliberately, because that action was taken with the knowledge of hon. members who were then in this House. We are supposed to know what it meant, and we approved of it· we must have known what it meant when we took that course. The blame for anything that has gone wrong since must be attributed to us; if a mistake was made, we made it. Why did we make the change referred to? To my mind the matter is clear, and I agree with the view taken by my hon. friend from North Oxford (Mr. E. W. Nesbitt) with respect to it. The language of the vote was changed expressly to permit Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to accept an allowance practically as an addition to his salary. What was the wording of the vote of 1915? "Special allowance to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to cover expenses in connection with the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council." My hon. friend from Springfield and my hon. friend from Red Deer said that money was paid to enable Sir Charles Fitzpatrick to travel. There is nothing in the vote which limits the payment to travelling expenses. We are assuming that there was no expense in connection with the office but expenses of travel. We do not know whether or not Sir Charles Fitzpatrick employed clerical assistance or stenographers, or disbursed money for telegrams, postage, or the like. So long as any expense was incurred at all the payment of the money cannot be withheld. Let me give a little instance by way of illustration. Every hon. member of this House who were here fifteen or twenty years ago accepted mileage every year and travelled on a railway pass. Members of the Ontario Legislature do that yet. In the Militia Department the higher officers receive an allowance per diem; they do not give details of their expenditure for travelling expenses, they do not vouch their accounts. The allowance, I believe, is some $12 or $15; at any rate whatever the amount may be, I am told they do not give an itemized account of their expenditures; they accept the allowance no matter how small their expenditure has been. Our judges do the same thing. We give them a per diem allowance of $6 or $8 for expenses, and if the expenses happen to be $2 or $3 below the amount, the allowance is drawn just the same. The money is not given for actual expenses, it is an allowance, and it was so in connection with the money that was voted to Sir Charles Fitzpatrick.

Mr. R. H. COOPER (Vancouver South): Will the Solicitor General definitely state that this money was voted for work done by Sir Charles Fitzpatrick?

Mr. GUTHRIE: I do not quite catch the question.

Mr. COOPER: This money was voted in connection with attendance at sittings of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council. The Solicitor General says that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick may have used it for certain other expenses, but he does not say that it was expended for work in connection with the Judicial Committee.

Mr. GUTHRIE: I have just as good a right to say that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick might have used it for other purposes as hon. members have to insinuate that he did not use this money for expenses. I have just as high and firm ground for doing that as hon. members have who are criticising this payment. The fact still remains, however, that when we voted this money we voted it in plain, distinct language as an allowance, and having done so we should assume the responsibility. I quite agree that no good end is going to be served by a discussion of this unfortunate question in this forum. In my opinion this discussion is purely academic, and I do not think anything will come of it, whether we adopt or reject this motion. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick may say: "I do not propose to return this money," even if we adopt this motion. How are you going to compel him, if he takes that attitude?

An hon. MEMBER: What about his telegram?

Mr. GUTHRIE: He may not act on it, he may even change his mind with respect to it. How are you going to exercise compulsion? Where is this going to end? When is any finality going to be achieved? There is a forum where this question could be disposed of, and I think the suggestion of the leader of the Opposition is the correct one in view of the statute which says that a claim of the Crown may be adjudicated by the Exchequer Court of Canada. I believe that is the proper form to which this whole question should be referred and there be dealt with. Sir Charles Fitzpatrick can be heard there. We have not had the other side of the matter, except in the somewhat discursive communication which has been read from Sir Charles Fitzpatrick himself, but if we have a claim, or believe we have a claim, the Exchequer Court is the forum where this question should be decided. In that court we should get finality, a definite finding. Here the discussion may have the result of casting a slur upon Sir Charles Fitzpatrick, which, in my humble judgment, is entirely undeserved on account of anything that has occurred in this transaction.

Mr. H. C. HOCKEN (West Toronto): Mr. Speaker, the member for South Wellington (Mr. Guthrie) does not place Sir Charles Fitzpatrick in a very favourable light when he tells us that even if we vote that this money ought to be returned to Parliament Sir Charles Fitzpatrick will not return it, although he has offered to do so. I shall not attempt to follow the legal side of the argument. I think it was well that that side should be stated, and it was stated very completely by the member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle). I do not look at this matter from the legal standpoint, neither do I think the people of Canada so regard it. I think the member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) gave the right view of it. The people of Canada see an item in the Estimates of $2,500 for expenses, and as far as they can learn no expenses have been incurred. Now, I submit, Sir, that if any expenses had been incurred sufficient to warrant the taking of that money some member of this House would be able to say so to-day. No person has ventured such a statement, no person has even insinuated that any expenses had been incurred. We are told that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick might have spent something on postage, clerical help, or something of that sort, but no effort is made to show how much that is or how little, and if it was anything like sufficient to justify this payment I am sure that fact would have been stated here to-day.

If a postman, Mr. Speaker, takes fifty cents improperly we send him to the penitentiary for five years. I do not mean to say that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has stolen the money, but I go this far, that the one man in Canada who should be careful of his position in matters of this kind is the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Every man should be careful of what he does in financial transactions if he is an honest man, but the one man above all others in this Dominion who should be careful that nobody can say he has taken five cents improperly is the man who presides over the Supreme Court of this country, and it is most regrettable that he should have allowed this matter to go so far when he knows the feeling of Parliament from former discussions.

Is it any wonder, Mr. Speaker, that working men, farmers and others who have to work for five years to earn $5,000 should get restless when they see that amount taken by a man already drawing $15,000, and taken improperly. How are we going to

prevent unrest, how are we going to satisfy the people that we are doing the square thing by them when men who have the highest paid positions in this country resort to these means to add to their incomes? Whether Sir Charles Fitzpatrick is able legally to retain this or not, he has no moral right to it, and that is the view I take and I propose to give effect to it by my vote.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): Mr. Speaker, I regret very much to have to say anything in regard to this matter. I heard it all at the last session, and I then made up my mind that surely the Chief Justice, the model of the law courts of this Dominion, would hand back that money, but I find he has not done so. I regret very much that he intends to retain $5,000 for which he has given no return. If he had gone to the old country to sit on the judicial bench, then he would have had a right to that money; but not having gone I do not see that he has the slightest grounds for retaining it. If some poor man or woman took improperly $50, or even a loaf of bread, he or she would go to jail for it, and yet here is a man who, while occupying the highest judicial office in this country, took $5,000. I think it is something this country expects to have dealt with, and I for one am going to vote accordingly.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: If the hon. gentleman purposes to speak he can only do so in closing the debate, and if he exercises his right to reply now, other hon. members will be precluded from speaking.

Mr. EDWARDS: I only wish to say, Mr. Speaker—

Mr. DEVLIN: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. member for Wright (Mr. Devlin) has the floor.

Mr. E. B. DEVLIN (Wright): Mr. Speaker, I wish to say a few words upon this question, but if my hon. friend the member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) wishes to make a statement that he withdraws his resolution, then I will give way to him.

Mr. EDWARDS: Mr. Speaker, I have no intention of withdrawing my resolution. I am aware of the fact, as I presume my hon. friend is, that it is a quarter to six. I believe the sentiment of this House is that we take a vote on this matter.

Mr. DEVLIN: Mr. Speaker, I have done my best to follow the reasoning of the hon. gentlemen who have already spoken. I am indifferent in this matter as to whether the charge is made against a man who calls himself Fitzpatrick, or whether it be made against a man who might call himself by any other name. I desire not to give a silent vote, but, I hope, an intelligent one, and in order that I may give that vote, as I mean to give it, I want to say a few words in explanation. We have been dealing this afternoon with a case that I might call the case of Edwards vs. Fitzpatrick. The complainant in this case asks us to constitute ourselves into a transferring court to transfer the charge in the case of Edwards vs. Fitzpatrick to one of the King vs. Fitzpatrick. I understand that the Government take the position that they will not recommend, nor will the officers of the Crown recommend, that the case be styled one of the King vs. Fitzpatrick, but that it must continue to be the case of Edwards vs. Fitzpatrick.

I was brought up, Mr. Speaker, under the British system of justice, and you all know it is a rule of British justice that every man in this country must have a fair and a free trial, that the evidence for and against him shall be heard, and that both parties shall have access to the court to give their version of the case.

I put it to hon. members of the House: Is this a fair trial to give to the defendant in the case of Edwards vs Fitzpatrick? The hon. gentleman asks us to sit here not as judges but as jurors and to render a verdict upon the facts as he has stated them, without giving the accused, or the defendant, an opportunity of stating his version of the case. Is that fair? Is that British justice?

I want to emphasize the further point that there are jurors in this case who do not stand indifferent as between Edwards and Fitzpatrick. It is a rule of British justice that when a juror is not indifferent as between the King and the accused, he shall stand aside and not be allowed to decide upon the facts of the case. The member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) told us that he was not concerned with the law in this case; that he did not want any instruction to the members of this House—the jurors in this case—on questions of law. Is that British justice? What would he say, for instance, if in some famous trial, after the judge had charged the jury upon the points of law, one of the jurors called upon to decide on the questions of fact stood up and said: "Your Lordship, away with your questions of law. We do not want to know any law in this case;

we want to decide it according to the facts as we wish to see them, not according to the facts as they have been placed before the court."

An hon. MEMBER: Hear, hear.

Mr. DEVLIN: Will the hon. gentleman who said: "hear, hear" be good enough to stand up?

Mr. BURNHAM: What does the hon. member wish to know?

Mr. DEVLIN: I was not referring to the member for West Peterborough (Mr. Burnham).

Mr. McLEOD: Is the hon. gentleman asserting that it is not the right of the jury to decide the facts in any case heard before them? I say to him that it is absolutely the right of the jury to decide the facts.

Mr. DEVLIN: My hon. friend is a lawyer and he must know well that I am not propounding any such doctrine. It is perfectly within the province of the jury to decide upon questions of fact. But let me ask the hon. gentleman: is it not within the province of the judge to instruct the jury upon questions of law? Will he be fair and answer that question?

Mr. McLEOD: Yes.

Mr. DEVLIN: The judges in this case are the law officers of the Crown, who tell us that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick had a legal right to keep the money. Are we to take that into consideration, or are we not? Will the hon. gentleman again be fair and tell me what his view is on that point?

Mr. SPEAKER: I think the hon. member should confine his remarks to his discussion of the subject before the House, and not address another hon. gentleman.

Mr. DEVLIN: Then I ask you, Mr. Speaker, at the present moment the judge of this court, whether you would simply take the facts of a case brought before you and set aside all the law, where the case had to do with facts and law? I take your silence, Mr. Speaker, as indicating that you thoroughly agree with me.

With the statements that we have before us—the statement of the mover of the resolution and some of his friends and the statement of the Government advised by the law officers of the Crown—what can we poor mortals, layman jurors, decide in this case? Have we not the right to ask that the defendant at least be heard in some way before we decide this case against him? Unless that right is granted, Sir—that right which is a principle of British justice—I propose to vote against the resolution.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): Mr. Speaker, I have listened to the legal luminaries on both sides of the House and have come to the conclusion that every hon. member must have come to: That this is really not a legal, but a moral question. With regard to the moral question—the fact that Sir Charles Fitzpatrick has agreed to leave it to the judgment of this House, notwithstanding the fact that he knows the packed jury and the mentality of them—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. I must ask the hon. gentleman to withdraw that remark.

Mr. READ: Well, I withdraw that remark. —notwithstanding the nature of the jury, I am perfectly satisfied that in his own mind Sir Charles Fitzpatrick stands acquitted, as stainless as a star. Now, to give you my own attitude I shall paraphrase a few words from that grand old moral philosopher, Robbie Burns:

> Who made the heart, 'tis He alone
> Decidedly can try us;
> He knows each chord, its various tone,
> Each spring its various bias.
> Then at the balance let's be mute,
> We never can adjust it;
> What's done we partly can compute
> But know not what's resisted.
> Then, gently scan your brother man,
> Still gentler Charles Fitzpatrick;
> Tho' he has gang a kennin'wrang
> His company's full of bad tricks.

Mr. C. G. POWER (Quebec South): Mr. Speaker, I beg to move the adjournment of the debate.

Motion negatived.

Mr. POWER: Mr. Speaker—

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. The hon. member has exhausted his right to speak.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbiniere): A question of principle has been raised today in the discussion of this whole question. The hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) stated that in his opinion the money had been unduly taken. Whether it was legally or illegally taken, so long as it was unduly taken, it should have been returned to the treasury. I will not lay very much stress on the question whether the money has been taken legally or illegally, but I will call to my assistance another principle which has been applied ever since Confederation. I refer to the separation of the three distinct powers which are at the foundation of our constitution—the executive power, the judicial

power and the legislative power. It has been the constant practice of all statesmen not to allow any one power to trespass on the province of another. The executive power, the province of which is well defined by our constitution, should not trespass on the legislative power. That is one of the reasons why we so much object to the method of procedure by Order in Council. We consider that by the method of procedure by Order in Council, the executive power is trespassing upon the province of the legislative power. The hon. member for Frontenac (Mr. Edwards) has, in this resolution, asked us to substitute the legislative power for the judicial power. It is the duty of this House to enact laws, but it is not the duty of this House or of this Parliament to pass judgment on the laws that this Parliament has enacted.

The House adjourned at 6 p.m.

Thursday, March 27, 1919.

The House met at Three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Order in Council of date 19th March, 1919, providing for the cancellation of certain regulations made under the provision of the War Measures Act.—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

Report of the Military Service Council for last year.—Hon. Mr. Meighen.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by asterisks.)

ORDER IN COUNCIL No. 3168.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. When was Order in Council No. 3168 passed?
2. When was it first published?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1. Passed 9th November, 1917.

2. These regulations were published and generally distributed in the Red Book of "Instructions for Dealing with Deserters and Absentees without leave," issued by direction of the Minister of Militia on 26th of December, 1917. The regulations were submitted to the House of Commons on the 18th of March, 1918, and were published in Canada Gazette on 25th of January, 1919.

THE HALIFAX EXPLOSION.

Mr. DESLAURIERS:

1. Has a report been made to the Government as to the finding of the Court of Inquiry into the Halifax explosion?
2. Was Captain Martin, Superintendent of the Dockyard at Halifax, removed?
3. Was Captain Martin subsequently appointed to a position in the Esquimalt, B.C., Dockyard?
4. If so, why was the change made?
5. Was Commander Wyatt dismissed from the service?
6. If so, why?
7. Did any Canadian ratings lose their lives at the time of the Halifax explosion?
8. If so, has the department in any way recognized the bravery and heroism of these ranks and ratings?
9. Is the Government aware that Imperial Government Ratings from H.M.S. Highflyer, who performed similar service at Halifax, N.S., have been awarded medals and placed on the Honour List in the Royal Navy?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. Captain Martin was transferred from Halifax to Esquimalt dockyard as superintendent.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. Owing to greatly increased work and responsibilities at Halifax dockyard it was considered advisable to appoint an officer of admiral's rank as superintendent thereof.

5. No.

6. Answered by No. 5.

7. Yes.

8. Yes, the names of those who distinguished themselves at the time of the explosion were forwarded to the Admiralty with a view to obtaining for them proper recognition. His Majesty the King has been pleased to approve of the following posthumous awards: Mr. Albert Mattison, late acting boatswain, R.C.N., Albert medal; late Stoker Petty Officer Edward S. Beard, V.R., 1731, R.N.C.V.R., Albert medal; John T. Gammon, Chief Master-at-Arms, R.C.N., member of the Military Division of the British Empire Order; Chief E. R. A. 2nd class Hay, R.C.N., Meritorious Service medal; Walter Critch, A.B., official number 1242, Newfoundland R.N.R., Meritorious Service medal. The British Admiralty have requested that an expression of Their Lordships' appreciation may be conveyed to the following officer: Mr. Walter O'Reilly, Gunner, R.C.N. The Admiralty have sent letters of appreciation to the next of kin of the following ratings: Chas. C. McMillan, Leading Seaman, V.R., 2496; Carl C. Wilson, Able Seaman, V.R., 1561; Albert Saunders, Able Seaman, V.R., 4066; Freeman P. Nickerson, Able Seaman, V.R., 1891; George H. Yates, Stoker 2nd class, V.R., 5480.

9. No information in the Department of the Naval Service.

THE STEAMER STADACONA.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. At any time during the war did one Lt. Jarvis, R.C.N., make a report in regard to the condition of the Steamer "Stadacona," purchased by the Government?

2. If so, is that report on file in the Department?

3. Was the "Stadacona" in dry dock at Vickers, Montreal, at the time the report was made?

4. Were the recommendations in that report followed by the Government?

5. Was Lt. Jarvis a competent person to make a report?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. Yes.

3. No.

4. Yes, the vessel was examined by experts whose recommendations were carried out.

5. Lt. Jarvis was competent to report on any subject of which he had proper knowledge.

PURCHASE OF DESTROYERS—COMMANDER J. K. L. ROSS.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. During the years 1914 and 1915 did Commander J. K. L. Ross urge upon the Government or any official thereof either by letter or word of mouth the necessity of the Government purchasing five or more modern destroyers?

2. Did Commander J. K. L. Ross offer to purchase one destroyer and present it to the Government providing the Government would purchase four or five additional destroyers?

3. If so, was the offer accepted?

4. If not, why not?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Not so far as the Department of the Naval Service is aware.

2. Not so far as the Department of the Naval Service is aware.

3 and 4. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

GOVERNMENT-OWNED AUTOMOBILES IN OTTAWA.

Mr. KAY:

1. How many automobiles are owned by each department of the Government in the City of Ottawa?

2. What are the names of the manufacturers of said automobiles?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

Department of Customs: 1. One. 2. Hudson Motor Car Company.

Department of Interior: 1. 5 trucks. 2. 4 Fords, 1 Dodge.

Department of Justice: 1. One, Dominion Police. 2. Reo,1914 model.

Department of Militia and Defence: 1. Eleven. 2. Eight Cadillac, motor cars five McLaughlin motor cars.

Department of Mines: 1. Three. 2. One Chevrolet, two Fords, all stored and not used at Ottawa.

Department of Post Office: 1. One. 2. Pierce Arrow. The Pierce Arrow Motor Car Company.

Department of Public Works: 1. Two. 2. One Ford and one Packard.

Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment: 1. (a) At Head Office for administrative purposes, two; (b) at Vocational School for Instruction in Driving, two. 2. (a) McLaughlin Manufacturing Co.; (b) Ford Motor Co. and Willys-Overland, Ltd.

Board of Pensions Commissioners for Canada: 1. One. 2. Ford Motor Co.

LEON TROTSKY AND THE DOMINION POLICE.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

1. Was Leon Trotsky, the present Bolshevist Foreign Minister for Russia while en route to Europe in 1916, ever in the custody of the police authorities of the Dominion or of the City of Halifax?

2. If so, when?

3. Were any representations received in favour of Trotsky's release from Canadian custody? If so, from whom?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: 1, 2, and 3. No record.

TERMINAL ELEVATORS.

Mr. SUTHERLAND:

1. How many public and private terminal elevators are operated by the Dominion Board of Grain Commissioners?

2. What is the capacity of each, and where located?

3. What departments of the Government exercise control over elevators referred to?

4. What is the capacity of each, and quantity of grain handled at each elevator under the several departments of the Government?

5. What are the profits or losses over cost of operation in connection with each elevator, during each of the past five years, or such years for which the information is available?

Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Five.

2. Port Arthur, capacity 3,250,000 bushels.
Moosejaw, " 3,500,000 "
Saskatoon, " 3,500,000 "
Calgary, " 2,500,000 "
Vancouver, " 1,250,000 "

3. The Department of Trade and Commerce.

4. All the grain in these elevators is handled under the Department of Trade and Commerce.

Port Arthur—Capacity 3,250,000 bushels.

Crop Year 1914-15.	Receipts. Net Bush	Shipments. Net Bush.
Wheat	7,501,752	7,561,200
Oats	1,486,097	1,488,263
Barley	279,248	281,411
Flax	395,127	405,947
	lbs.	lbs.
Mixed grain	2,517,940	2,522,300
Screenings, etc.	357,780	6,193,560
Crop Year 1915-1916.		
Wheat	25,659,650	25,156,497
Oats	7,523,751	7,173,281
Barley	809,801	781,721
Flax	523,652	516,942
Rye	708	708
	lbs.	lbs.
Mixed grain	3,145,040	2,556,640
Screenings, etc.	445,740	12,697,400
Crop Year 1916-1917.		
Wheat	13,292,056	13,732,148
Oats	6,270,438	6,053,378
Barley	662,792	677,449
Flax	975,605	1,036,502
Rye	662	662
	lbs.	lbs.
Mixed grain	4,308,550	4,728,662
Screenings, etc.	68,800	5,603,940
Crop Year 1917-1918.		
Wheat	8,911,239	9,178,615
Oats	1,438,719	1,856,788
Barley	307,851	314,654
Flax	469,905	488,726
Rye	12,135	12,135
	lbs.	lbs.
Mixed grain	1,499,300	1,329,375
Screenings, etc.	923,000	8,260,895

Moosejaw—Capacity 3,500,000 bushels.

Crop Year 1914-1915.		
Wheat	2,294,127-50	2,215,346-50
Oats	589,993-28	572,064-16
Barley	16,911-02	15,664-08
Flax	1,375-42	492-30
	lbs.	lbs.
Mixed grain	58,390	58,390
Screenings, etc.	....	4,895,150
Crop year 1915-1916.		
Wheat	4,604,617-50	4,402,635-00
Oats	763,698-29	746,184-00
Barley	33,523-46	24,903-32
Flax	85,999-34	81,602-47
Rye	5,320-00	5,249-16
	lbs.	lbs.
Mixed grain	444,520	408,200
Crop Year 1916-17.	Receipts	Shipments
Wheat	4,147,931-40	4,185,688-10
Oats	953,546-31	942,337-12
Barley	32,338-10	32,761-10
Flax	148,892-04	153,326-33
Rye	9,494-26	9,494-26
	lbs.	lbs.
Mixed grain	423,080	1,020,030
Screenings	.....	446,360
Mustard seeds	550	550
Crop Year 1917-18	Net Bus.	Net Bus.
Wheat	1,481,606-30	1,632,867-50
Oats	2,786,792-21	2,749,204-01
Barley	27,223-06	27,771-02
Flax	31,885-01	33,521-39
Rye	1,663-02	1,663-02
Corn	1,187-28	1,187-28
Mixed Grain	286,560 lbs.	645,990 lbs.
Screenings	94,300 lbs.	94,900 lbs.

Saskatoon—Capacity 3,500,000 bushels.

Crop Year 1914-15.		
Wheat	1,076,957-30	1,076,629-10
Oats	1,356,202-28	1,374,437-24
Barley	25,971-37	25,971-37
Flax	....	....
Mixed Grain	60,320 lbs.	1,912,620 lbs.
Screenings	11,520 lbs.	2,189,720 lbs.
Crop Year 1915-16.		
Wheat	6,791,690-20	6,717,180-50
Oats	1,381,782-19	1,346,457-20
Barley	69,057-09	67,195-23
Flax	203,614-37	193,252-46
Mixed Grain	925,946 lbs.	890,030 lbs.
Screenings	....	2,771,330 lbs.
Crop Year 1916-17.		
Wheat	5,153,870-20	5,246,208-30
Oats	1,773,964-23	1,764,722-02
Barley	56,829-35	57,986-12
Flax	249,394-16	259,434-20
Mixed Grain	525,740 lbs.	853,820 lbs.
Screenings	122,320 lbs.	7,681,610 lbs.
Crop Year 1917-18.		
Wheat	4,607,153-20	4,611,588-50
Oats	3,607,068-00	3,609,364-25
Barley	72,294-45	69,342-43
Flax	69,723-23	68,802-10
Mixed Grain	694,370 lbs.	673,340 lbs.
Screenings	1,426,050 lbs.	2,764,530 lbs.

Calgary—Capacity, 2,500,000 bushels.

Crop Year 1915-16.		
Wheat	1,037,109-19	1,023,693-09
Oats	841,211-00	823,268-30
Barley	40,602-47	40,481-35
Flax	2,608-12	2,608-12
Rye	2,020-00	2,020-00
Corn	1,053-32	1,053-32
Mixed Grain	1,405,670 lbs.	1,327,810 lbs.
Screenings	9,640 lbs.	71,250 lbs.

Crop Year 1916-17.	Receipts.	Shipments.
Wheat	1,469,379-00	1,468,089-10
Oats	1,943,718-20	1,966,107-00
Barley	160,391-37	160,404-43
Flax	15,857-28	15,327-21
Timothy Seed	36,917-40	34,765-16
Rye	6,413-52	6,413-52
Corn	1,285-40	1,285-40
Mixed Grain	856,270 lbs.	625,000 lbs
Screenings	6,775 lbs.	566,990 lbs
Crop Year 1917-18.		
Wheat	740,716-00	752,968-00
Oats	2,328,921-08	2,281,885-03
Barley	211,256-01	198,688-45
Flax	7,302-39	7,395-22
Rye	39 275-37	39,275-37
Corn	1,446-24	1,446-24
Timothy Seed	21,352-47	23,173-21
Mixed Grain	880,290 lbs.	817,530 lbs.
Screenings	685,979 lbs.	1,009,110 lbs.

Vancouver—Capacity 1,250,000 bushels.

Crop Year 1916-17.		
Wheat	73,419-00	71,424-00
Oats	160,101-04	158,504-29
Crop Year 1917-18.		
Wheat	482,304-31	375,619-10
Oats	245,818-03	240,106-01
Barley	6,114-03	6,114-03
Beans	1,833-20	1,833-20
Mixed Grain	66,230 lbs.	66,230 lbs.
Screenings	72,320 lbs.	76,610 lbs.

Port Arthur.

Fiscal Year 1913-14—Profit	$ 66,708 54
1914-15—Profit	153,966 84
1915-16—Profit	162,384 53
1916-17—Profit	395,425 19
1917-18—Profit	399,454 95

Fiscal year 1914-15.	
(October to March) Loss	$17,092 21
1915-16 Profit	56,432 37
1916-17 "	59,829 26
1917-18 "	73,482 32

Saskatoon.

Fiscal year 1914-15.	
(October to March) Loss	$ 11,787 69
1915-16 Profit	57,740 17
1916-17 "	124,506 19
1917-18 "	79,949 55

Calgary.

Fiscal year 1915-16.	
(September to March) Loss	$ 9,540 28
1916-17 Profit	6,899 51
1917-18 "	36,748 47

Vancouver.

Fiscal year 1916-17.	
(January to March) Loss	$ 8,620 86
1917-18 "	733 34

Note:—These figures include salaries of the respective elevator staffs, but do not include depreciation or interest on the money invested, or the salaries and expenses of the Board of Grain Commissioners.

COLD STORAGE ON STEAMERS.

Mr. CASGRAIN:

How many steamers are furnished with cold storage apparatus?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

So far as the Department of Marine is concerned—none.

The question of cold storage for certain vessels being built by the Canadian Government (one of which is actually in commission) is under consideration.

THE FRASER SEIGNIORY.

Mr. GAUVREAU:

1. Have the Seigniors Fraser, of River du Loup, requested the issue of a fiat permitting them to sue the Government to have their claims confirmed in respect to the shore portion of their seigniory, and compel the Department of Public Works to pay for that site, or the lease thereof, where certain wharves have been constructed?

2. If so, who will plead the case for the Government, before what tribunal, at what place, and on what date?

3. Does the Government dispute said Seigniors Fraser's exclusive rights to the shore and bed of the river opposite their seigniory?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2. Mr. E. H. Cimon, Advocate, Fraserville. Before the Exchequer Court of Canada. At the place, and upon the date to be determined by the Judge or Assistant Judge of the Exchequer Court of Canada.

3. Yes.

CANADIAN SOLDIERS DRAWING PENSIONS.

Mr. SHEARD:

What number of Canadian soldiers are drawing pensions, and what number of same are drawing less than fifty per cent disability?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

(a) 34,897. (b) 31,300 drawing less than fifty per cent disability.

PROSECUTIONS FOR SALE OF LIQUOR.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How many prosecutions have been brought by the Department of Justice under the authority of Section 7, Chapter 19, of the Acts of 1916, relating to the illegal sale of intoxicating liquor shipped from an outside province into a dry area?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: None.

SOLICITORS ON SOLDIERS' SETTLEMENT BOARD.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. What are the names of the solicitors in Nova Scotia who have been employed by the Soldiers' Settlement Board of Canada, and the gross amount paid to each of them for their services up to the 31st of December, 1918?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: A. J. Campbell, Esq., K.C., Truro, Col. Co.; D. McLellan, Esq., K.C., Port Hood, In. Co.; Messrs. Rowlings & Duchemin, Sydney, C.B.; H. Ruggles, Esq., Bridgetown, Anna. Co. The only amount paid is the sum of $25 to Messrs. Rowlings & Duchemin, of North Sydney, C.B.

ANTI-LOAFING LAW.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. How many special officers were appointed in Nova Scotia under the Order in Council of April 4th, 1918, commonly known as the Anti-Loafing Regulation?
2. How many arrests were made in Nova Scotia under that regulation, and how many of those arrested were convicted?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. None.
2. There is no record in the department, the local police being responsible for the enforcement of the regulation.

C.N.R.—FORT WILLIAM LANDS.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Has the Government or the Canadian National Railway System experienced any delay or difficulty in getting possession or ownership of certain lands at Fort William or Port Arthur which should have been turned over to the Government with the C.N.R. Railway?
2. If so, what are the particulars of such difficulty or delay, and what progress has been made towards securing possession and title to such lands?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. No. The Canadian Northern Railway has title to its terminal lands at Port Arthur and Fort William.
2. Answered by No. 1.

CUSTOMS RECEIPTS—DORCHESTER COUNTY.

Mr. CANNON:

1. What are the annual receipts for customs entries at St. Anselme, County of Dorchester, since the establishment of the customs office at that place?
2. What is the name of the collector or agent, and what salary does he receive?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. St. Anselme was established a customs outport from January 1, 1914. Customs duties Jan. 1, 1914, to March 31, 1914, $70.74; April 1, 1914, to March 31, 1915, $2,491.67; April 1, 1915, to March 31, 1916, $1,514.04; April 1, 1916, to March 31, 1917, $1,935.01; April 1, 1917, to March 31, 1918, $1,158.93; April 1, 1918, to Feb. 28, 1919, $1,171.61.
2. Darius Cadrin, $800 per annum.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT DEFAULTERS.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Have the Police Court Judges and Magistrates of the different provinces of Canada been authorized to hear and adjudicate upon the cases of defaulters under the Military Service Act, 1917?
2. If so, is it possible for the said defaulters to present themselves before the said judges before they are taken into custody by the Military Police authority?
3. Who is authorized to institute proceedings against the said defaulters?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes. By virtue of their offices.
2. Although there is nothing to prevent a defaulter presenting himself before a magistrate before he is taken into custody, the magistrate cannot proceed to conviction except upon information and hearing and with the consent of the Attorney General of Canada. Moreover by the regulations of 12th February, 1919, no provincial, municipal or local police or peace officer or constable not thereunto authorized by the Chief Commissioner or Acting Chief Commissioner of Dominion Police or by the Commissioner of the Royal Northwest Mounted Police may accept surrender or apprehend or receive or have in custody, or take or deliver to any court of summary jurisdiction any deserter or absentee without leave, and the court cannot proceed to hearing or disposition of any charge of an offence of desertion or absence without leave from the Canadian Expeditionary Force unless the person charged be in the custody of or brought before the court by a police or peace officer or constable thereunto duly authorized as aforesaid.
3. Any person having the necessary information may institute the proceedings.

SERVICE MEDALS FOR SOLDIERS.

Sir SAM HUGHES:

Is it the intention of the Government that service medals will be issued to the militia who did duty as guards and sentries on bridges, canals, etc., throughout the Dominion during the war, but who did not get overseas?

Major-General MEWBURN: Definite regulations have not yet been published, but it is intedend that soldiers who have been on active service in Canada during the war will receive a medal

LIEUT. PARISEAULT.

Mr. SAVARD:

What were the costs in connection with the lawsuit of Captain Pariseault, the officer in charge of recruiting at Chicoutimi, in 1915?

Major-General MEWBURN: The costs paid in connection with the prosecution of Lieut. Pariseault amounted to $280.26. These accounts were assessed by the Justice Department.

EXEMPTIONS—MILITARY SERVICE ACT.

Mr. DEMERS:

1. How many cases have been appealed to the Judge of the Central Court of Appeal, from each of the provinces of Canada, under and by virtue of the Military Service Act of 1917?
2. How many exemptions were sustained by said Judge, respectively, for each province, under said Act?
3. How many exemptions were rejected by said judge, respectively, for each province, under said Act?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Alberta, 423; British Columbia, 468; Manitoba, 1,567; Ontario, 7,894; New Brunswick, 256; Nova Scotia, 2,164; Prince Edward Island, 188; Quebec, 28,102; Saskatchewan, 1,238.

2. Alberta, 153; British Columbia, 204; Manitoba, 988; Ontario, 3,761; New Brunswick, 91; Nova Scotia, 881; Prince Edward Island, 20; Quebec, 10,869; Saskatchewan, 542.

3. Alberta, 237; British Columbia, 136; Manitoba, 324; Ontario, 2,107; New Brunswick, 112; Nova Scotia, 633; Prince Edward Island, 144; Quebec, 16,279.

Note 1.—Of the cases mentioned in (1) the following numbers were undisposed of by the Central Appeal Court on November 11, 1918, when all tribunal operations ceased: Alberta, 33; British Columbia, 128; Manitoba, 255; Ontario, 2,026; New Brunswick, 53; Nova Scotia, 650; Prince Edward Island, 24; Quebec, 954; Saskatchewan, 428

Note 2. The cases mentioned in (1) do not include those scheduled where leave to appeal was refused by Central Appeal Judge, nor cases scheduled of men of the 20-22 class whose exemptions were eventually cancelled by Order in Council.

MAJOR GIBSON.

Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

Is Major Gibson, who was recently appointed Judge of the Superior Court of Quebec, the same Major Gibson who represented the Government as Chief Scrutineer in France during the general elections of December, 1917?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: No.

[Major-General Mewburn.]

MINISTER OF LABOUR.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Honourable the Minister of Labour represented in the House by an officially appointed Parliamentary Secretary?
2. If so, what is the name of the member occupying the said position?

Hon. Mr MACLEAN:

1. No.
2. Answered by answer to No. 1.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr DELISLE:

1. How many drifters were in the service of the Canadian Naval Department during the period of the war?
2. On whose order were these drifters built?
3. Were any drifters built on the order of the Canadian Government?
4. If built on Imperial order did the Naval Service of Canada take them over, and were they manned by Canadian crews?
5. Were the crews paid Canadian rates of pay?
6. What has been the refit cost to each drifter since becoming part of the Canadian Navy?
7. Does the Canadian Government bear the cost for these refits?
8. Did the Canadian or British Government inspectors supervise the construction of these drifters?
9. Are these drifters considered efficient and seaworthy?

Mr. CANNON:

1. Did the Government increase the salaries of its civil servants in the County of Dorchester during the year 1917?
2. If so, what are the names of the officials and employees who received increases, giving the date of each increase?
3. On whose recommendation were these increases made?

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How much has been expended by the Government on newspaper advertising since August 4, 1915?

BRITISH AMBASSADOR AT WASHINGTON.

CABLE FROM RT. HON. SIR ROBERT BORDEN DENYING NEWSPAPER RUMOURS.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, from time to time press despatches from abroad have erroneously associated the name of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister with the position of British Ambassador at Washington. The matter has been brought to the attention of the Prime Minister, and I have received from him to-day this cable:—

Paris, March 26, 1919.

Acting Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

You are authorized to state publicly that I am not considering the post of British Am-

bassador at Washington, and that it is my intention to return to Canada and resume my duties as Prime Minister as soon as the work of the Peace Conference will permit.

Borden.

DEATH OF SENATOR TAYLOR.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): There occurred in the Capital yesterday an event which I feel the members of this House would not desire should pass without fitting and appropriate reference. I allude to the sudden death of the Hon. George Taylor. As is known to the members of this House, the hon. gentleman was a member of the Senate, having been appointed to that body in 1911, but it was through his long association with this chamber that he was best known to parliamentarians and to the public throughout Canada. In the general election of 1882 he was returned with a majority of less than 300, and at each ensuing general election he was re-elected by a gradually increasing majority, which in the year 1911 had reached nearly 1,000. He was a member of the House of Commons for almost thirty years, serving under the premierships of Macdonald, Abbott, Thompson, Tupper, Bowell, Laurier.

The late Senator Taylor belonged to a generation of public men that is fast passing away. In his earlier days party spirit ran high and men were strong partisans. Senator Taylor was a staunch party men, and there was never any doubt as to where he stood upon a public question. He had the most implicit and abiding faith in the tenets of the Conservative party, and his devotion and loyalty to its leaders were unbounded. As has been the case with almost all men of his type, his strong partisanship in no wise prevented his being held in high esteem and respect by his political opponents. I am sure that the House will support me in saying that he was a man who was always well liked by both sides in this chamber.

For a period of twenty-five years he was Chief Whip of the Conservative party, and he enjoyed in very marked degree the personal friendship and confidence of the Right Hon. Sir John A. Macdonald. I know that he also enjoyed the esteem and respect of the late leader of the Opposition, the Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier, and there was no man in the councils of the Conservative party whose advice was held in higher regard by Sir Robert Borden, the present Prime Minister, than was that of the late Senator Taylor. In addition to the confidence which was reposed in him by his leaders, and which he continuously enjoyed, he was popular with the rank and file of the Conservative party, and indeed, as I have stated, of all members of the House. In his own constituency, which I have the honour to represent in Parliament to-day, he was regarded as the foremost citizen of the town of Gananoque, in which he had lived since early manhood. The late Senator was a man of fine public spirit and good works; a man of high benevolence, whose benefactions were many and most generous. I think the outstanding feature of his personality was his exceeding kindness of heart, which endeared him to all who knew him. He was never so happy as when doing a kindness to a neighbour or extending a helping hand to any of his constituents, or to any with whom he might be acquainted, or even chance to meet casually. In his constituency and here at Ottawa, where he was best known, he was regarded, and rightly so, as a man of most sterling integrity and probity of character. He will be greatly missed by his associates in both Houses of Parliament. I am sure that this House will join with me in an expression of deep regret at his passing away, and of sympathy with his widow and other members of his family circle in the bereavement they have sustained.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I am sure that we are all pleased to join in the handsome tribute paid to the memory of the late Senator Taylor by the leader of the Government. By his death we are, Mr. Speaker, once more reminded of the uncertainties of life, that we are merely pilgrims in this land, and that our sojourn here is but a transient one. The departed senator was for many years a conspicuous figure in the public life of this country, he having occupied a great many municipal, provincial and federal positions, to all of which he brought a full sense of responsibility and of public service, and, as has been well said by the leader of the Government, he also brought to them an extraordinary amount of energy and devotion. We all remember him with respect and kindly feelings, for he was a sincere and faithful friend and a man upon whom at all times the country and his friends could depend, for he held decided views, and there was no misunderstanding his attitude where the interests of this country were concerned. I wish to connect myself, as, I am sure, my hon. friends on this side of the House do, with what has been so appropriately said in regard to the memory of our departed friend, Senator Taylor.

ST. LAWRENCE RIVER DAMS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: Mr. Speaker, before the Orders of the Day are called, I would like to ask the hon. the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) if there is anything new in connection with the project of damming the St. Lawrence? During the concluding stages of the war a request was made to the Canadian Government, and referred to the International Waterways Commission, to the effect that a company, in order to produce war material, should be allowed to increase its power capacity, and permission was granted to that company by the commission to dam the St. Lawrence at a certain point in the river, but for the period of the war only. I would like to know if that permission has been withdrawn now that the war is over.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): Mr. Speaker, there is very little to be said in answer to the question of the hon. member for Maisonneuve. The matter has been under review departmentally, and a departmental report on the subject is being prepared, upon the receipt of which it will be submitted to a board recently constituted, known as the Dominion Power Board. I may add that that board, which is composed of the leading engineers in the Government service, has now surveys and investigations under way in respect to various portions of the St. Lawrence, and is also utilizing the investigations made by the Hydro-Electric Power Commission of Ontario and by other bodies; all that information will be utilized and brought to bear upon the determination of the question as soon as the departmental report is submitted.

RETURNS NOT BROUGHT DOWN.

Mr. ROBB: Mr. Speaker, I have a list of thirty-seven orders for returns voted last session. It seems to me that it is only reasonable the Government should have these brought down without further delay, and I would ask the Acting Prime Minister if he will see that those orders are brought down.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I would ask my hon. friend to give me a list of them. I shall interest myself to see that they are brought down as quickly as possible.

ADJOURNMENT OVER EASTER.

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY: Mr. Speaker, a rumour that recently went around the corridors of this building has, I observe, blossomed out in the public press by way of information that the Easter recess this year will be one of three weeks' duration. May I ask the Acting Prime Minister if, in view of the great amount of public business requiring attention in Parliament, the Government have it in mind to give countenance to any such unjustifiable waste of time?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The statement is without foundation and has not been drawn to my attention by any one except my hon. friend, although I think I saw something of it in the press. An announcement by the Government as to the Easter recess will be made in due course. My own view would be that the recess should not be of undue length, because it is highly desirable that Parliament should proceed as rapidly as possible with the public business.

OVERSEAS MAIL—RIMOUSKI.

Mr. LEMIEUX: With your leave, Mr. Speaker, might I ask the member of the Government who represents the Postmaster General if it is true that Halifax has been substituted for Rimouski for the reception of the trans-Atlantic mails?

Mr. ROWELL: I will make inquiries and give my hon. friend the information tomorrow.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, a matter of keen and widespread public interest at the present time is that of daylight saving. The Government has received numerous—I had almost said innumerable—communications from various sections of the community both in favour of the continuation of the legislation of last year and against such legislation. The question is not a party one and it involves no question of political principle of which I am aware, and I think it is desirable in the public interest that there should be a free discussion by the members of this House, representing, as they do, all sections and all interests of the Dominion, upon the subject. With that in view I intimated to my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr McKenzie) this morning, and the information was also conveyed to the Whips on both sides of the House, that when the Orders of the Day were reached I would move that the House to proceed to a notice of motion

by the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Cooper), appearing as No. 46 on the Notices of Motion on the Order Paper. The resolution is as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to re-enact at once Chapter 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight-Saving Act, 1918."

It has appeared to the Government that such a discussion as I think we shall have will bring out the opposite points of view held on this subject and the arguments by which they are sustained. I therefore move:

That the House do now proceed to Notices of Motion, No. 46.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Does the leader of the House say that the Government has no policy on this matter?

Mr. SPEAKER: Order. This motion is not debatable.

Mr. SMITH: I rise to a point of order. This motion should have the unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. SPEAKER: The unanimous consent of the House is not necessary. It is competent for the Government to move that a certain Order of the Day be proceeded with.

Motion agreed to.

The House thereupon proceeded to the Order: "Notices of Motions."

Mr. RICHARD CLIVE COOPER (Vancouver South) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to re-enact at once Chapter 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight Saving Act, 1918."

He said: In deference to requests received from large centres of population all over the country I bring this matter before the House in order that hon. gentlemen may express their opinion with regard to it.

In the matter of daylight saving there is a clear, dividing line between two conflicting interests. On the one side we have the dwellers in the cities and towns, and on the other the farming interests. The question is: whose claims are the stronger? I am not going into the subject in detail, but I wish to point out that while the dwellers in the cities and towns are practically unanimous in their approval of daylight saving, the farmers are not. Many farmers all over Canada, particularly in the West, would gladly support daylight saving legislation.

I do not intend to deal with this question in the light of any precedent; that Germany, England and France have found daylight saving of value does not matter. To my mind the question is whether the re-enactment of the Daylight Saving Act would benefit the majority of the people of Canada. I believe the largest number of people in Canada reside in the cities and large towns and work within the confines of four walls —in offices, stores, laundries, factories,— where the ventilation leaves much to be desired. As they are in the majority, the demands of these people for an extra few hours of daylight throughout the summer months must be given consideration. Moreover, the desire of the mothers and the children to get out in the sunlight after the father has come home from work must be regarded by all reasonable men who desire to conserve and improve the greatest asset in our national life; the children.

Reading the speeches dealing with this matter last year, I was impressed by the fact that mention of a very large labouring class was carefully omitted. I refer to the miners of Canada, who, with their wives and children, embrace some three hundred and fifty thousand persons. Only the dwellers in cities and the farmers were mentioned in the discussion of the matter last year; an odd fisherman or two was brought into it, I think, but not to make any matter. So that if we consider the wishes of the miners we shall find—as I know from a conversation I had to-day—that they sincerely desire to have the extra hour of daylight during the summer months. They work for the most part in the darkness under ground, and they will appreciate the extra time which the daylight saving enactment will enable their wives and children to spend in the sunlight with them.

A daylight saving enactment comes into effect in the United States on the 30th day of this month, and if we do not follow the example set by our big neighbour to the south, a great deal of confusion is bound to result. I should like to point to a lesson to be learned from the great war. Up to the spring of 1918 the Allied armies were struggling along under a divided command, and the results were not such as we desired. But from the time that we came under one undivided command, that of Marshal Foch, our success was speedy and was continued until it culminated in victory and the Armistice on November 11, 1918. I submit that application of the principle that brought us success in that case can be made to the action of Canada and the United States with regard to daylight saving.

It has been very truly said that the farmers are the backbone of the country. But if that backbone is too rigid, it becomes a

detriment to many of the country's interests. The farmers are divided on this question. Those who live close to towns and railways are opposed to daylight saving, while those who live at a distance from the towns and railways are more or less indifferent. In the West there are large farming communities of foreign settlers, the Doukhobors and the Mennonites, for instance, who own huge tracts of land and care nothing for the movement of the hands of the clock. If a vote were taken on this question among the farmers of the West and the votes of the farmers living close to towns and railways balanced against the votes of foreign settlers and farmers living distant from towns and railways, the majority would be in favour of daylight saving. I believe—it will not be denied that for many years, even before I came to Canada and probably before I was born, the people of Canada from the Atlantic to the Pacific have been living under artificial time. That time has always been dictated by the railway companies. Would it hurt the farmer in any way to add another little bit of artificial time? I submit it would not. I sincerely believe that in this Daylight Saving there is no obstacle to the best interest of the farming communities, and in every centre of population throughout Canada there is a strong and insistent demand for it. I have had, from all parts of Canada, a large number of communications, only one of which, which arrived at 2.20 p.m. to-day, but which covers Canada from coast to coast, I purpose reading:

> The Canadian Credit Mens' Trust Association, Limited, representing the wholesale trade from coast to coast strongly endorse re-enactment Daylight Saving law commercial classes largely preponderating over agriculture minority and living in large centres would receive great benefit without injuring agricultural classes can we do anything to strengthen your hands?

The endorsement therein contained is, I believe, the sentiment of the majority of the people of Canada.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve and Gaspé): I should like to state very briefly the reasons why I support the motion moved by the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Cooper). I have the honour to represent, for the time being, two constituencies, one a farming constituency, the other a manufacturing constituency. I remember when the Daylight Saving Bill was introduced into the House last year by the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), there was very strong

opposition to it, and if I was pleased at anything, it was that the Government, through Sir George Foster, had the courage to stand by its guns and see the Bill through. I trust the Government will, at the earliest opportunity, take the bull by the horns and bring in a similar Bill to the one introduced by Sir George Foster last year. That is, however, only an aside.

I represent a farming constituency in which this daylight saving was in force last year as it was in all other parts of Canada, and from the county of Gaspé I received no protests whatever against the measure. On the contrary, I do not think it affects the farmers or the fishermen of that county. They are, and have to be, early birds in any case in order to earn their living. At three o'clock in the morning the Gaspé fisherman is in his barge sailing for the banks in the Baie des Chaleurs, and he does not even look at the hands of the clock. But I also represent the manufacturers and the labour element of Maisonneuve, in which constituency the Daylight Saving measure was in force all last year, and from that important section I received very many letters requesting me to support a renewal of the measure. That is the reason why I stand to-day as a seconder of the motion moved by the hon. member for Vancouver. I believe, moreover, that, in the interest of the health of the people of Canada the measure should be put in force again. It worked very well last year, and I was impressed by the figures from Washington quoted by the Minister of Trade and Commerce, whereby it was proved beyond peradventure that millions upon millions of tons of coal had been and would be saved as a result of the enactment of the Daylight Saving measure. I would be interested to know what Mr. Magrath, the able Fuel Controller, thinks of this question. It is true the war is over, but our people must learn to save coal, because we may have labour troubles amongst the miners of Pennsylvania and also of eastern and western Canada, and our people may see the advantage of saving coal and thereby saving light.

Another point which impresses me is this. Whatever any one may say, we are living side by side with the great American Republic to the south, and although we must not be merged with that great republic in all the doings of its legislators, still, there are measures passed by the United States Congress which affect the whole of our national life in Canada. Congress has recently passed a Bill which will bring Daylight Saving into force in the United

States on the 31st of this month or on the 1st of April. This will affect, amongst other things, chiefly the transportation business of both countries, and I am in a quandary to understand how the railway systems of Canada are going to conform with the time-tables of the railway systems of the United States. If the time in Canada is an hour behind the time in the United States, how are connections to be made at the boundary line? Will all the trains stop one hour at the boundary line, or what will they do? This is one reason why I think a Daylight Saving Bill should be reintroduced this year, and if it is I will give it my hearty support.

Mr. JOHN BEST (Dufferin): Last year, when the Daylight Saving Bill was before the House, I opposed it because I believed that we were here to legislate for the greatest good of the greatest number, and my opinion is still that the great majority of the people of Canada are to-day opposed to daylight saving. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) said the other day that the farmers get up early in the morning. I am a farmer and I get up early in the morning, but there have been times when I have had to get up in the late hours of the night, and I can say, as a farmer, knowing this to be a fact, that last summer thousands of farmers throughout the Dominion got up in the late hours of the night in order to take their milk and other perishable goods to the station in time for the train. The hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cooper) said that the intention of this legislation was to increase the amount of daylight by one hour. If any man in Canada can tell me how this Government, or any other government, can increase the time of daylight by one hour, then I shall sit down and say no more. The few men in the towns and cities who are asking for daylight saving are not the men who get up at daylight; they are the men who remain asleep in bed until eight, nine, or ten o'clock in the day, and they want other people, who have to get up in the morning, to do their work at that time, while they drive around in automobiles. Last year, when the Daylight Saving Bill was before the House, I asked if any farmers' organizations had requested that it be passed, and the minister said, no. I believe the hon. member for Vancouver (Mr. Cooper) is absolutely mistaken when he says the farmers of this country are divided over this question, because I believe they are against the re-enactment of a daylight saving almost to a man. Nor can I understand why he says that the people in the cities and towns and villages are in favour of daylight saving; I believe that at least half of these people are against it. Many of this latter class have told me they are opposed to it because they have to get up an hour earlier in the morning. A working man who goes to work at seven has to get up at six for his breakfast. If the time is changed, he will have to get up at five. Would any sane man in this House say that the labouring class in this country want to get up at five o'clock in the morning? The hon. member also says that daylight saving would save fuel and light. I am a farmer myself and I know what I am talking about, and I say that during the last six weeks which daylight saving was in force last year, more fuel and light was consumed in the morning than under the old system. Imagine a man having to get up at four or five o'clock in the morning during the latter part of September and October, and having to put on a fire and burn light. Under the old system he would have gone to bed about the same time, I admit, but he would have saved fuel and light in the morning.

The hon. member also says that the farmers near the cities and towns and villages are not opposed to daylight saving. I want to tell my hon. friend that there is not a class of farmer so much opposed to daylight saving as those living near the towns and cities and villages, and for this reason: The labouring man who comes out from the town or village to work for the farmer during haying and harvest sees his fellow-workers in the nearby town quitting work at five in the evening, and naturally gets dissatisfied. There are cabinet ministers sitting here to-day who will tell you that their experience has been that it is this class of farmers which is the most opposed to daylight saving, for the reason I have given; and I cannot understand how my hon. friend should make such a contention. Any man who knows anything at all about farming knows that from haying until winter comes, an hour in the evening is worth two in the morning, because a farmer cannot start haying or harvesting before eight; and if the time is changed again this year it will mean he will lose an hour at night.

Why does the farmer living farther away from the towns and villages not want daylight saving? Let me give a concrete case, which is illustrative of conditions all over the Dominion. In the county I have the honour to represent a mail courier starts his trip twelve miles from one of the towns.

Now he has to be in that town at 8.15, and every man, woman and child in the villages along the route are opposed to the time being changed, because it means they will have to get up at three instead of four o'clock in the morning to catch that stage. This carrier has to get up now at four in the morning to feed his horses, and if the time is changed he will have to get up at three. I think almost as many men from the cities and towns have spoken to me against daylight saving as the farmers themselves. It is true that telegrams in favour of daylight saving have been sent to me by a few men; but who are they? Manufacturers who have nothing to do but ride around the country in their automobiles. Last year, just because a few men asked the Government to put a daylight saving measure through, this Government said they were obliged to do it—had pledged themselves to do it at the election. The men who made those representations to the Government did not represent three per cent of the population of this country.

Why is it conditions are so unsettled all the world over to-day, and unrest and anarchy prevail in many parts of the civilized world? It is because one class of people is being set against another, and I would ask whether it makes for harmony for the hon. member for Vancouver to stand up in this House and almost ask the Government to defy the farmers and say: We will enact this law.

Mr. COOPER: Will the hon. member quote any word of mine that was at all along the line the hon. member suggests?

Mr. BEST: I will. I think a sufficient justification for my remark was the hon. member's statement that we should not look to the farmers of this country, but should inquire what the people in the cities and towns want, and then enact a daylight saving measure. I say not only in connection with this Bill, but with every Bill that comes before the House we should try and compose our little differences and live in harmony together as one nation. We have simply got to do it; there never was a time in the history of Canada when there was so much disunion among the people as at present. One of the Ottawa papers said the other day that the only excuse the farmers gave for wanting the time to remain as at present, was because it was God's time. I say that is an insult to the farmers of this country, who have very good reasons for wanting the time to remain as it is. In the rural districts many children have to go one or two or three miles to school. At present they can help their parents by doing some of the chores before they go, but if the clock is set ahead they will not be able to help their parents in any shape or form.

The cheese and dairy men of this country do not want daylight saving. Imagine asking these men who now get up at four o'clock in the morning, to get up at three and milk fifty or seventy-five cows and take the milk to the station, while ninety per cent of the people in the towns and cities are asleep in bed. I made a trip in my automobile a short time ago—

Some hon. MEMBERS: Oh, oh.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Does the hon. member get up at seven in the morning and ride in an automobile?

Mr. BEST: I get up at five. Does my hon. friend mean to say that the farmers of this country have not the right to own an automobile? The farmers are the people who feed these men lying asleep in their beds, and if they are not entitled to an automobile I should like to know who is. Well, what did I find as I drove through those towns? I passed many men driving along with their milk and cream.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Was it in Dufferin county that these people were asleep?

Mr. BEST: I say that ninety per cent of the people in these towns were asleep while the farmers were already at work and had milked their cows. How can a farmer get hired help from a village or city during haying and harvest, if daylight saving is re-enacted? The farmers of this country have to crowd practically their whole year's work into five or six months during the summer, and when they hire men from the villages and towns during haying and harvest the men are not willing to work until six or seven in the evening when they see their fellow-workers in the towns quitting work at five. If the Bill is introduced and is made law, I am of the opinion, Sir, that there will ensue a greater agitation than is likely to be caused by any other Bill on the Order Paper. I do not suggest that it will cause any considerable harm, but the people of this country are looking askance at Parliament and there seems to be a general feeling that if their wishes are to be ignored to meet the whims of the few it is time that they were organized in an endeavour to obtain justice and fair play. I would, therefore, earnestly request the Government

to consider this matter with extreme care and not to be influenced by a few telegrams that have been received here. Telegrams, Sir! Why, I can get from one township in my county more telegrams deprecating the daylight saving scheme than all the cables that are to-day in this House. I read about two dozen telegrams the other day obviously signed by one who was trying to convince people that every man, woman and child in his neighbourhood favoured daylight saving. We have too many petitions and resolutions, and altogether too many telegrams sent to hon. members, purporting to be representative of popular opinion on this subject, when, in nearly every case, the man who has sent the telegram probably does not represent even all the members of his own family.

The farmers have a strong argument against this scheme. During the past four years they have risen early in the morning and retired late at night in order that they might, as far as possible, comply with the urgent request of the Government to increase production in view of the crisis that faced the nations in the matter of food supplies. They worked admirably to save the situation, and in return are their wishes now to be ignored? Why should not the farmers be allowed to observe the standard of time to which they have been accustomed? The hon. member is apprehensive of trouble at the boundary. I admit there may be trouble at the boundary; I am not disposed to dispute that probability; but would that trouble be at all comparable to the difficulties that would arise through every school section in the Dominion having a different time? In our county, people were unable to get their children off to school in the morning. Many of the trustees interviewed the inspector and desired him to revert to the old time. He saw the situation and agreed. In the confusion that resulted from the change of time there arose serious difficulties that cost the farmers considerable money. A farmer breaks his machine and has to stop work at three o'clock in the afternoon. He starts for the town or village believing he will get there before six o'clock to have the necessary repairs attended to. When he reaches the shop he finds that it was closed at five o'clock, and in consequence he loses a day, which means a good deal to him in the busy season. Now, this Dominion has spent hundreds of thousands of dollars in an attempt to keep men on the farms, but how can they expect to retain the rural population if they are to be ignored in such important matters as this. I would ask my hon. friend from Vancouver (Mr. Cooper) to produce, if he can, a letter or a telegram from any organized farmers' institution in Canada expressing approval of the daylight saving scheme. I do not believe he can, and I hope the Government will see that the wishes of the people are respected in this matter, and that whatever laws may be enacted we shall not have any antagonism between the cities and the towns, and the country.

Mr. H. E. LAVIGUEUR (Quebec County): Mr. Speaker, I represent one of the largest constituencies in the province of Quebec, and I think that the daylight saving law passed last year had the approbation of all the people in my section. Speaking for the city of Quebec, whose views I think I voice, I desire to state that if the Government introduces this measure I shall support it.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): I must congratulate the Government and its leader on the course they are taking in this matter. In no possible sense is it a political question, nor can it be regarded as such; and while the tone of the remarks of my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr Best) will probably be excused because he is a farmer and talks about something from which he has suffered, still I think the best judgment of the House will be that no attempt is being made to set race against race or class against class in this matter, and it is one that each hon. gentleman will deal with according to his best judgment. I might say, as a resident of the great city of Winnipeg, that we adopted Daylight Saving two years ago, regardless of any action of the Federal Parliament, and the people of that city were very much gratified with the result. The residents of Winnipeg were pleased with Daylight Saving, and I believe will continue it, although there were some difficulties which resulted from its operation. For example, there was a difference between our railway time and the city time, but there was not very much complaint with regard to that, and if I represented Winnipeg city in Parliament I would vote to have Daylight Saving continuously. However, I represent a rural, not an urban constituency.

I received a few minutes ago a telegram which I shall read to the House:

Winnipeg, Man., March 27, 1919.

R. L. Richardson,
House of Commons.

This organization, after fullest consideration of subject with business men, farmers, labourers, is practically unanimous in favour of con-

tinuation of Daylight Saving plan in Canada this year, and urges Government to take immediate action to this end.

Winnipeg Board of Trade,
W. H. Carter, President.

I am surprised at the statement in the telegram as to the attitude of the farmers, because my constituents are generally opposed to daylight saving. In the West the sun rises very early and sets very late, and it makes a very long day. As against that telegram I have received a letter from the Minister of Education of Manitoba, the Hon. Dr. Thornton, which I shall read to the House, because it is a very important declaration, and should have a considerable influence on the members from Manitoba with regard to the vote which they may give on this resolution.

Winnipeg, Manitoba, March 6, 1919.

R. L. Richardson, M.P.,
Ottawa.

Re Daylight Saving Law.

Dear Sir:—I wish to call your attention to a resolution passed unanimously by the annual convention of the Manitoba School Trustees' Association protesting against the re-enactment of the above law; also to a similar resolution passed unanimously by the Legislature of the Province of Manitoba. I wish further to add my own protest because of the difficulties which arose in connection with practically all the rural schools of the province. The nature of the difficulty will be more clearly appreciated by reading the enclosed copy of a letter received from one School Board. This is only one of a great many dealing with the same situation. I hope the Parliament of Canada will not re-enact this measure.

Yours very truly,
(Signed) R. S. Thornton,
Minister of Education.

Dr. Thornton has not sent me the first resolution to which he refers, at least it was not enclosed in the letter, but I take his statement as authoritative that such a resolution was passed by the Manitoba School Trustees' Association. In the resolution passed by the legislature you have the consensus of the opinion of that province as represented by the provincial members

Now here is a copy of a resolution passed by a School District:

At a meeting of the School Board of the Elgin Consolidated School District, held on February 27th, a resolution was passed that this School Board appeal to you to use your influence against the re-enactment of the so-called Daylight Saving law. Last year we found it to be entirely unworkable in our Consolidated School, and had to set our school hours at 10 a.m. to 5 p.m. This led us out of one difficulty, viz.: the starting time for the vans, but immediately we found our noon hour conflicting with the meal hour of the parents living in town. This was a cause of constant friction.

[Mr. Richardson.]

I may explain for the benefit of hon. gentlemen who may not understand the reference to "vans" in the resolution, that in the province of Manitoba many of the school districts have large wagons, or vans, which they send about the road allowances to collect the children. That is particularly desirable in cold weather when blizzards might overtake the children, as sometimes happens, with fatal or disastrous results. Under the circumstances I take it that the opinion of rural Manitoba is strongly against daylight saving. My hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) has already advanced arguments showing the difficulty of farm help carrying on operations early in the morning because of the dew on the grass, and I may say that difficulty has been a very serious one in the West. Furthermore, farm labourers raise objection to daylight saving as under it they have to work longer hours than those men who work in manufacturing towns. Therefore they want the hours set at the same time, but not under daylight saving, because it operates rather seriously and entails hardship upon the farmers. Accordingly, as the representative of a rural constituency I shall feel obliged to cast my vote against the resolution.

Mr. A. B. McCOIG (Kent): Having the privilege of representing possibly one of the largest rural constituencies, which also contains a large city and a large town, I am in much the same position as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat. From the cities of this country there comes some request for the enactment of a Daylight Saving Law, and I have received a request of that kind from one of the largest towns of my constituency. In every other section of my constituency, however, resolutions have been passed by the county and township councils asking me to oppose Daylight Saving and to vote against the re-enactment of such legislation.

I agree with the hon. member for Springfield (Mr. Richardson) as to the inconvenience which will result in getting children to school if the daylight saving law is re-enacted. In the rural parts of my constituency there are children who have to go a distance of a mile and a half to three miles in order to attend school, and under daylight saving the mothers of those children are obliged to rise an hour earlier in order to get them off each morning. This legislation has been opposed not only by women in the rural districts, but also by women in the towns and cities. This is a fact which hon. members must not overlook, because

we expect that at the next general election the women of this country will have a voice in the election of representatives to Parliament.

As far as the labouring men are concerned, we expect that sooner or later in this country—legislation has already been introduced in some of the legislatures—an eight-hour or nine-hour day law will be called for. If such a law were in operation the men in our industries would quit work at four o'clock in the afternoon, instead of five o'clock, which would leave an extremely long afternoon between the time of stopping work and retiring to rest.

As regards the saving of coal likely to result from daylight saving, I do not see much argument in it. Daylight saving only operates from the 30th of March until the 30th of October, which period comprises the warmest months of the year, so that not very much coal would be saved in that time.

The question of the towns passing by-laws has been referred to. In some cases by-laws have already been passed compelling business houses to close at nine o'clock, even on Saturday nights with the result of greatly inconveniencing many workingmen, and business men who sell goods after the stipulated hour for closing are subject to a fine, which is another great hardship. The question of the effect on farming operations of daylight saving has been referred to. In the southwestern parts of Ontario crops are raised which are known as hoe crops, and it is utterly impossible to hoe some of these crops while the dew is on them. That is the case with the bean crop and the sugar beet crop. There are a number of other crops of which the same might be said.

I believe that the House is now thoroughly conversant with both sides of the question, and to save a prolonged debate I will move, seconded by the hon. member for Middlesex West (Mr. Ross) to replace the words "it is expedient to re-enact at once," by the words "it is not expedient to re-enact until this day six months," which would postpone the matter for the present

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: The motion as amended will read as follows: ,

That in the opinion of this House it is not expedient to re-enact, until this day six months, Chapter 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight Saving Act, 1918."

Mr. WILLIAM SMITH (Ontario, South): When this question was introduced last year I took strong ground against it, and I am more than ever convinced that I was right in my action at that time, by the support which I have since received in the country. It is true that I am not, like my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best), perhaps a farmer according to his strict interpretation because I live upon the farm where I was born, whereas that hon. gentleman, a number of years ago, left the farm upon which he had lived.

I am not going to discuss the question as to whether this legislation is right, I shall leave that in the hands of the House. I will say, however, that I was more than delighted that this amendment has been moved by the hon. member for Kent. Any one who has ever lived upon a farm or been in close personal connection with farmers absolutely agrees with the amendment which has been moved to-day. Had the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) not moved his amendment, I would have gone one step further and tested the opinion of this House upon the resolution. As a farmer and as one in close touch with farm life, I may be allowed to say that if the Government of this country would think for a moment of the result in Manitoulin, in South Huron, and in the northern part of the county which I have the honour to represent, I do not imagine they would have allowed this to go so far. The farmers —and I am one of them—have a right to their own opinions, and they have the right to give expression to their opinions in this House, and while I do not say they are always right—neither do I say my hon. friends from the Great West are always right—I am bound to say that on this question of daylight saving the farmers of the province of Ontario are absolutely in touch with the amendment which has been moved by the hon. member for Kent, and which I propose to support.

Mr. S. W. JACOBS (George Etienne Cartier): Mr. Speaker, when this question came up last year it had the support of the Government, and I am sorry to note to-day that the Government has not the courage of its convictions of last year in this matter. The measure was introduced last year by the hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster), but unfortunately for those who are in favour of the measure the hon. minister is not here to-day to back it with the authority which he gave to it on the last occasion. I would like to ask the hon. members of this House who are opposed to this measure why it is that practically the whole civilized world has passed legislation in favour of daylight

saving. I would like the hon. members of this House to tell me what country in Europe has not adopted a measure of this kind. The United States has adopted this measure. After all there are some farmers in the United States who are doing quite as well as the farmers in this country, and yet there was no protest from them. How is it that in the whole of Europe—in France, in England, in Germany, in Austria, a measure of this kind is in operation? I do not think that the farmers of this country are one whit less able to carry on their business than those of other countries, and it seems to me that it is a reflection on them to say that they cannot.

When this question was before the House last year we had a learned disquisition upon it by the hon. Minister of Trade and Commerce, and he cited some facts which I think it might be useful for us to bear in mind. Some gentlemen of this House seem to have very short memories, or they may be like the famous Bourbon family, they never learn and they never forget. The hon. the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who must be considered to be one of the high priests of the Unionist party, gave some information to this House which I think it is well we should hear to-day. He stated that a parliamentary committee was appointed by the British House of Commons some few years ago to study this whole question of daylight saving. This committee did not restrict its energies to Great Britain alone, but it went on a roving commission throughout the whole of Europe, and it learned that the measure was in every respect beneficial, not only economically, but in regard to the morals and health of the people. That committee, in one of the paragraphs of its report, said:—

> We have devoted particular attention to the question of the effect of "summer time" on the health of children, and we have been glad to find that, in spite of certain statements which had been made to the contrary, the bulk of the evidence favours the conclusion that in the case of children also "summer time" has proved a success.

Then the report deals with the position of the employers:—

> The general view of employers as expressed in the replies to the questionnaires, was that their employees had taken full advantage of the extra hour's daylight; and that while the majority were not in a position, with so short a period of observation, to state positively whether or not an improvement in health had resulted, a number had noticed increased vitality in their workers, and in some cases an improvement in the standard of the work. Only one or two employers recorded the appearance of any ill effects in the shape of tiredness and irregular time keeping. We have had evidence from all sources of the value of the extra daylight to the very large number of workers who cultivate gardens and allotments.

There is a further paragraph with regard to agriculture, which may be of interest to our friends from the farming districts:—

> In spite of such difficulties as have been recorded, a very large majority of farmers and war agriculture committees are in favour of the renewal of the Act, and the majority even of those who are of opinion that it was not advantageous to agriculture consider that it should be renewed, as they recognize its great benefits to the community at large.
>
> Taking the whole of the evidence, we are satisfied that the great bulk of the working classes are favourable to summertime, and we are convinced that they stand to profit by it as much as, and in many cases more than, any other section of the community. Such real inconveniences as have been experienced will, we believe, be remedied with a little more experience of summertime conditions.

That is the report of the British parliamentary committee who, as I have already stated, made an exhaustive study of the subject throughout Europe. Now we find ourselves in this position, that every white civilized country in Europe and North America will be in favour of this measure, and the only country that will not be in favour of it, if this resolution is not put through, will be Canada. I ask hon. gentlemen of this House whether they wish this country to be put in that position or not.

Mr. J. E. SEXSMITH (East Peterborough): Mr. Speaker, I was a little surprised at the hon. gentleman (Mr. Jacobs) who has just taken his seat, telling us that Austria-Hungary and Germany had this daylight saving record, and I wondered if he considered that that was a good recommendation for us. I would like to remind him that they have Bolshevism there and many other things that we do not want in Canada.

When this so-called daylight saving measure was up last year I opposed it, and I feel to-day that I was perfectly justified in my action, and I am convinced now that seventy-five per cent of the people of Canada are opposed to this legislation. It may have some advantages, but its disadvantages far outweigh them. The men that work from nine to ten hours a day, I do not care whether in the city or in the country, Mr. Speaker, oppose this measure. I know, for I have talked to city men who were working last year when this measure was brought down, and when it went into force on the first of April, they said: "We had just commenced to go to our work in the morning daylight, but when the clock was put back one hour we had to go by

lamplight." There is no getting away from the fact that the people in Canada that are asking for this legislation to-day to be put on the statute-book are the class who go to work at ten o'clock in the morning, and some of them perhaps do not do any work at all; but the people who are opposing the measure are the people who work long hours. I know that sportsmen, lacrosse and baseball players, and golfers, are the people who are agitating, and I am sorry to say some of the newspaper editors have taken up the cudgels in their favour. We have all been discussing serious matters here during the last month. Canada is burdened with debt, and where are we going to get the products to pay that debt? Shall we get it by putting the hands of the clock ahead an hour? No, we must get it out of the earth, the mine, the field, the forest, the sea. The farmers to-day, and justly so, are opposing this measure as an unit from the Atlantic to the Pacific, simply because it was detrimental to them during its operation last year.

Many farmers in my district supply milk on contract to firms in Toronto, where the hon. member who edits the World (Mr. W. F. Maclean) comes from. I got off the early train at four o'clock one morning last year on my way home, and when I saw the farmers around the station at that hour I dodged off to the other side in order to meet as few of them as possible. In order to carry out their contracts these farmers were obliged to begin milking operations last year between three and four o'clock in the morning. Ordinarily the local train carrying the milk to the city leaves at six-forty in the morning, but when the hands of the clock were turned ahead, that practically meant that the train for Toronto left at five-forty. One man told me that at the end of the season he was absolutely played out because of the hours he had to keep. Is it reasonable, is it sensible, is it in the interests of this great country, that farmers shall be obliged to milk by lantern light not only in the winter, but in June and July as well? A farmer who has three or four children said to me: My older boy is twelve or thirteen years of age. His mother is not very strong, and before this daylight saving came in he used to do a little work in the morning before he went to school. But now we cannot get the children to go to bed an hour before sundown, and the result is that when the men get up and work an hour or two they must have their breakfast; then when the children get up their mother has to prepare a second breakfast. Not only does she lose the little services which the children formerly rendered before they went to school; she has imposed upon her the additional burden of getting a second breakfast.

I think that some of the schools asked the inspector to allow them to run under the old time, but he refused, and the schools were run on the new time, to the great disadvantage of all concerned.

I saw something in the Ottawa Journal a couple of mornings ago to the effect that the cities and towns and railroads should adopt the daylight saving and then let the isolated farmer "go hang," so to speak. Now, in harvest time the farmer always loses an hour or two in the morning, because he cannot draw in or run the binder before nine o'clock or half-past nine. Before the hands of the clock were changed he made no complaint about losing that time, but last year he lost not only an hour in the morning, but also an hour in the afternoon, because the men would not work after five o'clock. Only one municipality in my constituency continued to use the old time.

It is true that in the cities production in garden plots may have been increased under daylight saving. Out of patriotism, men and women, boys and girls, were working day and night, early and late, to produce as much as possible. But if the daylight saving measure is put into operation this year, many farmers who have to depend on hired help will be very careful about their operations. The newspapers are preaching to the people the doctrine of "get back on the land." Will this measure help to get the people back on the land? I contend that it will help to get them off the land. Many farmers throughout Ontario who have had to hire help are selling out and getting off the farm simply because of labour difficulties.

The arguments of the hon. gentlemen who have advocated the re-enactment of the daylight saving measure are very feeble. It is said that United States has adopted a measure of this kind for this year. I think I am right in saying that the measure adopted by the United States this year is simply a continuation of the measure passed the year before. A very strong feeling prevailed throughout the United States this year in favour of the repeal of the daylight saving measure, but the resolution was placed at the bottom of the list and the interested parties filibustered it. It was talked out and a decision never reached, as has sometimes been the case in this House; so that the daylight saving measure

remained law in the United States this year. I am glad that our daylight saving legislation lasted only a year and that we have now the privilege of expressing our views with regard to it, and if necessary, of casting our vote for or against it. I sincerely trust that the Government will take into consideration the inadvisability of re-enacting this legislation, and that we shall have heard the last of it for this year.

Mr. GEORGE WILLIAM ANDREWS (Winnipeg Centre): Mr. Speaker, when the daylight saving legislation was brought down by the Government last year, I was strongly in support of it. Personally, I see nothing very much wrong with it to-day, but when I returned to my constituents last year—who, by the way, are not farmers, but real working men nevertheless—I found that the measure was not at all popular amongst those who started work at six or seven in the morning. It did not meet with the approval either of the men or of their wives, and I have no hesitation in saying that if a referendum could be taken in my constituency of Winnipeg Centre, where there are some eighty thousand people, the measure would be heavily defeated.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): It was generally understood throughout the country that the daylight saving legislation would not likely come before the House this session, and until I came into the chamber this afternoon I had not expected that this, the last resolution on the Order Paper, would come before us for consideration. It is generally recognized that after the House has been in session about four weeks, resolutions of private members placed on the Order Paper after that date, would have little or no chance of getting before the House.

I have no intention of going into this matter in detail, but I earnestly request every hon. member to consider carefully the signs of the times. A feeling of great unrest prevails in practically every country in the world to-day.

Many labour organizations throughout the country are not content with even an eight-hour day, but are now advocating for a six-hour day and that the old rate of wages should be maintained. Since the beginning of the war the cost of living has undoubtedly increased considerably throughout the world, and while many industrial workers in the towns and cities are receiving large wages, I believe many of them are unable to save more than they did when wages were much lower than at present. The result is that they naturally look at this question with an earnest desire that the cost of living should be considerably reduced. What will the trend be if all these agitations are complied with? Does any one think it possible that the cost of living in this country can be reduced under such conditions as reducing the hours of labour and moving the clock onward, by which many people can get their day's work done during the forenoon so that they will have the whole afternoon for play? Does any one think that by putting a full day's work in during the morning at the old rate of pay, the result which is so much desired at the present time can be achieved? The people who are producing the food for the world to-day are tired; while the war was on they laboured hard under difficulties and made great sacrifices. Perhaps some people will say that they did it largely through a desire to reap the advantages of high prices accruing as the result of their labour. That may be true in a number of instances, but, on the whole, I believe they did it through an honest desire to help win the war. What are the conditions throughout Canada to-day? The value of the field crops of Canada during the past year amounted to about $1,000,000,000. We have facing us at the present time an appalling debt, and when one takes a general survey of the physical features of our country from the Atlantic to the Pacific, where is the hope for the future based most strongly? Is it not from our soil, our fields, our forests, and our mines, that we hope to create the wealth necessary to overcome the serious condition with which we are confronted at this time? But it is rather significant that even under conditions as they were formerly without the short labouring day, without moving the clock on, the trend has been from the broad lands of Canada to the towns and cities, so that about one-half of our small population of around seven million people are to-day living in our towns and cities. That is not, from an economic standpoint, at all desirable, and that is why I protest when I hear people argue in favour of this so-called daylight saving. This is a most foolish name to apply to the measure, because it does not save daylight in any sense whatever and the name is a misnomer. In the county and province from which I come, the people who are engaged in the food production are almost, if not a unit in favour of leaving the time as it has always been previous to 1918, and I think their views are representative of the views of the majority of the people of Canada. I have received from

almost every imaginable representative body in my constituency resolutions protesting against the re-enactment of this legislation. While I have received such resolutions from school trustees, insurance companies, farmers' organizations, municipal bodies, indeed, practically every organization in the county, I have received only one petition or resolution in favour of this measure from the members of a horticultural society in one of the towns. I have had from the people of the towns numerous individual requests urging that this measure be not re-enacted; that they are not at all in favour of it; and I think if there was any strong feeling in favour of it, petitions that it be re-enacted would have been received. But in view of the feeling throughout the country that this measure was not going to be reintroduced, one can understand why those who are agitating for it, who desire to have nearly the whole afternoon for themselves to play, got busy during the past few days and made the wires hot bombarding the Government in order to make it appear that there was an overwhelming sentiment throughout the country in favour of it, and I presume that is why we are discussing this question this afternoon. I would suggest that the Government consider impartially what is really in the best interests of the country. The Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) will have to do a great deal of hard thinking and figuring before he is in a position to secure the requisite revenue to meet the expenditures with which we are confronted, and I, therefore, suggest that nothing be done which will, in any way, discourage those who are creating the wealth that is needed to help us out of our present difficulty.

I have the honour to represent a county that is well-known as one of the greatest dairying districts in Canada. Last year a survey was made of 437 dairy farms in that county as regards the revenues and profits that the farmers on those farms were making. The term "scientific agriculture" is very often used nowadays and, if I do say it, scientific agriculture is applied in that county as well, if not better than in any other section of Canada. What was the result of this census—and let us remember that this was taken during a year when the returns for dairy products were higher than ever before in the history of the world? It was found that after allowing the farmer $500 for wages, he received, on his capital invested, 7 per cent.

We hear people saying that the farmers were profiteers during the war; that they have reaped enormous advantages as a result of the high prices; that many of them have become wealthy; that they have their automobiles; well, if there is in Canada any class of people who require automobiles to carry on their business, it is the farmers. The automobile is a business proposition with them; it is not a question of pleasure altogether; and if it were not for the fact that a farmer has something of that nature, he would not be able to carry on his business to-day. Notwithstanding what may be said about the farmer, it is a fact that the movement from the country to the city that has been going on to such a tremendous and alarming extent for so many years, has continued during the war to even a greater extent than before. From 1915 to 1917, in Ontario, there has been an actual decrease in the farming population of 37,867. Some one may say that is the result of so many men having enlisted.

That is largely true, for at the same time the cities have decreased to the extent of 10,736, and towns and villages increased to the extent of 744. The war is ended, so far as we can judge at present, but the last few months have witnessed in the older sections of Ontario the greatest number of exchanges of farms in the history of Canada; and the significant thing is that it is not the impulsive shortsighted farmers who jump from one conclusion to another who are selling their farms, but the hard-headed business men among them. And the people who are taking their place are very largely people of inexperience who imagine that conditions on the farms of Ontario are much more advantageous than they really are. I would suggest to the hon. members of this House, and particularly to those who are so anxious to have the afternoons to themselves for play, that they consider the effect on the cost of living which this so called daylight saving measure would have in this country, and I would urge them not to aggravate the present situation. There is no denying that a bad and bitter feeling is growing up between the urban and rural citizens of Canada: we cannot close our eyes to that fact, and the sooner we recognize that something will have to be done to remove this feeling, rather than aggravate it by mischievous legislation of this kind, the better it will be for all concerned. In the rural sections many of the children have to go a long distance to school, sometimes two or three miles, and if this measure is again adopted they will have to be dragged out of their beds in the morning to get them to school in time. Is that a condition we

should have in this country, simply because it suits the convenience of those in the towns and cities who wish to have the whole afternoon or nearly so to themselves? This resolution if adopted will result in many more people selling their farms and moving into the towns and cities where their children can receive an education, which would be more difficult for them to receive in the country districts. Furthermore, there is nothing to prevent those who desire daylight saving from having it. There is no town or city in Canada that cannot pass a by-law bringing socalled daylight saving into effect, without interfering with people in other parts of the country.

It may be said that the United States have in effect a similar measure. The United States law of a year ago was to remain in force until repealed, differing in that respect from ours, which would have to be re-enacted. This year Congress rose with much business still not dealt with, and daylight saving as a result was automatically continued. I think it is generally conceded, however, that if the matter had come before Congress the law would have been repealed; so I do not think there is much force in the example of the United States. And as for making our law conform with theirs, why, that is hardly in keeping with the principle of autonomy of which we are so proud; and it is not exercising that initiative in our own affairs which we should exercise. Sometimes we lead even the United States.

I have spoken at greater length than I intended, but I have still not touched many important features, which, however, other speakers discussed fully, but I am satisfied that the arguments I have advanced ought to convince every-

5 p.m. one in this House that it is not in the interests of Canada under present conditions to have legislation of this kind put upon the statute book. Do not forget that self-denial will have to be practised by all the people of Canada, and do not imagine that it is the other fellow who will have to practise all of it, and that you can go scot-free. That idea is altogether too prevalent in this country. We must all make sacrifices in view of the conditions with which we are confronted, and I believe that if we face our difficulties with courage in a sound business-like way they will soon be overcome. I do not think anything will be gained by having this discussion this afternoon, and I regret exceedingly that the Government have seen fit to allow it to come up to-day. I think it would have been much better if the matter had been left in abeyance and nothing done to aggravate the feeling which undoubtedly exists to-day between urban and rural citizens.

Mr. WALTER DAVY COWAN (Regina): The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) sought to chide the Government for not having the courage of their convictions and bringing down their policy on this question, and the hon. member who has just taken his seat (Mr. Sutherland) practically took the same attitude. I think that criticism is quite undeserved, for I remember quite well when the Minister of Trade and Commerce brought in this Bill last session he brought it in as a war measure, in order to save coal which was absolutely necessary to meet war necessities, and he said at that time, in answer to a question, that the law would remain in force for only one year, and then Parliament could decide whether it should be re-enacted or not. And that is exactly what is being done to-day; I commend the Government for keeping the promise which was made last year.

For my part, I am quite satisfied that the Act which was passed last year has done exactly what it was intended to do; that is, it has saved to Canada many hundreds of thousands of dollars. In our city, in the power house and in every private house, a great deal of coal has been saved; but because I supported the measure last year, as I did, as a war necessity, it does not follow that I am going to support a similar measure when the necessities of war no longer exist. Conditions to-day are entirely different, and with me the question is simply this: Do the people of Canada want this Bill or do they not? I for one do not believe in forcing legislation down the throats of the people in advance of the time when they want it, and it is quite evident to me, from the numerous letters and resolutions which I have received from private individuals and public bodies and trade associations in my constituency, that a very large element in our part of the country does not want this legislation. Mark you this: In the city in which I live, on the 6th day of April, we are going to have fast time, because we have had it there by by-law for many years. It makes it very difficult to transact business, because we have slow time in the country all around, and the farmers often come in an hour late to transact business, but we have it, and it cannot be repealed except by by-law, and you cannot get

enough people to repeal that by-law. I tried it myself, because I did not like the trouble caused by having the two different times; but the people want it, and so let them have it. In time, I fancy the farming community will be educated to the advantages of daylight saving, but until that time comes, and they express a desire for it, I do not think we should force it down their throats. Therefore, I am going to suggest to the Government that they do not introduce a Bill for re-enacting daylight saving this year. I do so because it seems to me it would act simply and solely as an irritant to our agricultural community, and when you get a farmer irritated he gets hot, as the hon. member for Dufferin (Mr. Best) very clearly evidenced this afternoon. It is not desirable that such a condition should exist. What is happening to-day is this: The workingmen to-day are making considerable demands, and the farmers are about the last people in the community who have any inclination to accede to them; they want to get a dollar's worth of work for every dollar paid from any man whom they employ. I think that we should remove the irritation that undoubtedly exists by not enacting this legislation. The agriculturists are unquestionably annoyed, and these things are merely pin pricks that accomplish very little. I would, therefore, suggest to the Government that they do not bring in this Bill. I believe that a great many of those who express opinions on the subject are not by any means vitally interested one way or the other. By way of illustration I may mention one fact. One of the numerous letters I have received recently came from a Methodist minister who lives in the province of Saskatchewan—not in my constituency. He said that farm labourers were not available, and that as soon as they heard the factory whistles they wanted to go to the house and rest. This is, to say the least, rather strange, in view of the fact that there is not a factory whistle within one hundred miles of this gentleman, parson though he is! It is obvious, therefore, that a great deal of what we hear on the subject is purely imaginary, and we must remove these misconceptions. In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I do not think it would be advisable at the present time to put this measure through.

Mr. E. W. NESBITT (Oxford North): Somebody has suggested in the discussion this afternoon that the miners should be considered. As a matter of fact the miners nearly all over Canada work in three shifts a day, so that it cannot make much difference to them which system of time is adopted. I am not acquainted with the mining sections of the West, but I know the Cobalt section intimately, and know that that is the practice there.

Now, I do not think that there is any doubt that the people in the cities and large towns are largely in favour of daylight saving. The merchants and manufacturers and some of the workingmen regard it favourably—not all of the workingmen by any means, because I have been informed by some that they are indifferent in the matter. It can safely be said, however, that the bulk of the city people would be in favour of the Bill. As has been remarked many times this afternoon, we are a country of different classes, or rather, we follow different occupations; but it is best that we all should agree if we can, on some common platform. I believe that the farmers are opposed to this project, and the remarks of my hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) concerning their opposition I endorse, because I have had resolutions from cheese factories, farmers' clubs, municipal councils, county councils, and, practically speaking, any organization that could pass a resolution of any kind, in opposition to the renewal of daylight saving. My hon. friend from Montreal (Mr. Jacobs) said that there was no opposition to this daylight saving in the United States. On the contrary, as far as I have been able to gather from the United States press, there seemed to be considerable opposition from the farming communities in that country to it. Congress convened and rose suddenly, and as the law was not repealed it remained in force.

I hope I may be pardoned if I state a personal experience in illustration of my contention that the farmers are earnest in their opposition to the renewal of this law, and that they have reasons for such opposition. My hon. friend from Regina (Mr. Cowan) said, if I did not misunderstand him, that it was largely a matter of sentiment, and that the farmers, appreciating the advantages of daylight saving, would come to favour it. This contention, however, will not hold, as I shall show. In Ontario, as a great many hon. members no doubt know, there are threshing machines that go around from place to place and do the threshing by the bushel. This is necessary because we house all our own grain in the barn. It is also necessary, where we grow fall wheat and barley, to have a first threshing in order to clean out

the barn sufficiently to allow other grain to go in. This first threshing, as we call it, is commonly practised. Now last year it so happened that our crops in Ontario were very heavy, and I had to thresh early my fall wheat and other grain so as to get room in the barn for the oats. I had about 40 or 50 acres of oats standing out all cut and in shook. I had not sufficient men on the farm, and could not obtain a sufficient number in the immediate neighbourhood, to take in the crop as rapidly as I could desire, so one of the factories allowed me to enlist volunteers from among its men to help me. I took those men out, leaving the factory shortly after seven o'clock and arriving at half past seven. It was half past nine before any work could be done in the field, owing to the dew on the grain. The following morning the men went out again, but the dew was heavier than ever, and they could not commence work before ten o'clock. Our section of the country is largely a dairy section, and it is necessary for our men to stop work at five o'clock in order to get the milking done. The men that came from town would not work longer than ten hours and you could not ask them to do so. At any rate they stopped at five o'clock, and as a consequence they worked, practically speaking, only two hours or two and one-half hours in the forenoon and from one o'clock until five in the afternoon. Under these circumstances, therefore, the day is very short. One might suggest that the men could go and do something else in the morning while waiting; well your own men might be able to find other things to occupy their time, but where you have certain work ahead of you and men are waiting to do that work, they will not do anything else in the meantime. They will wait for the main work, and anything they may do in the way of chores will not under such conditions amount to anything. This is a matter, Mr. Speaker, in which the farmer is intensely interested. There is a feeling of irritation at the present time on the part of the farmers. They are of opinion that we are legislating in the interests of the city people and not of the farming community. This feeling is unnecessary and not correct. However, I would ask my city friends, who until last year, have done without this legislation all their lives, without any serious effect on their health or business, to give way to the farmers, in this matter at least, because the farmers' interests are at stake. Let them meet the farmers to that extent. It will do no harm and it will, in my judgment, prove of great benefit to the country. It will also prove to the farmers that we are not trying to legislate in opposition to their interests.

Mr. SAMUEL FRANCIS GLASS (Middlesex East): I do not rise with the idea that I can add anything to the arguments advanced in opposition to this legislation, or submit more strongly anything that was urged a year ago when the law was enacted. I do not, like the hon. member for Oxford South (Mr. Sutherland) take exception to the attitude which the Government has assumed on this question, which question has possibly agitated the country considerably more than from its very nature it should. Personally, I think the Government has taken a very wise step in permitting the question to be discussed dispassionately in the House, and having it decided on its merits. As has already been pointed out, the Government has kept faith with Parliament and lived up to its declaration of last session that this law should be enacted for the period of one year, and if not found satisfactory it could then be determined whether it should be continued or die a natural death. As I said last year, I cannot urge any personal objection to the Bill, but if I am to reflect the opinion of my constituents in this House, and respect their wishes, I can do nothing less than oppose the re-enactment of this measure. Every important organization in my constituency—the county council, township councils, farmers' clubs, fair boards, dairymen's associations, and all the different organizations engaged in the activities of agriculture—have passed strong resolutions opposing the re-enactment of daylight saving. In deference to their wishes, and respecting the opinion of farmers as expressed in agricultural journals and in the press throughout the country, I am bound to believe that the re-enactment of the law will cause a disturbance in the agricultural community that would not be justified by any benefit which the Bill could confer upon city communities.

The hon. gentleman who introduced this resolution has drawn attention to the fact that fifty per cent of the people of Canada are living within cities, and he reaches the conclusion, that because certain city organizations have placed themselves on record as strongly supporting this legislation, that therefore it represents the unanimous opinion of the cities. I am in a position to say, so far as the district from which I come is concerned, that feeling in the city of London is by no means unani-

mous in reference to this measure. I have heard labour organizations and labour men repeatedly urge that this law should not be re-enacted, and they expressed the opinion that it was a nuisance and an annoyance to them. If the city population represent one-half of our total population then they are not unanimous as to the desirability of re-enacting daylight saving.

It is sometimes asserted by those who claim to reflect city sentiment, that the farmers could very easily adjust their clocks to meet the situation which would be created by the enactment of this law. I pointed out, however, last year, and the statement has been repeated this afternoon, that possibly never before in Canada's history had the farmers been compelled to draw from the industrial workers in the city for labour for farm requirements to a greater extent than in recent years. And when recourse was had to such labour by the farmers residing in the districts surrounding cities, villages and towns where industries are established, they have found that their labour regulated its hours of employment so as to conform with the regulations of the labour unions of the district. Therefore this law necessarily imposes a difficulty upon the farmer in retaining the interest of the man drawn from that class of labour after the time for quitting work has expired in the surrounding towns. That is a very great difficulty which the farmers in those districts have experienced. Why cannot the farmer just as well say to our friends in the city, "If you find daylight saving a convenience, pass a by-law and go in accordance with whatever time suits you." I remember in the city of London a couple of years ago a by-law was passed in that way, and it was found that what was called local time was out of harmony with railroad time. Accordingly after the by-law had been in operation for a few weeks, the very organizations that had started the agitation for its passage objected to it on the ground of the inconvenience caused, and the by-law was repealed before the summer had half passed. If the railways are going to make their time conform to the time that is in operation in the United States I cannot see any difficulty in the cities adopting the necessary by-laws and fixing their hours of labour so as to harmonize with it.

There is another strong reason to be urged against this legislation and it is this: At the present time, when necessary onerous restrictions are being imposed on the people of Canada, or rather not so much of an onerous as of a vexatious character, farmers do not relish the idea of being compelled to submit to further unnecessary impositions. The proposed law will be unpopular in the country, and I believe it will not be acceptable to this House. Had a vote been taken on the question a year ago, I do not believe it would have carried. The sentiment of the House was just as strongly opposed to daylight saving last year as it is now, but the House deferred to the express wish of the Government at that time, and the arguments advanced by the Minister of Trade and Commerce that as other countries were making the experiment we might as well try it for a year, and if the law did not measure up to expectations, it could die a natural death. Now, Sir, that death has taken place, and we are now going to decide whether it is wise to have a resurrection. In my opinion the law will be buried. If we want peace and harmony in the rural districts we must not further impose a law of this nature on the people: we should refrain from arousing such irritation and dissatisfaction as will undoubtedly be created if this law is again placed on the statute books.

Mr. JOSEPH READ (Prince, P.E.I.): I am not going to detain the House very long, and I would not speak at all were it not that I have changed my mind since last session. I pointed out the other night that in my opinion consistency was the hobgoblin of little minds. I believe in expressing my views to-day, even though it may contradict everything I said yesterday, providing I have good grounds for changing my opinion. I want to say that the only vote I gave in this House last session to which fault was found in my constituency was the vote which I gave on this daylight saving measure. One of the reasons that I have for changing my mind is that my constituents found fault with me last year for supporting the Daylight Saving Bill.

I want to answer some of the arguments put forward, Mr. Speaker, in favour of daylight saving. One was in regard to train time. Some years ago the United States railway time was an hour different from ours, but we found no very great difficulty about it, and as a matter of fact there are three or four different sections between the Atlantic and Pacific where there is an hour's difference in the train time; for instance, we change our time one hour at Vanceboro on our way to Ottawa. That argument is not well taken.

Another thing that has come up in this debate would cause me to change my mind, that is, that I find that the large cities

which wish to adopt the daylight saving scheme within their own boundaries can do so by way of by-law. Therefore, why should we extend daylight saving to the country people who do not want it? If the cities want daylight saving, let them adopt it within their civic boundaries; then there is no harm done.

An argument advanced in favour of the Bill by the hon. member from Montreal (Mr. Jacobs) was that all the rest of the world had adopted daylight saving. That is no good reason at all in its favour. If it was, why every law enacted by other nations would need to be adopted by us.

Another very strong argument in favour of the amendment is that the country young men get very much dissatisfied with the fact that the city boys can knock off work an hour earlier, because it is impossible for the farming people to complete their work by five o'clock.

There is just one more thing I want to say in regard to this question, and that is to thank the Government for the change in its attitude towards this House, and inviting this expression of opinion, instead of its former course of introducing a measure and then telling the House: You must swallow this or defeat the Government.

Mr. R. C. HENDERS (Macdonald): Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the introduction of this daylight saving measure, and at the same time to express my appreciation of the fact that the Government has acted in good faith with this House in giving the opportunity that has been afforded this afternoon for an expression of its opinion. I distinctly remember that it was with the understanding that this measure was to be on trial that it was allowed to go into effect last year. It has been on trial for the year, we have been studying the facts in connection with it, and I believe that this House has come to the conclusion that the measure has not proven satisfactory.

I rise to protest against it, Mr. Speaker, and in doing so I believe I voice the opinion of organized agriculture in Canada. I have in my possession at the present time more than 300 resolutions passed by organized farmers in Western Canada and a number from Ontario, all of them distinctly opposed to this Bill, and in which they set forth in strong terms, good, sound argument why they are opposed to it. I have failed to discover one organization among them that is in favour of this Bill. Surely if it was an advantage to the farmers there would be some of them expressing themselves in favour of it. I think organized agriculture represents about forty-eight per cent of the population of the Dominion of Canada at the present time, and I take it that that forty-eight per cent have expressed themselves on this measure. Furthermore I find myself supported by men from the towns and cities in the contention I am now making—I have had expressions of opinion from organizations in some of the cities and towns putting themselves on record as opposed to this measure, and for this reason: They say that the children of this country should be taken care of and should have every opportunity of developing to the utmost advantage, in order to bring them up to the best manhood and womanhood that this country can develop, and they say that this measure is robbing our children of at least one hour's rest which is essential to child growth and child development. I find further that the public schools are opposing this measure. We have the Minister of Education from one province and the superintendents of education all over the provinces offering their opposition, for the simple reason that they say one hour of the education day is practically lost to the rural population by daylight saving. By this I mean that we had it on trial in our public schools and we found that the children coming there at the earlier hour in the morning were not up to normal for the first school hour because they were deprived of the rest they should have had. And after giving it a trial, a number of our schools simply went back to the old order of things and opened at nine o'clock.

I do not think any valid argument has been advanced in favour of this measure. Several assertions have been made with regard to the saving of light and coal, but I fail to find that a single hon. member presented a valid argument in support of such assertions. I therefore ask the Government that this measure be not passed.

Mr. H. H. HALLIDAY (Bow River): Mr. Speaker, the pros and cons of this question have been pretty well gone over—at least the cons against this so-called daylight saving have been; I have not heard very much from the pros. Last session I supported this Bill, and I did so with a clear conscience. In opposing it this year I believe I am not speaking for myself alone but for 40,000 other people whom I represent here. After leaving the House last session I made

careful inquiries throughout my constituency, which is a very large one, and I did not find one man who was in favour of this measure being enacted again this year. That is the reason why I oppose this resolution to-day. An old lady came to my door on the twenty-second of June last, while I was reading a newspaper at 10.15 p.m. She jumped on me about this daylight saving. I said: "My dear lady, you did not object to this daylight saving legislation before it came up in the House last session." "Well," she said, "I am willing to try anything once."

Mr. DUNCAN CAMPBELL ROSS (Middlesex, West): I agree with what has been said by various members who have opposed this resolution. More than ninety per cent of the agricultural people of Canada are absolutely opposed to daylight saving, and the great masses of the labouring people as well are opposed to it. These two organizations constitute a great majority of the people, and we should respect their wishes by defeating this resolution. If the House adopts daylight saving it will be giving more consideration to the pleasure of the leisured classes in the big cities than to the business and the production of the toiling masses on the farms and in the cities. On that account I am opposed to this resolution.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General): I rise to a point of order. I direct your attention, Mr. Speaker, to the language of the motion now before the House. It is as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to re-enact at once Chapter 2, Statutes of 1918. "The Daylight Saving Act, 1918."

The amendment of the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) asks that the words "it is expedient to re-enact at once" be replaced by the words "it is not expedient to re-enact until this day six months." If the amendment means anything, it is what is known as the "six months' hoist," which is merely a motion to adjourn and is not debatable. On the other hand, the meaning might be that it is not expedient to re-enact the Daylight Saving Act now, but that it should be enacted six months from now, which would bring it in force next autumn. I fancy that the amendment has not been very carefully worded, and if one voted for it he would render himself rather ridiculous. The main motion can be met with "Yes" or "No." If the amendment is merely a six months' hoist, it should not be debated; if it is merely a negative, it should be ruled out of order. I submit that we should have a ruling on this point before the debate proceeds further.

Mr. SPEAKER: While this amendment purports upon its face to be a motion for the six months' hoist, in actual fact it has not that effect. The sense of the amendment is that daylight saving be enacted six months hence, not that the subject should be considered six months hence, which would be the six months' hoist. The second point raised by the Solicitor General is whether a motion to effect a six months' hoist is debatable. If that motion is made in the form of an amendment to a substantive motion which is before the House, it can be debated, because there remains sufficient of the original motion, which is debatable to permit debate. On the other hand, a motion made not by way of amendment, but "that the subject be considered this day six months," would be a straight motion for the six months' hoist, and, under Rule 17A, would not be debatable. As the motion of the member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) is in the form of an amendment, it is debatable. Although it is not very happily worded and does not, in my judgment, convey the meaning which the mover had in his mind, it is technically in order.

Mr. McCOIG: The amendment was worded as it is for the purpose of permitting a discussion of the matter. Had I worded it differently, it would not have been debatable, as I think you, Mr. Speaker, will rule. I was going to ask the consent of the House, at the conclusion of the debate, to change the wording to make the amendment read: "considered this day six months."

Mr. DAVID MARSHALL (Elgin, East): I have received letter after letter from my constituents expressing their opposition to daylight saving. I was the first man to start a canning factory in Canada, and I have been in the business ever since; that brings me in close touch with the farmers, and enables me to speak with some authority on this subject. Last year we contracted for 30,000 acres of corn, peas and tomatoes, all produced by the farmer. If there was ever a time when we should try to make things pleasant for the farmer, it is now. The daylight saving measure interfered very much with our getting contracts from the farmers this year. They say "we have to stop our work at five o'clock instead of six, and that interferes with the harvesting of our crops."

I am quite in sympathy with what has been said by the member for Kent (Mr. McCoig). When the ground is damp you cannot work many of the crops produced for canning; consequently daylight saving would be very detrimental to the farmers, and in expressing my opposition to it I am expressing the views of the people whom I represent.

Mr. WILLIAM GARLAND McQUARRIE (New Westminster): Last session I supported the Daylight Saving Bill and when I went back to my constituency I found that apparently I had done the right thing, because so far as I know all my constituents are in favour of daylight saving. I think I am safe in saying that the people generally of British Columbia are in favour of daylight saving. About two-thirds of my constituents are farmers. I represent about 50,000 people, two-thirds of whom live outside the city. I have recently received from many organizations in the city requests that I should support daylight saving, and at the same time, I have received no objections whatever from the farmers. I presume, if my farmers objected to daylight saving, they would advise me of their objections just as farmers in other places have advised their representatives of their objections. I, therefore, take it for granted that my farmers are in favour of daylight saving. Possibly, the farmers of British Columbia are a little in advance of the farmers of the East in their ideas in regard to daylight saving. It is, perhaps, not surprising to see the farmers of the East opposing an innovation of this kind, because farmers have opposed many innovations. It may be remembered that when the first locomotive appeared in this country, the farmers were opposed to it; they said that locomotives were a nuisance; that they frightened their cattle and so forth. When automobiles were invented, the farmers opposed them, saying that they should not be allowed, and, if I remember correctly, it is only within the last year or so that in Prince Edward Island automobiles have been allowed to use the roads and now they can use them for only two or three days a week. My opinion is that in a few years the farmers will appreciate the fact that in this respect it is the right thing for Canada to fall in line with the rest of the civilized world. I trust the Government will see fit to re-enact the daylight saving measure this year.

Mr. AUGUSTE THEOPHILE LEGER (Kent, N.B.): When the Daylight Saving Bill was brought down last year, from what I could understand of it, I was opposed to it. After the session was over when I went home I made inquiries amongst the farmers and the labouring classes of my constituents. I found the farmers were absolutely opposed to daylight saving and the labouring classes said: We do not like it at all; it means more expense to us, especially in the fall of the year; it is an hour lost to us. Therefore, I am going to vote against the re-enactment of this measure just as I did last year. Some hon. members contend that daylight saving is a great thing for the cities and towns. While it is true I come from a small town, I find that when the merchants open their stores at seven o'clock in the morning, or six o'clock under the old time, there is practically no one around, so that they lose an hour in the morning, and in the evening they lose another hour.

So far as the farmer is concerned, Parliament, instead of giving him an hour in the morning, should give him an hour in the evening so that he can harvest his grain. As has been stated, farmers cannot start harvesting until ten o'clock in the morning, and the afternoon from two o'clock to six or seven o'clock is the best time for the farmer to harvest his grain. The morning I left to attend this session of Parliament, I met one of the most important farmers in my constituency and he told me to do all I could to prevent this measure being re-enacted, because it is against the interest of the farmers. I have been asked to tell the Government to keep its hands off the farmers, to give the farmers all the latitude possible, because they are the backbone of the country, and should, therefore, be given every advantage, and the same may be said of the working classes. For these reasons, therefore, I intend to oppose the re-enactment of daylight saving.

Mr. GEORGE BOYCE (Carleton): I was very much amused at the hon. member from British Columbia, who wants to make us believe he represents a farming constituency. They are truck farmers, and in the East we do not take much stock in truck farmers. I do not think any hardship will be caused by the people of the cities working an hour or two hours in the morning, as they choose. We do not want to dictate to them, but we do not want them to dictate to us. I come from a constituency comprising mostly farmers and dairymen and my opinion is that if this measure be re-enacted, a great hardship will be suffered by them. I believe also the people in the cities who are supporting daylight

saving are standing in their own light, because if this measure be re-enacted, it is bound to enhance the cost of the production. We cannot go out into the fields to cut grain until eight o'clock in the morning, and the greatest part of our day will be lost. If the farmers do not know their own business when to begin and when to quit work, without being dictated to by the people of the cities, they are not endowed with as much common sense as I thought they were. I think the great majority of the people of the cities do not want daylight saving, only a few who do not get up until nine o'clock in the morning and who want to play baseball, cricket and so on in the evening are in favour of it, and if they are the ones who are going to rule the farmers of this country the farmers want to know it. Do not aggravate the farmers too much. So far as I can make out, there is in existence a little organization, just about as big as a man's hand, called the Organized Farmers. If you aggravate the farmers too much you will get that organization down here, and while I am a strong supporter of the Government, I ask the Government to be very careful, or those people will drive it out and my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best) will, perhaps, become Minister of Agriculture. I trust that the result of this discussion will be that the farmer will start work whenever it suits him and the city people the same.

Mr. HORATIO CLARENCE HOCKEN (West Toronto): I want to say a few words on this question on behalf of the farmers of Toronto. There are, in my constituency, a great many farmers, and although, of course, they are truck farmers, as the hon. member (Mr. Boyce) has stated, yet they produced a great deal last year and they did so after they had performed their day's work, so that I think in that respect they are entitled to some consideration, as in doing that they show that they are willing to work overtime in order to bring about that production which the country needs. The statement has been made by the Fuel administration at Washington that 1,250,000 tons of coal were saved by daylight saving in the United States during the past year. I have not figured out what proportion of that would be Canada's saving, but the proportion must be very large.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Will the hon. member explain how one pound of coal can be saved? I have never heard that explained yet.

Mr. HOCKEN: It is saved by not starting lighting plants so early in the day as under the old system; that accounts for a very substantial saving in coal. Large quantities of coal oil are also saved by people not having to light their lamps so early. The saving in light and fuel has been enormous in the United States, and proportionately large in Canada.

Mr. CLARK (Red Deer): Does the hon. member think, now the war is over, that it is desirable to save coal? Would it not be better to keep people digging it and keep all our industries going?

Mr. HOCKEN: We have a Commission of Conservation in this country, the purpose of which is to conserve our natural resources, and I submit that if we can save two or three hundred thousand tons of coal, that is a saving worth while. I appreciate that I am in a decided minority in this House, judging by the speeches that have already been made, but I want to say that there never was a more popular measure than daylight saving so far as the big cities are concerned. The workers in my own plant and in my constituency—and I represent 90,000 industrial workers—are unanimously in favour of daylight saving; they think it is the greatest boon ever given to this country. On the other hand, if we do not enact this measure, there will be a state of great confusion in this country Tne hon. member for Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) has said that daylight saving will mean that the farmer will have to get up an hour earlier to catch the milk train. But he will have to do that anyway, because the railways of this country are going to conform with the American time.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): What authority is there for that statement? I am very interested in this matter and would like to know from the Government whether it is a fact.

Mr. HOCKEN: I saw the report in the newspapers, and I think we may take it for granted that our Canadian railways are going to conform with the American railway time. In the county of Haldimand the people did not adopt daylight saving last year, but held all their meetings in churches, schools and other places on the old time. I want to warn the House that if daylight saving is not adopted by Parliament this year there will be a state of great confusion in our industries all over the country, because transportation is our principal industry, upon which all the others depend. I realize that the sentiment of the House as expressed is abso-

lutely against me, but I am here to represent my constituents and my personal opinion also is that daylight saving is one of the best measures that this Parliament has ever enacted.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

Mr. J. A. CAMPBELL (Nelson): Mr. Speaker, I think that the Government should be fully informed as to the sentiments of the people on the daylight saving question. It is immaterial to me whether the proposed legislation is put into effect or not, and I may say that the people in the greater portion of the constituency from which I come are not interested in the matter either. They feel that there is adequate daylight for all their purposes, and in fact more than enough. I am, therefore, able to look at the question from an absolutely unbiased standpoint. Some of the constituencies, however, think differently. I have travelled a good deal and am satisfied that the farmers in Manitoba and northern Saskatchewan are almost unanimously opposed to any change. I do not propose for a moment to go into arguments from the farmers' viewpoint; they have already been advanced by others more qualified perhaps to speak on the subject than I who have had no actual experience on the farm. It has been suggested that there might be some difficulty or confusion in the railway service between the United States and Canada if there were a change of time, but I see no reason why there should be any more confusion in the service between the two countries than at different points along the lines in Canada, such as Port Arthur, Broadview and Field, where the time changes in any event. The prevailing sentiment in Manitoba has been fairly well expressed in the letter which has been read from Hon. Dr. Thornton, and I believe that the farmers generally throughout Canada are strenuously opposed to this proposed legislation. This is not a vital question to the future welfare of Canada, it is one that might well be left to the majority to decide; and if the minority should happen to be those who are in favour of daylight saving, then they have the privilege of legislating to suit themselves in their own cities and towns.

Mr. THOMAS HENRY THOMPSON (Hastings East): Mr. Speaker, I desire to put myself on record as being opposed to the Daylight Saving Bill, although I supported it last year as a war measure. The arguments that have been advanced by the hon. member for East Peterborough (Mr. Sexsmith) are practically identical with my own, and express the views of the people of the riding I have the honour to represent. My district is a dairy section. Some of the milk is shipped to Toronto but 95 per cent of it is sent to the cheese factories. I believe that under the by-laws of the cheese factories that the milk drawer must be at the end of the route at five o'clock. If the change in time were effected that would mean four o'clock, and the farmer would have to rise too early.

The Government has spent considerable money in an endeavour to educate the farmers in the proper methods of dairying. and one of the things which they have advocated is the regular milking of cows. It has become the practice to milk at five o'clock in the morning and at five in the afternoon. Five o'clock in the afternoon their hired help leave and the farmers are obliged to do the milking without assistance. Besides, the sun is still high at that time and it is more difficult and expensive to save the milk. The cheese companies have passed resolutions opposing daylight saving, and several have requested me personally to oppose it. The school sections are also strongly opposed to it; it is not necessary that I should give their reasons. The hon. member for East Peterborough has taken up this point and I agree with all he has said. The farmers' co-operative associations have passed resolutions against it. The county council of Hastings composed of thirty-one members—twenty-six farmers, and five members representing four villages and one town—have also unanimously expressed their disapproval of the proposal. Another disadvantage that attends the daylight saving is that the hired man is idle in the morning, while he loses an hour in the afternoon. Looking at the question from these standpoints therefore I do not think the Government should put this legislation into force. I must commend them, however, for having given the members an opportunity of expressing their views on this question. As far as I can see there is no need for the amendment, and I am prepared to vote against the resolution.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN (York South): I have listened with a great deal of attention and interest to the discussion, and the views of the farmers as expressed by various hon. members have my entire sym-

pathy. There is no doubt a grave feeling of unrest among the farmers, and I agree with the statement which has been made that the farmer's occupation is a very precarious one. Now if there is an unrest among the farmers, such as we have evidence of on all sides, it is the duty of the Government to address itself to this state of affairs and remedy such grievances as may exist for the day will come when the farmers will be industrially organized and will obtain their rights. I also agree with the statement made by the hon. member for East Hastings (Mr. T. H. Thompson) that the farmers should be at liberty to express themselves in this House.

But there is more than that goes with it: If the farmer is entitled to express his opinion in the House and it prevails, then the farmer has a right to rule this country as well as express his opinion here. The way in which this question has come up to-day brings to my mind, and will bring to the minds of the people of the country the responsibility that rests upon the Government of the day in dealing with this question, which cannot be made an open question and cannot be relegated to private members to settle. My contention is, although I may be wrong in my doctrine, that the Government must take the responsibility of dealing with this question. I have heard conversations of late in regard to the responsibility of the Government, and I thoroughly agree with what I have heard in those conversations, viz:—That while members may speak and express their opinion, the responsibility rests on the Government of the day of dealing with questions at issue, and especially of dealing with a question of this kind. The statement appears in to-night's evening papers that the Canadian Railway War Board, has assumed to deal with this question, and says that the daylight saving arrangement of the United States is to obtain in regard to the railroads of Canada. I would like to know at this point, if I can, whether the Government intend to assume responsibility for the policy of this Board. If it does, then we shall have daylight saving in spite of the expressions of opinion here, and especially in spite of the expression of opinion by the farmers. It would be a disappointment to the farmers, however, if they are merely to have the opportunity of expressing their views, and that in some way an irresponsible body, like the Railway War Board, shall assume to give us daylight saving in this country.

Then there is another view of the matter. This country forms part of the continent of America, and we have, more or less perhaps, to continentalize our policy, daylight saving to-day is the rule and is the law in the United States. Heretofore the administration of our railways in this country has largely been based on the system that prevails in the United States, and has worked in harmonious arrangement with the administration of the railways of that country; the two systems have always run together. I want to know whether, if this House votes, as I expect it will vote to-night, against daylight saving, the order that has gone forth of the Railway Board is to obtain, or whether the grievances that have been expressed here this afternoon as far as the farmers are concerned are to end in nothing? Will the Government tell us to-night that it intends to assume the responsibility on this question, and to be responsible for the acts of the Railway Board, or if it intends to recall, after the vote takes place to-night, the order that has gone out from the Railway Board? If the Government assumes that responsibility and recalls the order referred to, it will be a party to something that will result in great dislocation of the business interests of the country. An hon. gentleman sitting near me suggests that I should ask the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) now. If the minister cares to offer an opinion well and good, but I do not think I can fairly press him to do so. However, I want to point out first, the dislocation, as far as the business organization of America is concerned, which is involved in the present situation, and second that the Railway War Board, an irresponsible organization, proposed to retain daylight saving in Canada. I want the farmers to understand fairly what they are going to get. Are they to get daylight saving or not? Are they to be satisfied with a mere opportunity of expressing their dissent? There is a great deal of reason in that dissent. I say that although I voted for daylight saving and intend to vote for it again to-night, for I know what is the condition of the farmer in Canada. I am not going to say that I have tried to do a little farming myself, because it seems to be an offence for some of us who were born in the country, and who would like to have, and do have, a home in the country, to make such a confession. I have been unbraided in this House on account of that, and yet it is my right, and I intend to exercise it, to express my opinion. On behalf of the farmers I say that if the House to-night votes to defeat daylight saving then the farmers are entitled to get

the advantage of it. If not, the Government must assume responsibility for the action of the Railway War Board, and compel the farmers to submit to daylight saving, and I do not know what is going to be the outcome in that case.

But I revert to the question that I have raised, that we must harmonize ourselves with the rest of the continent to which we belong. We have heard a good deal on that subject in this House. I disagreed to a certain extent with some hon. gentlemen in this House when the question was up before. But the more I study the question of the recent great war, and the more I see of it, the more I am convincel that it is the duty of this country to associate itself with the continent of America in the matters arising out of it, and to keep clear of, and keep away from, as much as possible, the present issues that are embroiling Europe. We have over there to-day, representing Canada, the Prime Minister, the Minister of Justice, the Overseas War Minister, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, and the Minister of Customs. We have those ministers who, from my point of view, are butting somewhat into the affairs of Europe, and are open to the charge,—and I am not saying it in any spirit of disrespect,—that they are actually porch-climbing to get into the conferences of Europe.

An hon. MEMBER: Question.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: I am talking to the question, I am talking to the question of responsibility. The Speaker may call me to order, but I wish to point out that in view of the responsibility that goes with this question, and what has taken place in Europe, our duty is to keep our country in harmony with the rest of the Continent, and not to dislocate our railway arrangements. I do not know whether other hon. gentlemen appreciate the situation; I have tried to appreciate it, I have studied the railway question. It may be that the dislocation that I fear will not occur, that the problem will be satisfactorily worked out. Nevertheless, I fail to understand how the great city of Toronto will maintain its business connection with the United States, or with the ports of Europe, unless we have harmonious arrangements, or how the city of Montreal, or the other great manufacturing centres of Canada will maintain their present situation.

An hon. MEMBER: Let them change their time table.

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Changing their time table will not do it. Perhaps the Minister of Railways has a plan to meet the situation, and if he has I shall be only too glad to learn of it, and to understand it. As I size the situation up, however, our business is going to be dislocated, and it will be a very serious matter if we dislocate our transport service by such a change in the law as is proposed here to-night. Let me repeat that we have always arranged our railway policy so as to harmonize with that of the United States. There was a time when we had railways of broad gauge. That was the case with the old Great Western. But the gauge was brought to standard and into harmony with the American railroads.

There was a great business built up between the two countries and a great amount of traffic came to Canada because we had standardized our gauge, which enabled us to take the traffic of the American roads and carry it over our lines to our own Atlantic ports or to the American ports. To-day we are allowing the great New York Central line to handle from the Niagara frontier all its traffic which originates in Chicago and to carry it over its lines in Ontario to Buffalo and New York. Now, is all that to be dislocated? So, my contention is that the responsibility must be assumed by the Government, and the farmers who are voting for this change are entitled to get what they expect, and their expectation is that there is to be this dislocation of the railway transportation of Canada—that daylight saving is to be at an end in this country. I feel that it would be better to leave things alone and to try out daylight saving a little longer. Of course, the cities have the opportunity of passing by-laws that will give them daylight saving, and I know all our cities and manufacturing towns will have it.

I know that the farmers who have been expressing themselves here this afternoon have a grievance. They have to get up too early in the morning in order to ship their milk to the cities. But if the Railway War Board at Montreal orders the railways to run on the daylight saving schedule, what is to become of the farmer?

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask the hon. member a question? What has the running of the railways to do with the farmers? What difference will it make to them even if you make the change to-morrow?

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: This is what the farmers say: If the trains run an hour later in the morning they will get the bene-

fit of rising that much later. If the Railway War Board orders the railway companies to operate their train service on the daylight saving schedule the farmers are going to draw a blank. They think they are considering something else here this afternoon, and that an expression of their appreciation for the opportunity of stating their views on this question is all they want. I venture to say that they want something more: They want results. And again I say, after all this war experience we should be careful before abandoning daylight saving. During the war we had to change many things, we had to abandon, more or less, responsible Government and take refuge in commissions, and we are to-day dealing with the transportation question by means of a war measure; we have appointed a receiver for the Grand Trunk Pacific as a war measure; we are governing the country still by means of war measures, and probably we are going to have daylight saving as a war measure by this Government. But if that is the case is it not time that we had responsible Government in this country?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Let us have peace.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: Let us have responsible Government first now the war is over. Let the farmers come here and express themselves, and if they express themselves in a certain direction, then if that expression of opinion by them is respected, they are entitled to carry on the Government of this country. That is the way it impresses me. I may be mistaken, but after studying this question very closely—and I am again speaking now from the business standpoint—I want to see the farmer have his grievance remedied in some way if possible, and a compromise may be effected, continuing to the cities and towns daylight saving in regard to railways and other things, and allowing the farmer to make his own time to suit himself. I know that is rather hard and I confess it may not be feasible.

I want the House to be seized of what the issue really is. We have been talking all the afternoon and I have waited for some one to tell us how our railways were to be run, and just at six o'clock I was made acquainted with a statement in the evening papers—I suppose it is correct—that the Railway War Board had settled that we were to have daylight saving. I will take the liberty of asking the Minister of Railways and Canals whether we are to have daylight saving in regard to our railways according to that statement?

Mr. J. D. REID: I have not any word from the Canadian Railway War Board. Of course, the Canadian Railway War Board may make arrangements to run their railways on whatever time they like, but in so far as the operation of the railways is concerned they must be operated in the public interest. If they are not being operated in the public interest Parliament can correct that condition; and as we shall practically own half of the railway systems of Canada in a short time, I think Parliament can make the railways do whatever they like.

Mr. W. F. MACLEAN: But I do not know yet from the statement of the hon. the Minister of Railways whether we are to have daylight saving. I hope he will give me credit for not speaking from a political point of view. I am trying to speak for many of the farmers of this country, I am also trying to speak for the business and the manufacturing and the railroad interests. I do not know what is going to happen to the railways who have this large transportation problem ahead of them retaining the very large international traffic which comes to them from their American connections. The funny thing is we are discussing this great question without a responsible proposition before the House. I do not remember a similar situation. Somebody must take the responsibility, and if the Government are convinced of the truth of the position of the farmers let them say: "All right; the farmers have made out their case and we assume responsibility of giving them the relief they ask." But we are told now by the Minister of Railways that the business interests of Canada are to be guarded. I am not going to abdicate my function as a member of this House by handing over this question to any irresponsible Railway War Board to deal with, and I do not think the Government ought to abdicate their functions or contract themselves out of their liability, as to the legal phrase is, but they must deal with this question, and I submit that before this discussion is over we ought to have a statement of the Government's policy.

Just one word more in regard to the advantages of daylight saving. These are many and have been demonstrated in the countries of Europe, and we are the first country to go back on what was called progressive legislation. The European countries may have been wrong, but I have seen no one yet who has brought forward a scientific explanation for the difference be-

tween our country and the countries of Europe on this question. A large portion of my reading has been in the direction of the increased benefit that has come to the working classes of this country by reason of daylight saving in connection with giving their children a little better chance, and my idea of the object of government is to improve human welfare. Now, if the farmer has a grievance it should be remedied. I do not feel justified in saying that the statements made by hon. gentlemen this afternoon with regard to the position of the farmer in this matter are not correct. If, then, they voice the views of the farmers, we must do more with regard to these grievances than merely allow them to be expressed in this House.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Wouldn't the simplest way be to let the farmers alone and let them mind their own business?

Mr. MACLEAN: I am not interfering with the farmers. The Canadian Railway War Board has interfered with the daylight saving proposition; it has said that on Monday the clock is to be set back in every railway station.

Hon. Mr. CARVELL: Set forward. That is what the whole trouble is about.

Mr. MACLEAN: The hon. gentleman intimates that there is trouble because somebody wants to set the clock forward. Will he, then, assume the responsibility of setting it forward. Somebody must assume responsibility in this matter. If the farmers are to get what they are after, a declaration should be made by the Government that daylight saving is at an end and that the farmer will not have to get up earlier in the morning. But as a result of the order issued by this Railway Board, on Monday morning the farmer, willy nilly, will have to get up early to milk his cows and get his milk to the train in time for shipment. If he is to get what he wants, he ought to know it to-night. The business community and the railways should know to-night what the policy of the Government is to be; otherwise each city will do as it likes in the matter, and instead of a well-ordered community we shall have something more or less in the nature of chaos. The members of this House should not go away to-night without knowing what is to be the law; without knowing whether the clock is to be put forward an hour next Monday, or whether it is to be left as it is.

Mr. P. R. DuTREMBLAY (Laurier-Outremont): Mr. Speaker, the cities and towns

[Mr. W. F. Maclean.]

of Canada, representing a majority of the people, are in favour of the daylight saving system, and more than half the rural population is in favour of it. This Parliament, therefore, should re-enact the daylight saving measure. I do not see what great inconvenience would thereby result to the afrmers. The daylight saving measure was given a good trial last year and it gave satisfaction; I did not meet a single person who believed that the measure was not a good one. I agree with the hon. gentleman who preceded me (Mr. W. F. Maclean) that the Government should take some stand in this matter. Last year the Minister of Trade and Commerce, with all his eloquence, brought the Daylight Saving Bill before Parliament; he was very insistent upon having it passed, and for my part I was pleased to support it. Now that daylight saving has had such a good trial and the people have become accustomed to it, why does not the Government bring down a Bill to re-enact daylight saving for this year? Are they afraid to take the responsibility? It is not proper that the Government, which is supposed to lead the people, should not take responsibility in this matter. In the views which I express I voice the opinion of practically all the people of the great city of Montreal. On Sunday the hour will be changed in the United States, and failure to adopt the same system here will result in great inconvenience to our large centres, our railroads and our economic system generally. The suggestions of hon. gentlemen as to the complaints of the farmers are not based on facts. I hope, therefore, that a daylight saving Bill will be introduced and adopted by the House.

Mr. HENRY ARTHUR MACKIE (Edmonton East): In order to have a clear expression of the views of the House on this matter, I wish to move, in amendment to the amendment:

That the words "until this day six months" be struck out of the amendment and the following substituted therefor: "during the year 1919."

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: Mr. Mackie moves in amendment, seconded by Mr. Douglas (Strathcona) that the words "until this day six months" be struck out of the amendment, and that the following be substituted therefor: "during the year 1919," so that the resolution will now read as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to re-enact during the year 1919, chapter 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight-Saving Act, 1918."

Mr. MACKIE: That is not the amendment that I suggest. I ask that instead of giving the six months' hoist to the daylight saving proposal, the Bill be not introduced during the year 1919.

Mr. MACLEAN (South York): Will the hon. gentleman tell us what the effect of this amendment is? I want to vote intelligently.

Mr. MACKIE: The hon. gentleman ought to be able to see what the effect of it is.

Mr. DEPUTY SPEAKER: To make this matter quite clear to the House, I shall again read the sub-amendment. The resolution is as follows:

That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to re-enact at once Chapter 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight-Saving Act, 1918."

It was moved by Mr. McCoig, seconded by Mr. Ross:

That the said resolution be amended by replacing the words: "it is expedient to re-enact at once" by the words "it is not expedient to re-enact until this day six months."

It was moved as a sub-amendment by Mr. Mackie (East Edmonton), seconded by Mr. Douglas (Strathcona):

That the words "until this day six months" be struck out of the amendment and the following substituted therefor "during the year 1919."

The resolution as amended will read:

That in the opinion of this House, it is not expedient to re-enact during the year 1919 Chapter 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight Saving Act. 1918."

Mr. HENRY HERBERT STEVENS (Vancouver Centre): Addressing a few remarks to the motion, the amendment and the amendment to the amendment, I think the House is quite clear on the main issue and both the amendment and the amendment to the amendment are of very little importance in this discussion.

As I listened to the various addresses, this is what I gathered, namely, that the principal objection to the so-called Daylight Saving measure is made on behalf of the farmers. Several reasons are given: First that the dairy interests are seriously affected in connection with the shipment of milk and other dairy products to the cities in the morning; second, that the farmers who have large areas of hoe-crops thereby lose an extra hour in the morning on account of the dew and so forth; third, that it interferes seriously with harvesting operations for the same reason; and fourth, that farm labour near the towns is also seriously interfered with. These arguments deserve careful consideration on the part of every hon. member.

On the other hand, I desire to present to the House a few arguments in favour of daylight saving, and the House should consider both sides of the question and decide accordingly. I am speaking to-day on behalf of that great army of workers in Canada, particularly of those in the city which I represent, who spend long hours of confinement within the walls of the factory, shop and office, and also on behalf of the wives and families of those workers in the hot and ill-ventilated flats in the congested areas of the cities. To all these the extra hour of daylight in the evening is unquestionably a great boon. It is of value to them from the standpoint of health as well as from the standpoint of adding, in a certain degree at least, to the small amount of pleasure they get in life.

It has been stated as a strong argument in favour of daylight saving that the United States of America has passed a similar measure, and that, therefore, we should follow suit. I have no sympathy with that argument, my opinion being that we should decide the matter as Canadians in our own country's interest.

I wish to refer to the argument advanced by some opponents of daylight saving that the only persons who are asking for it are the idle rich in the cities, a few gentlemen who wish to play golf and so forth. That is not the case. I can assure my hon. friends who represent country districts that we do not represent that class of people, who can look after themselves pretty well. Where there is one individual of that class, there are a thousand or more of the other class to which I have referred—the workers confined in the shops, factories or offices. It is on their behalf that I support the re-enactment of the daylight saving measure.

Mr. MICHAEL STEELE (South Perth): I feel to-night I am in agreement with the majority in this House, and that is a comfortable feeling to have. I am always inclined to say a good word for a departed friend, and I feel to-night, as we are attending what I consider to be the wake of the Daylight Saving Act, I should like, before it passes out of existence, to say a good word for it. A year ago I felt that it was a matter of very little concern whether the Daylight Saving Act came into force or not. I did not see much advantage in it, and I did not, at that time, see that there was going to be very much disadvantage.

After a year's experience, however, I have learned that daylight saving has advantages, and I should like to enumerate one or two which I have observed. We have today heard a good deal about the school children in the country, and I want to say a word or two on behalf of them. It is a great benefit to the school children in the country to be relieved, under daylight saving, from their school duties at three o'clock in the afternoon instead of being kept in school until four. That is a decided advantage which is perhaps not appreciated as it should be. It is far better for the welfare of the child to be in the schoolhouse from eight to nine o'clock in the morning and to be relieved at three o'clock rather than to go into the schoolhouse at nine and to remain there until four. The same argument may be used in behalf of the factory employee. The day is at hand when Parliament, employers of labour, educationists and others will have to give very much more attention to the physical welfare of the people, and anything which adds to the comfort and good environment of the factory employee is of advantage not only to the employee, but to the employer and to the country at large. If we can, under any measure, have the employees of a factory engaged from six to seven o'clock in the morning by sun-time, and relieved from their duties at five o'clock in the afternoon rather than have them entering on their duties at seven in the morning and being relieved at six in the afternoon, we are doing them a great favour, inasmuch as from five to six in the afternoon—and I am speaking of the factories in the small towns—is the worst hour of the day for the factory employee to spend in the factory employed at his work, because in the summer time it is the hottest hour of the day in the factory.

I would like to say a word for the people in the offices of our towns. I do not at all agree with some of the remarks made this afternoon which would lead us to believe that the farmer is the only person who works. While I know that no person works harder than the farmer, there are, in our offices, stores and factories, many people who are working just as hard as they possibly can.

They are not idle by any means, and because their work differs in kind from that of the farmer it does not mean that they are not being worked to the limit. I have found, during the past year, that daylight saving was an advantage to these people, allowing them to get away from their offices an hour earlier in the day and have that much more time for outdoor recreation. I believe that if we could total up the results of daylight saving during the past year we would find that the health of the people of this country has been considerably improved.

Mr. BEST: What about the flu?

Mr. STEELE: Having said that much, I think I have stated the chief advantages of daylight saving. But notwithstanding all these advantages, I think the disadvantages have been very much greater, and I therefore propose to vote against the re-enactment of daylight saving. I speak especially for the dairy farmers, inasmuch as I believe they are the ones who have been inconvenienced the most by the passage of the daylight saving measure. I want to say this to the people of our large cities: we hear a great deal of criticism these days of the producer of milk and the enormous profits he is getting, but it is my opinion that in the near future people will have to pay a good deal more for their milk than they are paying now. They can afford to pay a good deal more, and still be getting the cheapest food supplied to the people of this country. At fourteen cents a quart there is no cheaper food than milk, and when the people of the cities expect farmers to get up at three in the morning, milk their cows, haul the milk three, four, five, or six miles, and ship it to the city people so that they can get it early in the day, they are expecting something unreasonable from the agriculturists. I think the time is not far distant when the city dairies will have to have refrigerator cars left at points in many of our large cities, where the farmer can leave his milk at a convenient hour during the day. I must vote against the amendment to the motion. I cannot imagine how two representatives of agricultural constituencies could move and second such an amendment as was moved by the hon. member for Kent (Mr. McCoig) and seconded by the hon. member for West Middlesex (Mr. Ross). Their amendment read: "That it is not expedient to re-enact this measure until this day six months." How any person can argue against daylight saving in the summer time and favour its coming into effect on the 26th day of September I cannot understand. Surely the farmers of Kent county will not sympathize at all with the attempt of their representative to bring daylight saving into force on the 26th of September, and I am equally confident that the farmers of West Middlesex will

not approve such a move. I shall vote against the motion also, for the reasons which I have given. I believe it is in the best interests of this country that it should not carry, and I am quite satisfied that the majority of my electors are opposed to it.

Mr. W. A. CHARLTON (Norfolk): I have not any pronounced views upon this question, except that uniformity throughout the whole country is very desirable. Still, in view of the large number of petitions and resolutions I have received, I feel that I must say a word. One resolution I received was from the county council of Norfolk, which county I have the honour to represent, declaring unanimously against daylight saving. I have also received petitions from farmers' clubs and many other organizations and associations, all opposed to the measure, also several letters from residents of towns stating that we should favour the views of the farmers. Then, Sir, in keeping with the new order of things which has come into this world and which will remain so long as the world lasts—this beautiful world clothed everywhere with garments of Deity but now desecrated by the violence of man—in keeping, I say, with this new order in which women are not merely followers but great leaders in every movement which is for the welfare of the people; I have received an angelic petition from a group of mothers asking me to oppose this measure. Under the circumstances I feel perfectly justified in voting for the amendment to the amendment and against the resolution.

9 p.m.

Mr. J. W. EDWARDS (Frontenac): I listened with a great deal of interest to the remarks made by the member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) this evening, as I always do, particularly when he is speaking on matters pertaining to agriculture. My interest was aroused by the hon. member some years ago, when he suggested that the problem of farm labour be solved by the farmers hiring two shifts of men, working eight hours each. His close and intimate knowledge of farming conditions made a deep impression upon me at that time, and I have since listened with very great interest indeed to the words of wisdom which always fall from his lips. But I thought he came very near to violating the second paragraph of rule 18 this evening; if he was not violating that rule in the matter of irrelevance, he was dangerously close to violating it in the matter of tedious repetition. I am also in the habit of listening with interest to the remarks of my hon. friend from Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux), who is also the distinguished member from the rural constituency of Gaspé. I represent only one constituency in this House, but it is perhaps the most strictly rural constituency in the Dominion of Canada, because there is not within its bounds a city or town or even an incoroporated village. It is very convenient indeed to be in the position of the hon. member for Maisonneuve, representing as he does, two constituencies, one a city constituency and the other a rural constituency; and it is particularly convenient when a matter of this kind comes up on which there is a certain amount of conflict between the people who reside in the cities and those who reside in the country; because if the hon. member wants to keep in line with the rural population he represents Gaspé, and if he wishes to line up with the city dwellers, he is the distinguished member for Maisonneuve, which is an urban constituency.

I rise on this occasion for two reasons: First, because, representing a rural constituency, I think I should express my opposition to the re-enactment of the daylight saving measure; second, because I want to propose a solution of this vexed question So far, it has been considered from only one standpoint. Daylight saving proposes that every person should get up one hour earlier than in normal times and quit work one hour earlier in the afternoon, thus having an hour for play at the end of the day's work. Why not turn the clock the other way, and instead of getting up one hour earlier in the morning and quitting one hour earlier in the afternoon, get up one hour later in the morning and quit work one hour later in the afternoon? Then those who are interested in daylight saving—the dry goods clerks and the golf enthusiasts—could get up in the morning and play golf.

Then they will appreciate what it means to play golf when the dew is on the ground, and at the same time will realize the position of the farmer who has to go to work in the morning when the dew is heavy. Of course, if they played golf in the morning on moist ground they might probably soil their canvas shoes, and their fingers when they handled the ball, but they would find the atmosphere just as exhiliarating in the early morning as at any other time; and I venture to say that if they took their recreation at that time they would find

that the farmer had been at work an hour before them at that. I am told also that those who indulge in the game of golf and similar semi-manly recreations are people who have rather a tendency to stoutness; and, as I am credibly informed that the early morning dew is almost a specific for gout, there is an added reason why it would be advisable to change the time around and take this hour for recreation and pleasure in the forenoon and not rob the farmer of his best hour in the day.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, I object to re-enactment of the daylight saving law because I believe that the vast majority of the people in the country are opposed to it. I am sure that the hon. gentleman who moved the resolution was perfectly sincere when he gave his opinion as to the percentage of those in favour of daylight saving. I do not question his sincerity, but I certainly question the correctness of his figures. I believe that if a census of opinion were taken on this question it would be found that fully sixty per cent of the people very determinedly and positively oppose it, and of the other forty per cent, half would be as strongly in favour of daylight saving while the other half would be indifferent. That is a fair representation of the sentiment of the country, I think, whether it represents the sentiment of the House or not. I am opposed to the re-enactment of the measure because it not only puts the farmers to unnecessary inconvenience but subjects them to considerable financial loss as well. Some will probably disagree with me in the statement, but I am convinced that I am right when I say that last year considerable financial loss to the farmers attended daylight saving. Not only does it inconvenience the farmer, but it imposes extra work on the housewives in the rural part of the country and the wives of the labouring classes in our large centres of population. Who is benefited by it, and from what source comes the request for daylight saving? The newspapers? Why, certainly. It is all very well for the newspaperman who gets down to his office at eight o'clock in the morning and whose staff may want to go off in the afternoon; and there are no doubt a number of clerks who would like the change. But the farmers and the great bulk of the people who are working in factories and industrial plants, people who have to be at their work at seven o'clock in the morning, do not, I think, really want this law. Should we follow the example of the United States? I think not. Let us legislate for ourselves.

[Mr. Edwards.]

Conditions in Canada are not the same as those in the United States. One hon. member referred to the fact that England, France and Germany had adopted daylight saving. Well, what of that? Has that anything to do with Canada? The conditions in those countries are absolutely different. The hon. gentleman forgot that we have only a few people to the square mile in Canada while in the countries to which he referred there are one hundred, two hundred or three hundred people to the square mile. The population in each of those countries is very largely urban, dwelling almost entirely in the cities and towns, while the rural population is only a small percentage. Canada on the contrary is a rural country.

A few years ago the Government thought it wise to adopt on government works an eight-hour day. I expressed myself against the measure on former occasions, because I considered the adoption by the Government of an eight-hour day made it just that much harder for the farmers and the people in farming communities to obtain the help that was necessary to work their farms. That was one concession that the Government made to the labouring class when they agreed to the eight-hour day on government works, and I ask them now to make a concession to the farming class in regard to this matter of daylight saving. I do not think there can be the shadow of a doubt in the mind of any member of the House, after having heard the speeches delivered this afternoon, that the farmers are opposed to the Daylight Saving Bill. And if hon. gentlemen in this House believe that to be a fact, I ask them to respect the wishes of the farmers in this matter and vote accordingly.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): My hon. friend from South Oxford (Mr. Sutherland) was very much surprised that a resolution of this kind was put on the Order Paper or permitted to be taken up at this time, and he seemed to think that not only was there no need for it, but that the people did not want it in any shape or form. I must differ from him in that view, because I think that however we may vote—and I may frankly say that I will support the resolution—it is not at all a bad thing to have had this free and open discussion in Parliament on a question in which there is considerable interest, and which, after all, is not a political question in the ordinary sense of that word. I do not think my hon. friend from Dufferin (Mr. Best), quite did justice to the mover

of the resolution when he placed him in the position of having interjected a question, and said that he was engendering very bitter strife between large sections of the community. I did not so understand the mover of the resolution. I understood him to say that there would be a natural conflict of opinion between the rural and urban sections. I think my hon. friend from Dufferin need not have been so warm in some of his remarks, because after all, Sir, we can afford to hold different views and express them temperately.

I cannot agree with the statement made by some opposing the resolution that as low as three per cent of the population is in favour of such a resolution. My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards), I observe, put it very much higher. Of course we can only guess on a subject of this kind, but I think it is interesting to have the various opinions held in the different constituencies reflected by hon. members in the House.

I do not think that the method of approaching this subject is particularly to be deprecated, as my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) seemed to think. Some hon. members who have spoken have accused the Government of shirking responsibility on a question for which they ought to shoulder responsibility. Again and again in this House, I have heard hon. gentlemen complain that in democratic governments the tendency is for the Government to run the whole country and make their followers fall into line by the threat that otherwise the Administration would be smashed. I am rather inclined to agree with my hon. friend from Springfield (Mr. Richardson) that it is not a bad thing on a question like this to have a free discussion in the House, and to feel that even if members of the Government hold divergent views in regard to it they would still be justified in continuing to hold office. I am glad of that because on this question I may find myself differing from my distinguished friend from Leeds (Sir Thomas White).

However, there were one or two remarks made during the debate that I want to answer. Some of the hon. gentlemen who have spoken very strongly against daylight saving have stated that they believed it to be a good thing as a war measure, and they supported it last year on that account. I may be dense, or I may not perhaps have given the argument sufficient attention, but if daylight saving is good as a war measure because it instilled more energy into our people and caused more production in this country, it surely must be an equally good measure for Canada in days of peace.

I thought that my hon. friend from South Perth (Mr. Steele), who finds himself in the position of having to vote against the resolution, supplied one of the strongest arguments that I had yet heard in favour of the measure, when he gave it as his deliberate conviction, as a medical man, that on the whole the health of the people of Canada had been greatly improved through the operation of this legislation. If that is so I think it is a priceless blessing to achieve. The hon. gentleman also spoke of the very beneficial effects upon people who were working in factories, school children, and so on, that had resulted from the change in time. I am not disposed to dispute for one moment that in many respects daylight saving may have been somewhat detrimental to certain classes, and especially to the farming interests. I remember when the Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster) first mooted the idea of this legislation I was then Minister of Agriculture. Sir George Foster seemed to think that the whole country was in favour of it, but I told him at that time that I was inclined to believe that a large section of the farming community would be against it. He said he had given a great deal of attention to the subject, and I think he had ascertained the feelings of a very large portion of the community. It is true that the view held in the country with respect to this matter may have changed somewhat. I am prepared to admit that a great many of the farming section, possibly most of them, are against it, and it therefore became a matter of balancing conditions.

One of the things that I do think has a material effect upon this question as it presents itself to-day is the operation of the railways, and the fact that in the United States daylight saving is in operation. My hon. friend from South York tried to throw some responsibility on the Government. He demanded that it should control the railways and compel them not to observe daylight saving, if this House, by its vote, decided that it should not be adopted. Well, my hon. friend must know that this is a question of railway operation and of railway time tables. Surely he would not lay down the principle that because the railways are adopting daylight saving and alter their time tables they should not continue to have the power they have always had of running their trains at certain particular times? I must say that I am not convinced yet that if the

railways are altering their time tables by an hour, and that consequently the large business interests of the country, the financial institutions, and so on, with their ramifications, are also going to observe the difference of an hour, in the main it will not lead to a very great deal of confusion and loss if the whole country does not carry out the same policy.

Looking at this matter from the British Columbia point of view, I may say that I represent a constituency very largely rural. Perhaps I do not know the exact feeling which prevails throughout the province, but I do not know that in my visits to British Columbia last fall I never heard a single word against the operation of the daylight saving law. I believe it was the opinion and the expectation of those people out there that it would naturally follow that daylight saving would continue this year, and the only communications I have had on the subject at all have been communications expressing gratification that daylight saving had been accomplished.

My hon. friend from Frontenac (Mr. Edwards)—not very seriously I am bound to admit—suggested that some of this campaign was instigated by gentlemen who do a lot of golfing. I am almost afraid to admit that although I was a farmer for twenty-five years I am still a golfer, and I am not, as he pictured, an exceedingly stout person or suffering from any physical disability of that kind. Nor do golfers always wear canvas shoes, which are exposed to the dampening influence of the dew. Daylight saving is popular with the people in cities and towns, and I recognize the truth of the statement of the hon. member for Vancouver South (Mr. Cooper) that the workers in the stores and factories strongly support it. Personally, I am going to vote for the resolution and against the amendment. Whatever effect this particular resolution may have—according to my hon. friend from South Perth, it is almost dead now and we have come to assist at the burial—I am convinced that it is an excellent thing to have a question of this kind form the subject of a general discussion, and to afford to every hon. member an opportunity of voting on it without the question of party allegiance being raised. I think that it will be the means of fixing the attention of the whole country in a way that it has never been fixed before, and will ultimately lead to its being settled in a manner that will be for the good of Canada as a whole.

[Mr. Burrell.]

Lt.-General Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): I remember many years ago hearing an American stating that his doctrine in religious matters was to go to Hades his own way, and let everybody else go theirs. That is largely my doctrine on this question. I have not the slightest objection in the world to the people of the cities and towns advancing the clock an hour in the morning. If they think they can make a little better time in getting to or leaving their offices, they are welcome to it, but I am certainly opposed to upsetting the whole industrial conditions of the Dominion of Canada by enacting a statute of this kind. There is not a municipality in Canada to-day but can bring about the desired result by passing a by-law. As a matter of fact, in many towns to-day throughout Canada the whistles are started blowing at five o'clock, half-past five, six o'clock, six-thirty or seven o'clock, as the case may be. That procedure goes on and there is no great worry or turmoil over it; people adapt themselves to their environment. Those in the towns and cities who want their time advanced can easily find the machinery to do it. But I protest, on behalf of the farming community, and those who do not want to have legislation of this kind forced upon them, against this kind of thing. This talk of it being a war measure is the merest piffle which has been resorted to in the case of any one with a fad to advocate until it has become nauseating.

The farming community want to be let alone. They say the old standard time is good enough for them. I am not very old yet, but I can remember, Sir, when Toronto had one time, then at Donlands we had to set our watches ahead a few minutes, we had to do the same thing when we got to Dumbarton, and I remember in the town of Bowmanville where I grew up we were four minutes ahead of Toronto in our time. Our watches had to be adjusted when we moved up and down the country one or two miles, and yet the people survived, they raised their grain and sold it, and got along very well without any standard time. Then standard time came in, and I remember on one occasion being in St. John where I found they had three different times; the old meridian time, the standard time, and some eastern or Atlantic seaboard time, so that you never knew what time any one was going to travel by. Yet St. John thrived and things went on quite satisfactorily. Therefore I take the liberty of suggesting to the Government that there should be no further interference

with our standard time. The farmers are content with the old standard or meridian time, but they have no objection to the cities and towns passing by-laws to put the clock ahead or back an hour to suit their own convenience. Daylight saving is all very well for those people who are fond of the pleasant pastime at which my hon. friend the Secretary of State is such an expert—golfing is a very pleasant exercise for delicate women—and I have no objection in the world to cities and towns regulating their own time, but in the name of Heaven let us alone. Down in the city of Windsor they have one time, across the river another time. At Port Arthur our time is the same as it is at Sarnia; at Fort William, which is the dividing line, it is an hour ahead. So we have all that strip of Canadian territory from the Detroit line to Port Arthur with an hour's difference in time. I think there is a great deal of meddling in connection with this whole business, and I, Sir, shall vote to let the matter remain as it is without any interference with the standard time, leaving each municipality to regulate its affairs as it wishes.

Mr. ERNEST LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Mr. Speaker, I do not rise to discuss the merits of daylight saving legislation. I am going to express my opinion upon it when I cast my vote, and I think after the discussion we have already had it is the best way to express it; but I want to vote on a motion which is according to the Rules of the House, and I rise therefore for the purpose of raising a point of order against the amendment to the amendment as moved by my hon. friend from Edmonton (Mr. Mackie). The main resolution reads as follows:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to re-enact at once Chapter 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight-Saving Act, 1918."

That statute, chapter 2 of the statutes of 1918, reads as follows:

> 2. During the prescribed period in each year in which this Act is in force, the time, for general purposes in Canada, in each province, shall be one hour in advance of the time which under the law of the province is the time prescribed for such province, and, if there is no time so prescribed, of the accepted standard time.
>
> 3. This Act shall be in force during the present year for such time as may be prescribed by the Governor in Council.

If the main resolution is adopted it will mean that this Act shall be in force during the present year, that is the year 1919. So the amendment to the amendment, which merely says that it is not expedient during the year to enact this legislation, is merely a negation of the main motion and is not in order.

Mr SPEAKER: In respect to the point of order raised by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. Lapointe) I must point out that he refers to a statute, while the resolution before the House is merely an academic one, or one calling for an expression of opinion on the part of the House, and it would have no effect upon the legislation of the country whatsoever. Therefore it resolves itself into a question purely of phraseology, as to whether the amendment to the amendment is actually an amendment to the amendment. In my judgment it is, because the motion calls for the enactment of a statute at once; the amendment says that it shall be enacted in six months; the amendment to the amendment says it shall not be enacted for at least one year. So it is an amendment in question of time, and in my judgment therefore it is in order.

Hon. W. S. FIELDING (Shelburne and Queens): Mr. Speaker, I quite concur in the views of the hon. gentlemen who have expressed their satisfaction at the manner in which we have been permitted to discuss this question. I know there are times when it is necessary that the Government shall accept the responsibility of a measure, but I think it would make for every good end if we had more frequent opportunities to discuss matters in the free and open way in which this House has had this matter before it to-day. I have only received one communication on this subject from my constituents; it is against the Daylight Saving Act. Strange to say it does not come from a rural community, it comes from one of the incorporated towns within my constituency. In the town of Shelburne, the shire town of one of my counties, the Board of Trade has passed a strong resolution against daylight saving, and the secretary in transmitting it to me informs me that the views of that community are in harmony with the action of the board. Any hon. member will realise at once that the decision of an important body like a Board of Trade in one of our towns calls for profound consideration and respect from the representative of the county, and I certainly receive it in that way. That is one side of the question. The other side is this: Last year I briefly spoke and voted for the Daylight Saving Bill. After that I had an opportunity of visiting my constituents and

spending some time amongst them, and I am bound to say that no one offered any objection to the course I pursued so far as I heard. Wherever the question interested them at all they were perfectly satisfied and content. So I have on the one hand the apparent satisfaction of the whole community, and on the other hand I have this resolution of the Board of Trade of one of my towns, to which I should like to pay great respect. Taking it all in all, I am inclined to think I have not found sufficient reason to change the ground which I took last year.

Mr. F. F. PARDEE (West Lambton): Mr. Speaker, with regard to the question now before the House, I should like to endorse the sentiments of the hon. gentleman from Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding). I am thoroughly in accord with the course that the Government has adopted to-day, and I am not in accord with the course that the member for South York (Mr. Maclean) has taken. It would appear to me to be much better for this House and for this country that the members of this House should express their true opinions, rather than that they should express them wholly and solely under party patronage, so to speak. The Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) has very frankly risen in his place and said that the Government desired an expression of opinion from this House.

He desired that the members of the House should voice their own opinions or the opinions of their constituents without regard to party. The member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) seemed to ask that somebody should take the responsibility, but suggested that he should not; in other words, he wanted to be allowed to get in under the wing of the Government and say later to his constituents that he followed the Government, or did not, whichever suited his purpose. The course, therefore, followed by the Government in this matter is a fit and proper one.

We know from the experience of last session that a very decided cleavage of opinion prevails in this matter as between the urban and the rural population, between the country districts and the cities, towns and villages. The petitions and expressions of opinion that have been received by the great majority of members of the House from rural districts indicate that daylight saving is decidedly unpopular in the country and that the farmers do not desire it. It appears to me, representing, as I do, a constituency made up of both urban and rural districts, that, taking all things into consideration, the requests of the rural population in this case ought to be acceded to. It is true that there are two extremely arguable sides to the question, but the urban districts have unquestionably not expressed their view in as concrete and forcible a way as have the rural districts. Having regard to what the farmers have done for this country, considering the extent to which the prosperity of Canada depends on the rural interests and the definite manner in which those interests have expressed their opinion that the re-enactment of daylight saving would be absolutely detrimental to them, it is the duty of this House to listen to those representations and to carry out the suggestion contained in them.

Mr. GEORGE B. NICHOLSON (Algoma East): Like some other members, I represent a constituency the population of which is about equally divided between those whose business is agriculture and those who work in factories, saw-mills and mines. So far as I have been able to judge, just as much difference of opinion exists on one side as on the other. I took the opportunity of going all over the agricultural part of my constituency during the harvest season and finding out what the farmers thought of daylight saving. Many of them were decidedly opposed to it; many of them expressed absolute indifference. I found the same attitude among the men working in factories, in mines and in railway services. So that, so far as my constituents are concerned I am possibly not compelled to take any particular stand in this matter.

In this whole discussion there has been too great a tendency to regard this daylight saving proposal as something in the nature of a class measure. Many references have been made to the millionaires and the golf-players, and not enough consideration has been given to the large number of people in the urban centres who are neither millionaires nor golf-players and who work in shops and factories ten hours a day. These men say to me: It is a decided advantage for us to have our leisure moments all at one end of the day, and that in the evening. But it has been pointed out to us that the daylight saving system works a great disadvantage to a large number of people who work on and are interested in farms, and we are willing to forego the advantage accruing to us by the enactment of daylight saving in order to do away with the disadvantage resulting to our agricultural population. If

the subject was discussed from that point of view, without any effort to create prejudice in the minds of any class of the people, we would arrive at a more satisfactory conclusion. My judgement is that in the interests of harmony those of us who benefit by daylight saving should be willing to forego the advantage accruing to us from it in order that the agricultural interests may have their way, so to speak. Unquestionably 95 per cent of the people interested in agriculture throughout Canada are opposed to daylight saving, notwithstanding what I said regarding my own constituency. I am going to vote against the resolution, without regard to the amendments, because I believe that the re-enactment of the daylight saving measure would not be in the interests of harmony among all the classes of people in this country. I suggest that hon. members should discuss subjects of this kind on their merits. Many of the class differences prevailing in Canada are largely due to the activities of loose-lipped agitators who do not hesitate to take advantage of every opportunity to encourage these differences, having very little regard to the merits of the subjects they discuss.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): I wish to say just a word or two on this resolution because of the fact that the hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean) laid particular stress on the railway situation. The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, it is expedient to re-enact at once Chapter 2, Statutes of 1918, "The Daylight Saving Act, 1918."

I cannot see any necessity at all for an amendment to the original resolution on which I should like to have seen a straight vote. Be that as it may, however, two amendments have been moved which, if carried, really mean that the resolution should not be adopted. When the Government introduced the Daylight Saving Bill last year, one thing that had a great deal of influence on the passing of that legislation was the fact that from one end of the Dominion to the other the people were undoubtedly led to believe and, I think, hon. estly—that we were short of fuel and that everything possible should be done, in the interest of the public and in the interest of the war, to conserve fuel. Therefore, when the Bill was introduced, the farmers of Canada, being willing, as they were during the whole war, to make any sacrifices necessary to bring the war to a successful issue, decided to give up what they believed was of great value to them and perhaps make a sacrifice in order to conserve fuel and thereby furnish more ammunition and give better service to the men at the front.

Sir SAM HUGHES: May I ask the minister a question? I have asked it of several members and I have not yet received an answer. I should like to know how one pound of coal has been saved through the Daylight Saving Act.

Mr. REID: Whether any fuel was saved or not, there was at all events a feeling throughout the country that a shortage of fuel existed and that fuel might be saved as a result of daylight saving. For centuries, we have had a standard time in this country; we have got along very well under it; there has never been any trouble, and I want to say frankly that since since my birth I have been satisfied with the standard time, and have not wanted it changed and would like to see it continued as in the past. There is, however, a difference of opinion on this question throughout Canada. As the hon. member for South York has stated, the most serious matter at present is the way in which it will affect the railways of Canada. He asked me for an answer as to what the railways would do. The railways are being operated under their own managements, and unless some trouble should arise and complaint is made to the Government, the Government will, of course, not interfere. When trouble arises and complaint is made the Government, of course, are supreme in this country in so far as rectifying anything that may not be in the public interest is concerned. I do not know what the railways will do, but frankly I cannot see that the situation that may arise will be as serious as has been represented. Travelling from here to Vancouver, one retires to bed at night and when one gets up the next morning the time is changed one hour. One moves one's watch ahead, and the change does not seem to make much difference; one gets along just the same. My view, therefore, is this, that when a train arrives at the Canadian side of the boundary line the time will be changed the one hour's difference, just the same as occurs on the time-tables of trains going from here to Vancouver. There is only this difference—and what effect it will have I cannot say—that on transcontinental trains the time is changed at divisional points. The question has been asked: What effect will this have where trains are crossing the boundary not at a divisional point? No one can answer that question until the thing has been tried.

There is no doubt, however, the railways of Canada will, in their own interest, make their time-tables to suit the interest of the people they are serving. But after all, we have, as hon. members know, the Board of Railway Commissioners, which has full power and jurisdiction over all the railways in Canada in rates and time-tables, and the interests of the people are guarded by that board, from which there is an appeal to the Governor in Council and from that to the Parliament, which is supreme. Personally, I should like to have the old standard time retained in Canada. I believe the cities can change the time to suit themselves, as has been done in other places.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Does my hon. friend, as Minister of Railways, not think that, on the first of April next, when the time tables of the American railway systems are changed, the Canadian railways will have to adapt their time tables to those of the American railways?

Mr. REID: I am not doing any thinking until the thing is done and I see what the arrangement is. I will then do some thinking as to whether it is in the interest of this country or not. When one is crossing at Detroit and other places, the time table shows one hour's difference. The standard time is changed at American points, for instance at Rouse's Point. At present you leave New York at a certain hour and arrive at a certain hour at Montreal. I cannot see why the trains cannot simply change the time at Rouse's Point and run on Canadian time into Montreal. Perhaps, I am not an expert railwayman and so cannot see the effect of the situation on the railways of Canada, but this is a case where we should vote as our constituents want us to. I am quite satisfied from the petitions I have from my constituents that they are absolutely opposed to the daylight saving scheme, and until I feel that it is in the public interest to make a change, I consider it my duty to vote as my constituents would have me vote.

Mr. S. J. CROWE (Burrard): I was not very much in favour of the daylight saving Act last year, but after watching its operation last summer I am certainly in favour of its re-enactment this year. I believe that I am voicing the sentiments of my constituents when I say that ninety per cent of them are in favour of daylight saving. I have heard very little criticism of the measure. I have received quite a number of telegrams and communications from the city of Vancouver, of which I am one of the representatives, and all these communications strongly endorse daylight saving. This afternoon my colleague from South Vancouver (Mr. Cooper) received a telegram from the Reeve of the Municipality of Point Grey, which, as it arrived after he had finished speaking, he has asked me to read to the House. It is as follows:

> Point Grey Council, on behalf of the citizens, favours daylight saving and requests your urgent efforts towards that end.
>
> George Fletcher,
> Point Grey.

I received telegrams yesterday from the different athletic associations in the city of Vancouver, also a wire from the Retailers' Association of Vancouver, as well as a letter from the Kiwanis Club of that city, all in favour of daylight saving. I think myself that daylight saving is in the best interests of the great majority of the people of this country, and that is why I am going to support the resolution.

Mr. A. E. FRIPP (Ottawa): It seems to me there is a very important preliminary question to be determined before we vote to-night. The Minister of Railways and Canals (Mr. Reid) has not in my judgment cleared up the situation. Now, as I understand it, those hon. members who desire to vote against daylight saving will find themselves in this position, if the resolution is agreed to: The railways of Canada will follow the time tables of their American connections, and the result will be that instead of the farmers of Canada avoiding the disadvantage which some hon. members see in daylight saving, the trains will run an hour earlier just as they did last year. I therefore think that before we vote on this question we should have some assurance from the Government that if this House refuses to accept this resolution, the railways of Canada will not change their time tables but will run on standard time.

Sir SAM HUGHES: What have we to do with the railway time tables?

Mr. FRIPP: Everything. I am satisfied that the Canadian railways will change their time on Sunday next, and that means they will run their trains an hour earlier than at present. Then those who voted against daylight saving will have daylight saving in effect so far as train connections are concerned.

Mr. MANION: What effect will the change of time have on any railways except those that cross the border?

Mr. FRIPP: It will affect every railway in Canada.

Mr. MANION: But why should it, except those that cross the border?

Mr. FRIPP: My hon. friend must realize that a train leaving Ottawa this afternoon for New York must cross the border and—

Mr. MANION: I am speaking of the trains that do not cross the border.

Mr. FRIPP: If our Canadian railways change their time on Sunday to conform with American time, it means that all our trains will be run an hour earlier than at present. So far as my constituency is concerned, and myself personally, we are absolutely in favour of daylight saving. Last year it worked out marvellously well in the city of Ottawa. It gave to our labouring men, who have passed a resolution in favour of the measure, an extra hour a day which has been greatly to their benefit, and I venture to say that if you took a vote in the city of Ottawa to-day ninety-nine per cent of the people would vote in favour of a re-enactment of the measure. So personally I am prepared to vote for the resolution, but at the same time I imagine that if it is defeated those who think they have gained an advantage will find they have gained a lemon. I say that if the resolution is defeated, and there is to be no Daylight Saving Act in operation for the ensuing months, the railway companies of Canada should run on their present time; otherwise there will be great confusion in freight and passenger traffic, and all business connected with the railways will be in a state of chaos more or less, which will be detrimental to the best interests of the country. I repeat what I rose to draw to the attention of the House, that it should be well understood that if this resolution is defeated, the railway time tables of the country shall not be changed, but remain as they are.

10 p.m.

Mr. W. F. KAY (Missisquoi): It seems to me the question has been discussed thoroughly, and I shall say only a few words. There appears to be a difference of opinion between the rural and urban population of Canada. As a farmer, and as a representative of an agricultural constituency, I am decidedly opposed to daylight saving. There is no question that it does a financial injury to the farmer by reason of the fact that he loses an hour each day at the season of the year when time is most precious. Under daylight saving he rises by the clock as usual, does his chores, and is ready to proceed to the fields to cut his hay or grain probably at eight o'clock, but if the dew is heavy he will be unable to do anything until half-past nine or ten. That hour and a half is practically lost. Then, in the afternoon he has to stop at four or five o'clock—five o'clock at any rate but usually at four—if he has chores to do; so that it is a direct financial loss to him. On the other hand, I can quite appreciate the fact that the urban population is strongly in favour of daylight saving. I am willing to grant that the opinion is fairly evenly divided pro and con on this question. But that is not the point. The urban population have only this to claim for daylight saving, namely, that it gives them an hour more in the evening in which to enjoy themselves, or to rest, although it does not benefit them financially, whereas, against that, the farmer argues that he does suffer a direct financial loss, and it does not seem to me under these circumstances that there can be any question as to what the decision of this House ought to be.

As to what has been said to-night with reference to the railways, I can conceive, if the report which we see in the press to-night is correct, that the Railway War Board has ordered all railways in Canada to adopt the American time on the 31st of March, all farmers who ship milk, cream and other produce in the morning will be compelled to adopt daylight saving. I do not doubt that this is attributable to the action of the United States, and am not disposed to blame the Railway Board, because I do not see how we can help adopting the time of the United States roads. We have either to do that or hold our trains up on the border for an hour.

Mr. F. B. CARVELL (Minister of Public Works): I occupy the somewhat unique position, Mr. Speaker, of having voted on both sides of this question during the last two years. When this matter came up in 1917 I criticised it very severely. In fact I gave what some newspaper called a very learned dissertation on the whole theory of standard time and other allied subjects, and as a result of the severe criticism which was levelled at the Bill it was withdrawn by the present Minister of Trade and Commerce (Sir George Foster). Last year, in order to bring ourselves in harmony with practically all the rest of the

world, the Minister of Trade and Commerce, who was very anxious to put the Bill through, did me the honour of naming me as his seconder. Therefore, like many other hon. members I voted for the Bill. Now it comes up again, and as a member of the Government I take some credit for putting this matter up to the representatives of the people as we have done. I do not believe in the party whip system, as it has operated, I think, to the disadvantage of Canada in public life in the past. There has been too much, on the part of both Government and Opposition, of a practice of a dozen men or fewer getting together and outlining a policy and expecting the others to accept it. I realize that under the system of responsible government the great majority of matters that are really questions of policy must be decided by a government, and the government must stand or fall by the vote of the majority of the representatives. But this is not, in my judgment, a question of government policy. It is a question merely of what is best for the country. I was very much in favour of submitting this question to the House, and I am glad to see that the House accepted it in the spirit in which the Government put it forward, notwithstanding the objection of my hon. friend from South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean). I shall not enter into the merits of the question from the standpoint of either the farmer or the resident of the city. I am a farmer myself to some extent—my hon. friend smiles.

An hon. MEMBER: To what extent?

Mr. CARVELL: Well to the extent that I make some money, I am happy to say. I am a farmer, and I can agree with every word said by the farmers. In the part of Canada from which I come we lose not only an hour, but an hour and a half, because we are on the extreme western edge of the Atlantic standard, and our standard time is half an hour faster than sun time. When you add another hour to that, instead of leaving work at six o'clock during hay and harvest we leave at half past four. The same condition of affairs exists in Western Manitoba and near the Rocky Mountains, and wherever you get beyond the meridian when the standard time is in advance of sun time, until you reach a point where you are an hour and a half ahead of sun time, which makes it almost impossible for the farmers to get along. This, however, has been so thoroughly discussed by hon. members that I do not intend to pursue this phase of the subject. I shall now deal with the question in its relation to the railways. I am aware that there is a very strong prejudice by the railway companies in favour of the adoption of daylight saving, not so much, perhaps, because of any intrinsic advantage in the scheme, as that the United States, having adopted it, great inconvenience and difficulty will arise in the operation of the Canadian trains if we do not follow suit. It has been pointed out that there are many places in Canada where railways will be compelled to run an hour earlier than they do at present simply because the United States has adopted daylight saving. There must be twenty-five or more places in Canada where trains run across the border. There is no doubt that a train that starts from New York bound for Montreal or Toronto will leave an hour earlier than ordinarily and arrive at its destination an hour earlier, and the man who desires to travel by that train has to rise an hour earlier than usual. But there are a great many other places where it will mean an advantage rather than a disadvantage. At four different points between the Atlantic and the Pacific the time now changes one hour, and on every train that goes from the Atlantic to the Pacific the clocks must be changed so many times. There are two places in my own constituency where Canadian trains running into the United States are now compelled to change time by one hour. To-day they are compelled to change the time an hour in crossing from Windsor to Detroit or from Sarnia to Port Huron, whereas under this arrangement there would be no change. It is therefore apparent that while there are disadvantages there are also corresponding advantages. I have consulted some of the railway men, and will state their argument in favour of the adoption of daylight saving. I was not able to attend during all the debate, and possibly what I am about to say may be a repetition of what has been said before. If it is, the House will pardon me. The railway men admit that there is no difficulty in operating the trains where the time changes at divisional points because that is done all over the country. But there are certain places where trains cross the international boundary line which places are not divisional points and where there are no telegraph offices. An engineer running a freight train in the night may be handed an order that he is to stop at a certain hour. Either the train despatcher may make a mistake in not properly calculating the time, or the engineer may make a mis-

take, and there is liable to be an accident. I am not sufficient of a railway man to answer yes or no to that, or to say whether there is a great deal to it, but I will state this: I have found that most of the things that are held up as reasons for opposing a measure can be overcome if men want to overcome them. I have a great deal more faith in the ability of the Canadian railway companies and their very intelligent employees than to believe that it is impossible that they can work out a little matter like this. If they can work out a change of time at all these different points, moving from east to west across the continent, it seems to me they will not have much difficulty in arranging for changes of time when moving from north to south.

I also realize that it is a great convenience to people living in cities and towns to have the time advanced an hour. I think any person will admit that. But I do not agree that I am compelled, because of something that is a convenience to the dwellers in the cities and towns, to vote for a measure which, to my own personal knowledge, will result in great loss to the farming community. It is not a question of convenience or inconvenience to the farmers, it is one of absolute money loss; there is not a farmer in this House —I think there is scarcely one in the country—who would not tell you that the change of standard time was a real money loss to him. It is true that the inconvenience is worse in some places than in others; it is very much worse on the western edges of the standards than on the eastern edges. In the town of Riviere du Loup, for example, the adoption of this legislation would only mean the gain of half an hour, and therefore the disadvantage involved would not be very great.

The only great objection, from a business standpoint lies with the railways, and I do not think that is sufficient to justify me in voting to put the farmers of the country to a loss which I am sure they would incur if this legislation goes through. Therefore I will have to vote for the amendment to the amendment and against the resolution.

Mr. R. L. RICHARDSON (Springfield): I rise for the purpose of asking a question, not with any desire to speak again. I understand that the resolution declares it to be expedient to re-enact at once chapter 2 of the statutes of 1918. I presume that is the Act passed last year?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: That Act expires shortly?

Mr. CARVELL: Yes.

Mr. RICHARDSON: When does it expire?

Mr. CARVELL: At the end of the current fiscal year.

Mr. RICHARDSON: In that case what is the object of the amendments? If we vote down the resolution does not that settle the whole question? I think hon. gentlemen should have it established to their satisfaction exactly what they are going to vote on. If the motion is to re-enact the Daylight Saving Act, and we vote it down, then the whole thing falls and there is no necessity either for the amendment, or the amendment to the amendment, because the law will expire in three days. Let both amendments be withdrawn, and then members can vote intelligently on the question.

Mr. CHARLES GAVAN POWER (Quebec South): After having listened for a considerable time to the various opinions expressed, I have come to the conclusion, somewhat reluctantly, I admit, that the inconvenience occasioned to the farmer by the passage of this law will not be greater than the disadvantages which will result to the city worker and dweller should the law not be re-enacted. In common with a great many members of this House I have the greatest possible sympathy with the farming community, so much so that the day before yesterday I voted to remove what I thought was a very substantial grievance under which they were suffering. Unfortunately, Mr. Speaker, a large number of the members of the House who belong to the farming class did not seem to want that grievance removed. Now, Sir, taking those circumstances for granted, I must look to my own constituency, and I find, from letters, telegrams, and communications of all sorts which I have received in the past few days, that the financial, the business, and the working classes of the city of Quebec are almost unanimous in favour of a measure of daylight saving. That being my own conviction as well as the conviction of my constituency, I will take great pleasure in supporting the resolution introduced by the member for Vancouver South (Mr. Cooper).

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The object which the Government had in view in facilitating the debate upon the motion of the hon. member for South Vancouver has been amply accomplished.

In view of the acute divergence of opinion in the country, and among members of the House, it was felt advisable and eminently proper that an opportunity should be given for a frank, free, expression of opinion, precisely such as we have had to-day. If ever there was a question with which a Government, or a Parliament, had to deal, which might properly be submitted for the opinion of the members of the House of Commons this is one. It is not a party question, nor, as I stated this afternoon, does it involve any political principle. No one will pretend to say that those in the country who are opposed to daylight saving represent substantially any one political party. No one will pretend to say that those in cities and towns who are in favour of daylight saving represent completely or in large measure any political party. It seems to me, therefore, that it was an entirely proper proceeding, and I am very glad to have had the views which have been expressed, particularly those of the hon. member for Shelburne and Queens (Mr. Fielding) who has had a wide experience as a parliamentarian, and who was for so long a member of the Government of Canada, in support of the view which we have taken. Now it seems to me that Parliament was discharging a function to-day, which it might more frequently be called upon to discharge, and that is to inform the public generally of Canada as to the opinions which are held in the various sections of the country which are represented in this House upon public questions. I am the first to say that in any matter that involves the policy of the Government, the Government cannot transfer its responsibility to the House.

The executive has its responsibilities, and the House has its duties, but they are separate and distinct. The Government cannot escape its responsibility in the matter of policy, and of course its measures must be such as commend themselves at all times to a majority of this House. I do not at all agree therefore with the views put forward by the hon. member for South York that the course which the Government has adopted in this matter is in any way a violation of the principle of governmental responsibility.

Mr. JACOBS: May I interject a remark? It was made a Government measure last year.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I am aware of that. It would have been perfectly open for the Government last year to have taken the opinion of Parliament on the matter had it so desired.

I do not intend to-night to discuss this question on the merits, because it has been discussed from every angle, and I am exceedingly grateful to all the members of this House who have taken part in this debate and given the Government and the country the benefit of their views. I was aware, generally speaking, of the views which prevailed in the country and in the House, but although I have had information showered upon me from various parts of the country, this debate to-day has been most informing and illuminating and has as I stated before, abundantly justified the policy which has been adopted.

But as to the merits, I have just this to say. It seems to me to be a matter of inconvenience on the one hand and of hardship on the other. I do not mean to say that that will apply to every section of Canada, dividing such section into urban and rural districts; but, generally speaking, it appears to me that whereas in the case of towns and cities there may be inconvenience by reason of the House not adopting daylight saving legislation, at the same time this discussion has abundantly shown that in the farming communities there is more than inconvenience—there is hardship. Let me state further, that I make that assertion having regard to the conditions which prevail to-day. What those conditions will be a year or two years hence I do not pretend to say. But it has been shown in this House that under prevailing conditions with regard to shortage of labour and otherwise, there will possibly be hardship in many of the rural districts if daylight saving legislation is enacted, and that view has been strongly supported in the arguments which we have heard to-day from the representatives of the rural districts.

Now, this is not a Government measure which is under consideration to-night. It is a resolution of a private member which, if it had been reached yesterday, could have been discussed by this House precisely as the House has discussed it to-day; therefore it is open to every hon. member on this side of the House, and of course to every hon. member on the other side of the House, and to every hon. member of this Government, to vote upon this question precisely as he pleases without reference to party lines or to the fact that members of the Government vote one way or vote the other. As for myself, I intend to vote for the amendment to the amendment. The hon. member for Springfield (Mr.

Richardson) has pointed out truly that it would be very much better if we could have a straight vote upon the original resolution, but that is not the position before the House. The position is that one hon. member has moved an amendment which does not, I believe, represent what he intended to move. There is before the House also an amendment to that amendment, and by voting for the amendment to the amendment, as I propose to do, I shall vote against the resolution of the hon. member for South Vancouver (Mr. Cooper).

Mr. F. N. McCREA (Sherbrooke): Mr. Speaker, as I propose to vote on this question differently from what I did last year, I wish to express my opinion on the matter. When this same resolution was presented last year it appeared to me to be not a very sound proposition; I thought it was meddling with something that was outside the jurisdiction of the House, and consequently I voted against it. But after having tried it out for a year I am rather pleased with it, and I think it has been, in our section, a benefit rather than otherwise. I think it is one of the wise measures of the Government,—I am sorry I cannot congratulate them on all the measures that they have brought up and passed.

I can see no special harm in this resolution. I have a telegram to-day from my constituents, and I had a copy of a resolution, which I think has been forwarded to the Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, asking him to favour this measure; my constituents are very much in favour of it. Personally, whether daylight saving legislation is enacted or not does not affect me very much, because I have always had the habit of getting up before the law requires me to. But, as I say, in my constituency I think this daylight saving measure has had the effect of getting our people up earlier, and when you accomplish that you are moving in the right direction. It does not need any law to keep them out of bed at night, because most of them stay up too late; but if you can induce the population either in the cities or the country to get up earlier, I think it is a step in the right direction. I argued last year the farmer's standpoint, that he required his help in the afternoon, and that a man in the afternoon in haying or harvesting time or other busy seasons was of very much more value to him than a man in the morning That was especially true last year, and the year before probably, when the labourers practically dominated the whole situation. I do not think that the labour conditions are the same just now as they were last year, and it is not likely they ever will be. Then if your foreman or the man in charge was not feeling very good it was better for him to keep away, because if he appeared before his men looking cross they did not want to stay with him. But this coming season, and probably the seasons to follow, when the farmer goes to town to get help in his haying or harvesting season, while he may have to pay pretty reasonable wages, which is not objectionable, I think he will be able to say to his help anyway, "I will dictate to you to some extent the hours of labour. If I do not ask you to work earlier in the morning, I will expect you to work later in the evening."

The United States have adopted a law putting daylight saving into force from the first day of next month, and that has a peculiar effect upon our railway services crossing the border. For instance, on one particular section of the Canadian Pacific railway whicr passes through the state of Maine, the Maine Central and the Canadian Pacific operate over quite a distance on the same tracks. It would certainly be very inconvenient to have two systems of railways operating on the same tracks but under different schedules. Possibly the same condition prevails in other localities throughout the Dominion. It is quite probable that whether this House adopts the daylight saving system for this year or not, the railways will have to adopt it in order to carry on their work satisfactorily.

I do not think the farmer will suffer by the adoption of this legislation. If he does not want his hired man to start work at seven o'clock, he can tell him to come on at eight o'clock, as under the old system, and work an hour or two later in the evening. It has been said that the labouring class is not in favour of daylight saving. I am informed by the general manager of our business that they expect to put the daylight saving system in force from the first of April whether the Government adopts it or not. I appreciate the position of the farmer, but I believe that the labour conditions are such that he will not have the trouble that he has had in the past. I voted against daylight saving last year because it looked to me like a silly and uncalled-for move, but having tried it out, I am pleased with it. To my mind, anything that has the effect of encouraging people to get up early in the morning is a step in the right direction.

Hon. T. A. CRERAR (Minister of Agriculture): This debate has proceeded for five hours during this afternoon and evening, and all the arguments that can be advanced pro and con have been pretty well exhausted. I should like to observe, however, that we have the experience of last year to go upon, and there is no doubt whatever that upon a very considerable part of the population the daylight saving measure did work a hardship last year. The hon. member for Sherbrooke (Mr. McCrea) referred to the fact that the legislation was to be continued in force in the United States for the present year. I think I am correct in stating that had Congress not talked it out, as one hon. gentleman observed this afternoon, the chances are that the measure would have been repealed. The agitation against it was very strong indeed, and the consideration of its repeal was before Congress at that time.

I am not particularly impressed by the arguments that have been adduced as to the need of re-enacting this legislation in Canada in order to facilitate our railway train service. It is quite true that we may be obliged to alter our railway time tables in Canada so far as international train services, and possibly also so far as trains connecting with international lines, are concerned. But a large number of trains running daily in Canada are not connected with international train services, and there is no reason why they should be affected by the change of time in the United States.

The agricultural population of Canada are a unit in opposing this measure. It affects them peculiarly; it works a hardship upon them. If city dwellers desire to get up earlier in the morning, it is surely not necessary for Parliament to legislate in order to enable them to do so. The member for Sherbrooke on a little reflection will surely realize that that is a fact. For these reasons, Mr. Speaker, I propose to vote against the resolution.

Mr. THOMAS M. M. TWEEDIE (Calgary West): Mr. Speaker, I find myself in a position similar to that occupied by a great many members of the House with regard to this matter. I supported the Daylight Saving Bill last year, but after a year's experience I find that in the city of Calgary about as many are against the principle of daylight saving as are in favour of it, while in the outlying rural parts almost every one is opposed to it. It seems to me that the consideration of this matter resolves itself into a question of deciding between convenience and necessity. The necessity is all on the side of the agricultural interests in that district. No necessity is involved, so far as I have been able to ascertain, in the matter of daylight saving as affecting the people residing in the city; with them it is simply a matter of convenience. I propose to support the policy which has regard to necessity rather than to convenience.

The Railway War Board was absolutely justified in issuing an order making effective on Canadian railways the same time as they have in the United States. Many Canadian trains go to Boston,, Bangor Portland, Chicago, Detroit and other important centres in the United States, and if the systems running these trains did not adopt the time effective in the United States, the railway systems of the United States would have to alter their time tables to suit the train schedules in Canada in order to prevent traffic from being held up twelve or fourteen hours at points where connections are made. As the Minister of Agriculture (Hon. Mr. Crerar) has suggested, local trains not connected with international lines can give the agricultural interests the same service as they are receiving at the present time.

Mr. JOHN ELAWS REID (Mackenzie): I cannot see that there is any law which prevents the dwellers in the cities from getting up an hour earlier, if they see fit, and I am sure this House cannot pass any legislation which will compel them to get out of bed an hour earlier. I am opposed to the daylight saving scheme, because it is detrimental to the agricultural interests, and for that reason it is not good for Canada as a whole. I will just read a telegram which I have received from Mr. Morrison, of Toronto, secretary of the Organized Farmers of Ontario:—

> Consensus of members' opinions on so-called Daylight Saving almost completely unanimous opposition to it. We do not believe rank and file of towns and cities are in favour of it, if so they can make local arrangements without changing the clocks.

That is all I wish to say in regard to the matter, and it will be my duty to oppose the daylight saving scheme.

Mr. THOMAS FOSTER (East York): I did not intend to speak to-night, but so much has been heard from the farmers this afternoon that I want to speak on behalf of the people in the cities. It has been stated that the farmers work fifteen hours a day and have no recreation at all, and that they should have some consideration. I repre-

sent a city of some 550,000 people; Montreal has a population of 750,000 people; Quebec, 150,000 people; Hamilton, 100,000 people; London, 75,000 people; Winnipeg, 150,000 to 200,000 people; Vancouver, 150,000 people, and there are other smaller cities. Surely the people of those cities should have some consideration.

Some hon. MEMBERS: What about Ottawa?

Mr. FOSTER: If I have omitted any cities with large populations, hon. members are perhaps more familiar with them than I am. The point is that the daylight saving scheme was tried out last year and not one city has complained; the cities are all perfectly satisfied. Resolutions have been passed by the large cities endorsing daylight saving and I have enumerated hundreds of thousands of people who desire daylight saving. As has been said a dozen times, if the farmer wants to continue to work under the same conditions such as have existed for the last hundred years, let him do so, but let the city people work under such conditions as they find is most agreeable and beneficial to them. Surely the hundreds of thousands of people in the banks, factories, and all the other industrial institutions of the cities deserve some consideration. They must have recreation, physical exercise, and if they want to get that by putting the clock an hour forward so as to give them an extra hour in the evening, they should have some say and some rights in this Dominion. They do not want to have all the say, but surely these hundreds of thousands of people should have somebody to voice their sentiments. I have found such a change in the last twelve months that hon. members are falling over themselves in order to get from under, to get to the other side, to please the farmer. They imagine from the development of the last twelve months that the farmers are becoming a serious consideration in the political situation of this Dominion, and they want to stand on the right side of that influence. I am not going to be influenced by the farmers of the Dominion so far as to forego the rights of the people in the great cities. Where would Canada be, where would the farmers be if it were not for the consumers in the great cities? Could the farmer earn a livelihood, notwithstanding his great production, if he did not have the people in the great cities to consume his products? If it were not for the people in the great cities of this Dominion, neither daylight saving nor anything else would be of advantage to the farmer. The people of the cities are the backbone of this Dominion, financially, mentally and numerically, and it is not right for this House to be lop-sided on this question as it is to-day.

Mr. JAMES BOWMAN (North Huron): It seems to me absurd to add anything to what has already been said in opposition to the re-enactment of daylight saving, as numerous strong arguments have been brought forward in opposition to it, while the few arguments in favour of it have been very feeble. In the first place, I commend the Government for giving hon. members who represent the people of this Dominion an opportunity to say where they stand on this question. The hon. member for East York (Mr. Foster) claimed, I understand, that the urban population of Canada was in favour of daylight saving. The riding which I represent is composed of 26,000 people, about one-half of the population being urban and the other half rural. I have not received a petition in support of the re-enactment of the Daylight Saving Act, and I have received from councils and co-operative societies in the riding, as well as from many private individuals, petitions against the re-enactment of that measure. But we should go further than simply to depend on such evidence as that as evidence that the people are opposed to daylight saving. At the present time we are trying to place agriculture in this country on a good sound basis. We are also, through the Soldiers' Settlement Board, undertaking a very important work in placing our returned soldiers on the land. It is, therefore, very necessary that we should do what we can to make agriculture as profitable as possible, so that when those boys are placed on the land they will be encouraged to remain there. I am very much afraid that if something is not done along that line to aid agriculture, we shall find that the work undertaken by the Soldiers' Settlement Board will be wasted energy.

A number of hon. members, speaking in support of this resolution, have advocated that we should copy the legislation passed by the United States, putting daylight saving into force and effect for the ensuing year. I am not one of those who are prone to copy the legislation of the United States.

The people of Canada are the ones who should be consulted, and whatever legislation we place on the statute book should be in accord with the sentiments of the people of Canada. It has been said that daylight saving

was in force and has been re-enacted in many of the countries of Europe and in the United States, but that is no argument that it will be in the best interests of Canada. Conditions differ. Canada has largely a rural population, and its people are largely dependent on agriculture, whereas those countries that have enacted daylight saving and are still in favour of it are composed mostly of the urban class. We in Canada should do as we think right, and vote in the interest of the great majority of our people. I have nothing further to say except this: I should feel I was remiss in my duty did I not oppose the resolution which has been brought forward to-day for the purpose of re-enacting the daylight saving measure.

The House divided on the amendment to the amendment of Mr. Mackie (Edmonton) which was agreed to on the following division:

YEAS.

Messrs.

Anderson,	Knox,
Andrews,	Lalor,
Argue,	Lanctôt,
Armstrong (York),	Lang,
Arthurs,	Leger,
Ball,	Loggie,
Béland,	Long,
Best,	Mackie (Edmonton),
Blair,	Mackie (Renfrew),
Blake,	McCoig,
Bolton,	McGregor,
Bowman,	McIsaac,
Boyce,	McKenzie,
Brien,	McLean (Royal),
Calder,	McMaster,
Campbell,	Manion,
Cannon,	Marshall,
Carvell,	Michaud,
Casselman,	Middlebro,
Charlton,	Molloy,
Charters,	Morphy,
Clark (Red Deer),	Munson,
Clarke (Wellington),	Myers,
Copp,	Nesbitt,
Cowan,	Nicholson (Algoma),
Crerar,	Pardee,
Crothers,	Paul,
Cruise,	Proulx,
d'Anjou,	Read (Prince, P.E.I.),
Davis,	Reid (Grenville),
Déchêne,	Reid (Mackenzie),
Demers,	Richardson,
Denis,	Robb,
Desaulniers,	Ross,
Douglas (Strathcona),	Rowell,
Duff,	Seguin,
Edwards,	Sexsmith,
Fafard,	Shaw,
Finley,	Smith,
Fontaine,	Steele,
Fortier,	Sutherland,
Gauvreau,	Thompson (Weyburn),
Glass,	Thompson (Hastings),
Guthrie,	Thomson (Qu'Appelle),
Harold,	Truax,
Harrison,	Tweedie,
Hartt,	Wallace,
Hay,	Whidden,
Henders,	White (Victoria),
Hughes (Sir Sam),	White (Sir Thomas),
Hunt,	Wilson (Saskatoon),
Johnston,	Wright.—105.
Kay,	

NAYS.

Messrs.

Archambault,	Lapointe (St. James),
Boivin,	Lavigueur,
Bourassa,	Leduc,
Boyer,	Lemieux,
Brouillard,	Lesage,
Burrell,	Maclean (Halifax),
Cahill,	McCrea,
Cardin,	McQuarrie,
Casgrain,	Marcile (Bagot),
Cooper,	Martin,
Crowe,	Mewburn,
Delisle,	Mowat,
Deslauriers,	Pacaud,
Douglas (Cape Breton S and Rich.),	Papineau,
	Parent,
DuTremblay,	Pedlow,
Elkin,	Pelletier,
Fielding,	Power,
Foster (York),	Prevost,
Fournier,	Savard,
Fripp,	Sinclair (Queens, P.E.I.),
Gervais,	
Green,	Stevens,
Hocken,	Stewart (Hamilton),
Jacobs,	Tobin,
Lapointe (Kamouraska),	Wigmore.—50.

Main motion as amended agreed to.

Mr. SPEAKER: The House seems to be in more or less in doubt as to the question. It is largely technical. By adopting the amendment to the amendment a certain expression has been adopted, and that stands as a portion of the question. Technically speaking a portion of the original question still remains, and in order to have it intelligible, to say the least, it ought to be passed, hence the necessity for putting the motion as amended.

On the motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 11.35 p.m.

Friday, March 28, 1919.

The House met at three o'clock.

REPORTS AND PAPERS.

Report of the Auditor General for the year ended March 31st, 1918, volume 1—Sir Thomas White.

Summary Report of the Geological Survey (Department of Mines) for the calendar year 1917—Hon. Mr. Maclean.

THE PEACE CONFERENCE.

CABLE FROM SIR ROBERT BORDEN THAT GERMANY MUST PAY CANADA FULLEST INDEMNITY POSSIBLE.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, recently there appeared in the Canadian press a despatch from

London attributing to the Prime Minister, Sir Robert Borden, the view that no indemnities should be sought from Germany. I took the liberty of bringing the matter to the attention of the Prime Minister, and I have received from him to-day the following cable:

Paris, March 27, 1919.

Acting Prime Minister,
Ottawa.

Report alluded to is absolutely unfounded and indeed absurd. You are authorized to give absolute and explicit denial to any such statement. We are making every effort to procure from Germany the fullest indemnity that she is able to pay. Borden.

LANDING OF TRANSATLANTIC MAILS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Privy Council): The hon. member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux) yesterday asked if Halifax had been substituted for Rimouski as the port for the landing of the Transatlantic mails, and I promised to make inquiry and reply to the question to-day. I have to say that Halifax has not been substituted for Rimouski, nor is any such change in contemplation.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): Hear, hear.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: The situation is this: Owing to the interruption of Transatlantic traffic, due to the war, there is no regular line of ships now carrying the Canadian mails. Hence the Post Office Department must make arrangements with whatever vessels are available, and as the majority of these vessels are carrying troops and come under orders with respect to the landing of those troops, the mails are necessarily landed at the port where the disembarkation of troops takes place. There is no intention of changing the permanent policy which has been followed.

WEDNESDAY EVENING SITTINGS OF THE HOUSE.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. CHARLES MURPHY (Russell): In years past it has been the custom of the Government, after the first five or six weeks of the session, to introduce a motion changing the hours of meeting on Wednesdays and making them correspond to the hours of meeting on the other days of the week. Is it the intention of the Government to introduce such a motion applicable to next Wednesday, or the Wednesday following?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government will introduce such a motion later on in the session, but I think not before Wednesday, the 16th April. That is to say, I think next Wednesday night will be free and the Wednesday night following. I hope that arrangement will meet with the approval of the House.

OIL-BEARING LANDS—THE SHELL COMPANY.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX: I have seen the statement lately in the press that a company known as The Shell Transport and Trading Company has an application before the Government to acquire a monopoly of oil-bearing lands in Western Canada. I would like to know if that statement is true, and if so whether the Government will furnish some details with respect to it.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): The company in question has had an application before the Department of the Interior for some time, but it has received no favourable consideration.

DAYLIGHT SAVING—RAILWAY TIME.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): In view of the statements appearing in the press concerning an order supposed to be issued by the Railway War Board, or some railway organization, that the railway clocks are to be set forward on next Monday morning, might I ask the Government if the difficulty will not be met by the railways changing their time-tables instead of making a change of the kind proposed?

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): The Railway War Board is composed of the heads of the several railways, and they arrange the manner in which the operation of the railways will take place.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Cannot the railways arrange their time-tables without interfering with the clocks?

Hon. Mr. REID: They arrange the time-tables, and if there should be any dissatisfaction with any arrangements which the board may make in connection with the operation of any of the railways, the Board of Railway Commissioners, of course, will deal with the matter in the regular way.

DOMINION LANDS SURVEYS ACT AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN, Bill No. 10, to amend the Dominion Lands Surveys Act, was read a second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On section 1—Examination for admission as articled pupil.

Mr. ROSS: What change does this section make in the present law?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN: The subject of solid geometry is transferred from the final examination, where it was under the Act of 1908, and made applicable to the preliminary examination. Physics is a new subject.

Section agreed to.

On section 3—Examination for commission as a surveyor.

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN (Minister of the Interior): The subjects that are added by this section to the old curriculum are:

Analytical geometry and calculus; levelling, location and construction of roads, principles of irrigation, investigation and calculation of water powers; elementary geology and mineralogy, prairie and forest flora of Western Canada.

This is to bring the standard up to that of other countries for the final examination.

Sir SAM HUGHES: The whole tenor of the Bill seems to do away with the possibility of having any one become a Dominion land surveyor who has not passed this technical examination.

Mr. MEIGHEN: Yes.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it not a fact that a great many of the best engineers in the service are men who started in as chain men and worked up year by year, Why run to examinations? The tendency of all modern civilization is to get away from examinations. Examinations breed narrow men, not practical men. We have had a good many illustrations of that in every department of the public service. Not that I object to a man being master of these subjects—he might be a very good man in spite of them, but we have a lot of extraordinary good men without any of these examinations.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is no doubt true that competent surveyors may be produced, and have been produced, without a knowledge of the mathematical subjects that are defined here; but when one is establishing a standard, examinations are necessary; and when examinations are necessary subjects for those examinations are necessary; and it is only a question of what should be included. It is quite impossible to technically qualify men and not have examinations. If it were not so there would be no qualifications required for any profession. A man might become a very good doctor or a very good lawyer and not pass any examinations; but that would not be a very safe system to adopt for qualifying men for entrance to those professions. The same argument applies here. Consequently the purpose is to include not only the practical training and experience which the Act also provides for, but in addition technical qualification in the subjects which every Dominion land surveyor should understand. This simply brings the list of these subjects up to the standard adopted by every other country, and a survey of the included subjects would indicate to me that they would be very appropriate matters indeed upon which candidates for the profession of Dominion land surveyor should be examined.

Mr. SHEARD: I would like to ask the hon. minister, what is the value of astronomy in surveying? It is a very wide and extensive subject—almost inexhaustible if it is fully gone into, and it seems to me to be quite unnecessary. Then, we have prairie and forest flora of Western Canada. That practically embraces a study of botany, which, in order to be any way thorough to meet a proper examination as a separate subject, would take at least a year's time to acquire. To my mind, these subjects are more or less impracticable for one who is to undertake the duties of an ordinary land surveyor. I would like to get from the minister good and specific reasons why these two subjects are included.

Mr. MEIGHEN: It is an actual fact that the outlines in surveying work are now laid by astronomical calculation. In subdivision work that applies as well. Indeed, in much of our surveying the geodetic points are fixed by astronomical calculation. Astronomy is undoubtedly a most pertinent subject in the necessary curriculum of surveyors. As to the flora of Western Canada, a man might certainly become a perfect surveyor as far as it would appear to me at least, without a knowledge of that subject; but in the work of surveying in the Dominion Land Surveys Branch we require a report on the character of the land and of the plant life over which the survey extends. This is the cheapest and

most convenient way in which we can get it, and while I do not suppose it is intended to ask a candidate in surveying anything in the nature of a scientific botanical knowledge of the flora of Western Canada, still he ought to know generally how to describe in his report for the records of the department the plant life which he encounters in his surveying work.

An hon. MEMBER: How does this affect the old surveyors who have been in the employ of the Government for a number of years?

Mr. MEIGHEN: It does not affect them at all.

Section agreed to.

On section 6—Surveying by contract or tender.

Mr. MEIGHEN: The purpose of this amendment is to enable the day system to be used, instead of making it compulsory to use the contract system. The contract system was abandoned in the United States in 1910 with good results.

Mr. McKENZIE: What does the minister mean by the contract system as compared with the day system?

Mr. MEIGHEN: If a certain area is to be surveyed and subdivided, under the contract system that work would be given out by contract, instead of men being employed under the department to do it by day labour.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I do not find in this Bill anything covering those who are Dominion land surveyors under the present Act. Are their rights protected?

Mr. MEIGHEN: Their rights remain intact.

Sir SAM HUGHES: There is nothing in this Bill in regard to them.

Mr. MEIGHEN: A section would have to be inserted in this Bill, in order to affect them. As long as they are not mentioned, their rights are left as they were.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

BANKRUPTCY ACT.

Hon. HUGH GUTHRIE (Solicitor General) moved the second reading of Bill No. 18, respecting bankruptcy.

He said: In moving the second reading of this Bill, perhaps it would be well if I were to give to the House a brief explanation of some of the main provisions of the proposed measure. The subject of bankruptcy and insolvency has not been dealt with by the Parliament of Canada since 1880. As the House is aware, under section 91 of the British North America Act, the question of bankruptcy and insolvency is one of the questions which was left to the jurisdiction of the Dominion of Canada. In 1875, this Parliament passed a Bankruptcy Act, and after two amendments in subsequent years, that Act was finally repealed in 1880, so that for the last thirty-nine years we have had no bankruptcy law in the Dominion of Canada. It seems rather surprising that we should not have had one, because, with the exception of China and Canada, almost every country in the world has bankruptcy laws. Great Britain has a bankruptcy law, and every British Dominion save Canada has one. The operation of the Bankruptcy Act in this country between the years 1875 and 1880 was not regarded as a marked success, and it was urged that the machinery provided was much too cumbersome; that delays in the administration of the Act were very great and tedious; that the whole administration of the Act was expensive, and that too great liberty was permitted to fraudulent debtors to obtain special privileges. The result was that the Act gradually fell into disfavour and was finally repealed in 1880.

It has been thought proper that another effort should be made to pass an Act having general application throughout the Dominion of Canada. During the interval between the year 1880 and the present time, many of our provincial legislatures attempted something in the nature of bankruptcy or insolvency legislation. It was at one time doubted whether they had power to pass any legislation in regard to bankruptcy and insolvency, but that question was set at rest by a judgment of the judicial committee of the Privy Council in 1894. The province of Ontario, it may be remembered, undertook to pass an Act in respect of assignments and preferences by insolvent persons; the jurisdiction of that province to pass such an Act was questioned by the Federal authorities and a case followed which went to the judicial committee of the Privy Council. That judicial body held that Ontario was within its jurisdiction in passing that enactment. The ground of that decision was briefly this:

That the provisions of section 9 of Ontario "Act respecting assignments and preferences by

insolvent persons" which relate to assignments purely voluntary, and postpone thereto judgments and executions not completely executed by payment, are merely ancillary to bankruptcy law, and as such are within the competence of the provincial legislature so long as they do not conflict with any existing bankruptcy legislation of the Dominion Parliament.

That decision simply meant that so long as there was no Dominion bankruptcy or insolvency Act in force the provincial legislatures might, by reason of the ancillary jurisdiction which they possessed, pass laws which, while strictly speaking, not bankruptcy or insolvency Acts, related generally to that subject. For instance, while provincial legislatures might provide for the abolition of preferences among creditors, they could not compel a debtor to go into bankruptcy or provide for a discharge to the honest debtor. The provincial powers were exceedingly limited. Only this Parliament can pass a bankruptcy law which will have uniform force and effect throughout the Dominion. One difficulty in the way is the fact that there are so many legislative jurisdictions in this country. In Great Britain, the Bankruptcy Act is a comparatively simple thing, there being but one central legislative authority for the United Kingdom. But in Canada there is the Dominion Parliament, as well as nine provincial legislatures, and during the last forty years all the provincial legislatures have made some attempt to pass laws approximating very nearly to bankruptcy and insolvency laws. The effect of the passage of this measure by this Parliament will be to abrogate and annul the existing provincial laws upon bankruptcy and insolvency.

There is another difficulty in our way. In eight of the provinces of the Dominion the basic principle which has been adopted is the English common law, while in the province of Quebec the basic principle is the civil law, and a considerable distinction exists between the two. In the drafting of the present Bill an effort has been made to unify, as far as possible, the laws of the various provinces. The object of the Bill is to give uniformity in all commercial matters pertaining to bankruptcy, to the extent of abolishing all preferences or priorities as between creditors, and allowing all creditors to share equally in the estate of an insolvent debtor.

In the next place, the object is to provide an expeditious means of administering an insolvent estate, and at the same time to render that administration as inexpensive as possible. In the third place, and this is one of the main objects of the Bill, provision is made for the honest insolvent

[Mr. Guthrie.]

receiving, under certain conditions, an absolute discharge from further obligations; that is, the man who has fairly and fully disclosed his business dealings and handed over his assets to the trustee.

This Bill was before the House last session, but not exactly in its present form. Last year, it was referred to a special committee, which held twenty-five prolonged meetings and examined very carefully the provisions of the Bill. The Bill was reported to the House, but the session was then so far advanced that it was impossible to give it any further attention before prorogation. During the interval certain changes and amendments have been proposed to the Bill as it was reported from the committee last year. While there are a great many changes in the present Bill, with the exception of one or two the amendments are not in any sense radical. The object has been to follow as closely as possible the phraseology of the English Act, although that has not been possible in many of the sections. Most of the changes that have been made are changes in phraseology.

One radical change, however, has been made. The Bill presented last year applied to all persons, firms and corporations doing business in Canada, with the exception of farmers and wage-earners earning not more than $1,500 a year; but the compulsory clauses of the Bill did not apply to corporations. The present Bill has been changed in that respect, making all corporations subject to its provisions. The various clauses of the Winding-up Acts in our Canadian statutes have been incorporated in the present measure, so that this Bill, if it become law, will apply to all persons, firms and corporations except banks, railway companies, trust companies, and insurance companies, which are governed by special Acts, and to all persons except farmers and wage-earners earning less than $1,500 a year. Farmers may take advantage of the Act, but they cannot be forced into bankruptcy against their own wishes. If they desire the benefits of the Act they can receive them by making an assignment. The Bill, of course, is somewhat complicated, and contains a vast number of provisions which are more or less technical.

The machinery for administering the Act is to be the Superior Courts of the provinces. The Bill does not seek to establish any new court for the administration of the bankruptcy laws. It has been suggested that a bankruptcy court might give greater uniformity, but this would involve

a very large increase in the judiciary of Canada.

Mr. PROULX: Have the county courts jurisdiction in bankruptcy?

Mr. GUTHRIE: Not under this Bill. I assume that the principle of the Bill will receive the approval of the House, and I think that when the Bill itself comes under discussion in detail, many useful suggestions will be made. The Government do not for a moment consider that the measure is a perfect one, but it is as nearly perfect as they have been able, after a great deal of effort, to make it, and they will gladly accept any useful suggestions that may be made by way of amendment, as we carefully consider the Bill section by section. If the Bill is permitted to have its second reading, when it reaches the Committee stage every facility will be given the House for the fullest possible discussion in order to remedy any imperfections that may exist in the various complicated sections. The Bill also applies to the Yukon Territory, and the District Court of the Yukon is the tribunal specified there.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (North Cape Breton): At this stage I have very little to say regarding the Bill, as it is only within the last two or three minutes that it has been distributed and hon. members have not had an opportunity of studying its provisions. I have carefully followed the explanation made by the hon. Solicitor General (Mr. Guthrie), and I agree with him that a bankruptcy law for Canada should be very useful. It is no doubt a necessary piece of legislation. Not having had opportunity to examine the Bill, I have nothing further to say at present; but I might suggest to the hon. Solicitor General that perhaps it might be well not to press it in Committee to-day, as hon. members, not being familiar with its terms, are not in a position to offer proper criticism.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read a second time.

FISHERIES ACT, 1914, AMENDMENT—BRITISH COLUMBIA LICENSES.

On motion of Hon. Mr. MACLEAN (Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries), the House went into Committee on the following proposed resolution.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

That it is expedient to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914, by providing that the annual fee for a license to operate a salmon cannery or salmon curing establishment in British Columbia for commercial purposes shall be five hundred dollars, and in addition, four cents for each case of forty-eight one-pound cans, or the equivalent thereto, of sockeye salmon, and three cents for each case of forty-eight one-pound cans, or the equivalent thereto, of any other species of salmon, including Steel Head (salmo rivularis) packed in such cannery during the continuance in force of the license; and the said five hundred dollars shall be paid before the license is issued, and the remainder of the license fee shall be paid as the minister may from time to time by regulation prescribe.

He said: The resolution is self-explanatory, namely that it is the intention to increase the annual license fee for canneries to $500.

Mr. McKENZIE: Increased from what amount?

Mr. MACLEAN: Some two or three years ago this matter, together with many others incident to the salmon fisheries of British Columbia, was the subject of an inquiry by a commission, one of the recommendations of which was that the salmon cannery license fee should be $1,000. The present license fee is $100. It was not deemed advisable to make the license fee $1,000, but rather to increase it to $500. The proposal seems to be approved by all interested parties in British Columbia, so far as I have been able to ascertain. There was some opposition to it, of course, but inasmuch as the salmon fisheries of British Columbia are regarded as a monopoly it is generally considered but fair that the amount of the license should be $500. When I say that the salmon fisheries of British Columbia are in the nature of a monopoly, I mean that those who are interested in the business carry it on by virtue of a license. A license is issued for the various contrivances that are used to catch fish, and the canneries must also have a license. It is conceded that it would not be in the interests of the industry to allow every one to catch or can fish, and inasmuch as those who are permitted to engage in the industry do so by virtue of a license, their business is to that extent a monopoly. It is therefore deemed proper by the department that those who enjoy the privilege should pay more for it than they do at present.

Mr. ROSS: Can any one pay a license?

Mr. MACLEAN: Oh no, they are limited in number according to locality. It is always desirable to license but a limited number of fishermen or canneries in any district. Some districts will stand more fishermen and canneries than others, according to the quantity of fish that periodically visit those waters. It is a matter of much dispute in British Colum-

bia as to the number of canneries and fishermen that should be licensed, but the consensus of opinion is that there should be some limitation. Every one who desires a license, or applies for one, cannot get it and in that respect the officers of the department responsible for the administration of the law must do the best they can and give licenses to those whom they believe, to deserve them most. It is also believed that this increase in the license to $500 will meet the expenditure made by the Department of Marine and Fisheries in connection with the administration of the salmon fisheries of British Columbia. To-day it costs more than $200,000 to administer the fisheries in that province. It is thought that this increased license will yield a revenue considerably above that amount and it is hoped that the department will be able to do more to encourage the fisheries of British Columbia and also to expend more money in the administration of the law. It is my intention at the proper stage to send this Bill to the Fisheries Committee.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I do not profess to know very much about the fisheries of British Columbia but it would appear to me that it will only be strengthening the monopoly to make the license fee as large as $500. The same question arose in Eastern Canada in regard to the lobster fisheries. It was contended by the packers that it would be a good thing to have a limited number of canneries because there were not enough fish to supply a large number of canneries. It is the same argument that is used in British Columbia. That was always resisted by the people in Eastern Canada who wished the industry to be thrown open to any man who could erect a factory and equip it. It was felt that he should be allowed to do so; otherwise the business is bound to fall into
4 p.m. the hands of a few people who will put up the prices on the consumer. If we charge $500 for a license to catch salmon I assume that the man who packs salmon will get that money out of the consumer. We are also charging four cents a case on the fish packed and that will represent a very large sum of money payable by the packers of British Columbia. These packers will turn this account over to the people who consume the fish and we are assisting them in making the price of the salmon higher than it otherwise would be. What do we get for it? It strikes me that we do not get anything while we are making it possible for the few people who are engaged in packing salmon to create a monopoly. What do the public get out of this? The minister has not told us any benefit that is coming to the public from this change. I can easily see that it will be an advantage to the packer. I am not interested in the packer. I am interested in the people who consume the salmon. I would like the minister to explain, if there is any explanation, how this change that we are now asked to make in the law will in any sense benefit the consumer.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It might perhaps be difficult to answer directly the question which my hon. friend from Guysborough has put to me. As I stated before, it is impossible to administer the salmon fisheries of British Columbia without the granting to a limited number of people only the right to fish and to can salmon. That is conceded; nobody, as far as I am advised, will question that statement. It is not questioned by the citizens of British Columbia or by the fishermen of that province. It is conceded universally, I think, that the fisheries must be administered by a system of licenses. It is disputable, of course, whether in any given water any given number of licenses should be issued. Every day there are applications from fishing sections in British Columbia for licenses to fish and can salmon, but they can not be granted. That is conceded, even by those who apply for them, and who are very frequently refused licenses.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What is the reason that they cannot be granted?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Because of the nature of the salmon fisheries. They would be very rapidly destroyed if the fish were caught in too great quantities in any one season. I do not intend to go into the history of this particular species of fish this afternoon. I think that had better be reserved for the special committee or in Committee of the Whole House, but there are several reasons why this particular fishery must be protected. The salmon of British Columbia breed in the headwaters of the lakes and streams of the province. They then proceed when young to the sea. They return after two or three years to the place from whence they came and in proceeding back they are caught or proceed to their spawning grounds where they die. As a matter of fact but few return to the sea because they die on the return to the breeding ground if they

are not caught by the fisherman. It is necessary that not all the fish proceeding to the place whence they originally came be caught; otherwise they would be extinguished. My hon. friend opposite seems to think that an increase in the license fee will be a disadvantage to the consumer. I do not think that is correct, inasmuch as if the persons licensed to catch or can salmon have a monopoly it is only proper that they return a part of the profit to the Government. That is the principle of the resolution.

Mr. CAHILL: Will they not be allowed to increase the price to the consumer to the extent of the extra charge for the license?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not know. My hon. friend might as well put that question to me concerning any other commodity that is offered for sale.

Mr. CAHILL: We are not making a monopoly in any other commodity.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The salmon catch of British Columbia is marketed the world over. The greater proportion of the catch is marketed not in Canada but in Great Britain. I do not think that the additional fee proposed under this resolution will increase the price at all. But it is felt, and very properly so, in British Columbia, that they who have this privilege conferred upon them by a license from a department of the Government should pay a tax to the country, and that is one of the reasons for this proposed increase in the fee.

Some hon. gentlemen may object to the fee of $500 as being too small and they might do so with very good reason. However, the judgment of the officers of the department is that, for the time being at least, $500 is sufficient. It is to be understood that that is not the only tax the canners must pay. Hon. gentlemen will see by the terms of the resolution that they will also be obliged to pay four cents for each case of forty-eight one-pound cans, or the equivalent thereto, of Sockeye salmon, and three cents for each case of forty-eight one-pound cans, or the equivalent thereto, of any other species of salmon, including Steel Heads, packed in such cannery during the continuance in force of the license. That provision has always been in the statutes.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the weight mentioned there the lobster pound or the salmon pound?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Exactly the same condition prevails in British Columbia in respect to the content of the salmon can as obtains in the Maritime Provinces in regard to the content of the lobster can.

Mr. DUFF: I would like the minister to give us a little information as to how these licenses are granted. It seems to me that the argument which he advanced as to the likelihood of the extermination of salmon if more licenses are granted is altogether different from what can be urged with respect to other species of fish. I do not presume to know very much about salmon fishing in British Columbia, but I cannot agree with the hon. gentleman when he says that the salmon which go up the river one year to spawn will all be exterminated. The minister does not seem to realize that the salmon spawn before or after, going up the river, and while perhaps the old fish may be caught that year, millions of spawn have been deposited on the banks of the river which in the following year will grow into salmon, and consequently are ready to be caught the following year, or in years afterwards. I would also like the minister to state why these license fees have been increased from $100 to $500? If the fishermen have asked for that increase I think it is good legislation, but if it has been made at the demand of the canners, who wish to prevent other people from going into the business, I do not think it can be so designated. I have had a little experience in connection with our fisheries, and I think that every fisherman who wants to catch salmon should be allowed to do so. Then I would draw attention to the matter of the weight of the cans. The resolution states that there shall be an additional fee of four cents—speaking of Sockeye salmon—for each case of forty-eight one-pound cans. Now if the minister wants to make this resolution harmonize with that which he previously introduced in regard to lobsters, he must provide that the can shall contain sixteen ounces, or else change the resolution to read that the fee shall be four cents for each case of forty-eight twelve-ounce cans, each case of forty-eight thirteen-ounce cans, and so on, specifying the weight of the can from one ounce up.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): In regard to the last point raised by the hon. gentleman, I would say that it is proposed to introduce legislation this session compelling all manufacturers of food supplies to expose upon the containers the exact contents of each can, which legislation will apply in this case. As a matter of fact, the British Columbia salmon can to-day,

while called a pound can, does not contain sixteen ounces of salmon meat.

Mr. DUFF: It seems to me the hon. gentleman should change the resolution, because it specifically refers to one-pound cans, and one pound certainly means sixteen ounces.

Mr. MACLEAN: That will be provided for in another Bill.

Resolution reported, read the first and second time and concurred in.

Mr. MACLEAN thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 39, to amend the Fisheries Act, 1914, founded on the resolution.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

RAILWAY ACT CONSOLIDATION AND AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways) Bill No. 19 (Letter A of the Senate) to consolidate and amend the Railway Act, was read the second time.

Hon. Mr. REID: As this Bill is a very lengthy one, and there are a number of persons that desire to be heard with reference to some of its clauses, I would move, with the consent of the House, that it be referred to a special committee composed of: Messrs. Armstrong (Lambton), Carvell, Reid (Grenville), Green, McCurdy, Nesbitt, Mowat, Tweedie, Wallace, Morphy, Reid (MacKenzie), Davidson, Mackie (Renfrew), Allan, Boys, Crothers, Stevens, Lemieux, Murphy, Sinclair (Antigonish and Guysborough), Kennedy, Cahill, Ross, Casgrain, Copp, Demers and Molloy, with power to report from time to time, and that Rule No. 11 be suspended in relation thereto.

Mr. SPEAKER: As no notice has been given of this motion it can only be accepted with the unanimous consent of the House.

Motion agreed to.

AID TOWARDS ELIMINATING LEVEL CROSSINGS.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid, Bill No. 29, to amend the Railway Act (Aid for Railway Crossings) was read a second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair.

On Section 1—Grant continued for ten years.

Mr. REID: This extends the time so as to allow the Board of Railway Commissioners to pay a portion of the cost of removal of dangerous crossings for another ten years.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysboro): Does it apply to the Government railways?

Mr. REID: No, I intend bringing in a Bill later on to cover all the Government owned railways.

Mr. SINCLAIR: What does it apply to?

Mr. REID: All railways under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Does it apply to the Canadian Northern?

Mr. REID: Oh, yes, to every Dominion incorporated railway. The sums expended from this fund from 1909 to 1919, do not appear to be very large. They are:

1909-1910, $70,00; 1910-1911, $69,109.18; 1911-1912, $7,643.14; 1912-1913, $20,807.38; 1913-1914, $39,968.11; 1914-1915, $92,099.48; 1915-1916, $47,079.99; 1916-1917, $46,630.53; 1917-1918, $13,740.85; 1918-1919 (to March 12th), $2,336.85.

We have not used a very large amount out of the fund voted each year, but we thought it was as well to continue the provision pending the enactment of the new Railway Bill.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It would appear from the minister's statement that this Act is of no service to those parts of Canada served by the Government railways. On the Intercolonial Railway there are a great number of dangerous crossings, but so far as I know nothing has been done towards eliminating them. The hon. minister says that the Government railways may be brought under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners, and in that case I suppose the same law will apply as to other railways, but at the present time it is unsatisfactory. If that condition of affairs is going to continue, I would like the hon. minister to consider whether some arrangement could not be made by which the Government itself would take steps to eliminate these dangerous crossings, or unite with the municipalities in doing so.

Mr. REID: There is no doubt that the Government railways in the lower provinces will be under the jurisdiction of the Board of Railway Commissioners within a very short time, and of course this provision will apply there as well as to any other part of Canada. I have been over the Intercolonial, and I know there are some very dangerous crossings, but I sup-

pose the same condition applies to other railways. The difference is that in most of those cases on the Intercolonial they were urging the Government probably to do a greater proportion of the work than this section would cover. Under this section the railway, the municipality, and the Government each contribute a certain proportion of the cost of protection.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): How many people were killed last year at these dangerous crossings?

Mr. REID: I have not that information.

Mr. NESBITT: I think the new Railway Bill as it left the Commons last session had a clause in it, with the consent of the then and the present Minister of Railways, placing the Government railways under the jurisdiction of the Railway Commission.

Mr. REID: That is so.

Mr. DUFF: Do the Board of Railway Commissioners order the replacement of dangerous level crossings by overhead crossings, or simply the protection of level crossings?

Mr. REID: It is for the Board of Railway Commissioners to decide whether the removal shall be by subway or overhead.

Mr. McKENZIE: A certain amount of money is paid out of the public exchequer to the agency that is constructing this work, because it is not Government work, and the aggregate amounts to a considerable sum of money. It would be well for the House and the Committee to know under what system the parties to these crossings are entitled to get a contribution from the Treasury.

Mr. REID: The procedure and control, as I understand it, is that if there is on any railway a dangerous crossing to which this legislation will apply, an application is made to the Board of Railway Commissioners to investigate and report, and their decision as to whether that crossing should be removed and the expense incurred, is final. After that decision, the parties appear before the board and an agreement is arrived at as to what proportion will be borne by the railway, the municipality and the Government. The board may decide that fifty per cent of the cost will be borne by the railway, thirty per cent by the municipality and twenty per cent by the board. When the accounts are submitted by the railway company, whose duty it is to remove the crossing, the board will investigate the accounts and if they approve the accounts they will authorize the payment.

Mr. McKENZIE: The department pays out the money on the order of the Board of Railway Commissioners?

Mr. REID: Yes.

Mr. VIEN: Why do we not make the extension for two years instead of ten, so that in two years, when our railway policy is more clearly determined, we may decide what should be done?

Mr. REID: If the new Consolidated Railway Bill is passed, it will probably supersede this Bill. The former Act was for ten years, and I prefer renewing the former Act as it stood.

Mr. VIEN: I object to giving this authorization for ten years, and I am going to move that the word "two" be substituted for the word "ten." If the Consolidated Railway Bill supersedes this, the change will not cause any great inconvenience to the Government. On the other hand, if the Consolidated Railway Bill does not supersede this, when that Bill is being discussed in committee, the same objection will probably be raised. I move, seconded by Mr. Duff:

That the word "ten" be replaced by the word "two" in the sixth line of section 1 of this Bill.

Mr. NESBITT: If the new Consolidated Railway Bill supersedes this one there will be in it a clause cancelling this measure. If the new Consolidated Railway Bill does not supersede this one, and nothing else interferes, no better legislation could pass through the House than this to assist in doing away with level crossings. I see no reason why we should not continue this legislation for ten, or even twenty years.

Mr. VIEN: We are now taking control of the Grand Trunk Pacific, and if we can judge from the announcements of the Government to the House we are also going to take control of the Grand Trunk. When this is done there will be in Canada only two railway systems, the Canadian Government Railways and the Canadian Pacific Railway, neither of which require this aid to carry out the changes in dangerous railway crossings. Surely the Canadian Pacific Railway Company are able to do this work without the help of the Government, and so far as the Canadian Government Railways are concerned, this means simply transferring the money from one department to another. It may be advisable for the next two years to retain this item in the Estimates and to vote it, because we have not as yet taken over the control of the Grand Trunk Pacific

and the Grand Trunk, but I do not see why we should give this authorization for ten years. I do not believe it will be required for ten years, and I think we should economize and at the end of two years refrain from expending this sum of $200,000 a year.

Mr. REID: There would not be any difficulty for the hon. member, if he so desires, to ask, at the end of two years, that this legislation be repealed. I think this is a good measure, and even if we take over those two roads, I will press that this law be continued, because I think we should remove these level crossings. If the hon. member's suggestion should prevail, there will be no authority to order that dangerous railway crossings be removed. I would rather that even the full amount of $200,000 a year be paid for ten years if the result will be the saving of lives at these crossings. As a rule, the crossings ordered to be removed are those where life has been lost. This legislation refers only to crossings built prior to 1909, and surely we should give assistance to have them removed wherever it is found necessary that they should be removed. If the new Consolidated Railway Bill supersedes this measure, this difficulty will cease to exist, but we have now been trying for three years to get that Bill passed.

Mr. VIEN: The minister has not answered my arguments at all. He says that in two years, if he thinks it advisable, he will have this law repealed.

Mr. REID: I did not say that. I said that if the hon. member finds after two years that, in his opinion, the Act should be repealed, it will be for him to make a motion to that effect. I do not want this legislation repealed until the end of ten years.

Mr. VIEN: It would be much simpler to make it two years, than make it ten, and repeal the Act after the end of the two years. The minister has not answered my other arguments at all. I am strongly in favour of dangerous crossings being done away with, but I contend that the expense in connection therewith should be borne by the railway companies and by the municipalities concerned, not by the public. It would be very easy when the Railway Act comes up for consideration so to amend it as to give authority to the Board of Railway Commissioners to order any changes that are required to make dangerous crossings safe, the expense to be borne by the municipalities and the railway companies, whether it be the Canadian National Railways or the Canadian Pacific. It is not a question of not removing the danger; the question is, who shall bear the expense of removing it? I think the railway companies can well afford to pay the expense of making these crossings safe, and they are the ones who should be made to pay, together with the municipality concerned.

Amendment negatived.

Section agreed to.

Bill reported.

COMPENSATION TO GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES WHO ARE KILLED OR INJURED.

On the motion of Hon. J. D. Reid (Minister of Railways and Canals) Bill No. 30, to amend an Act to provide compensation where employees of His Majesty are killed or suffer injuries while performing their duties, was read the second time, and the House went into Committee thereon, Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

On section 1—Compensation payable out of Consolidated Revenue Fund as may be authorized:

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): When the resolution was under discussion, I suggested that the Provident Fund be devoted exclusively to pensions for retired employees of the road. I should like to hear from the minister with regard to that. Another point I made was that a certain class of employees on the Government railways does not appear to be provided for under this Act. If that is so, it is an important omission. The Act provides for all those who are employees according to the terms of the Provident Fund. Is it true that a certain class of employees on the Government railways are not provided for in this Act?

Mr. REID: All permanent employees of the Government railways are supposed to be members of the Provident Fund, and all employees, whether permanent or temporary, come under either the Compensation Act or the Provident Fund.

Mr. GAUVREAU: Even temporary employees?

Mr. REID: Yes, they come under one or the other.

In order to change the present Provident Fund Act the employees would have to approve of such change for the reason that they are subscribers to that fund. The largest part of it is subscribed by the members of that organization, and the Government could not undertake any change with-

out their consent. The present proposed changes are the result of a careful investigation of the whole matter by the solicitor of the Government railways, who has discussed the situation with the principals of the different organizations that subscribe to the Provident Fund. The employees of the Government railways have several organizations. They are union men, and the conductors, the engine drivers, the brakesmen, and others all have separate societies. In order that I might satisfy the House that this Bill, in the form in which it is, had received the approval of the employees, I brought into the House some days ago a memorandum signed by the heads of these different organizations in which there was a request that this legislation should be enacted. A number of employees who are superannuated and who availed themselves of this fund several years ago consider that the pension they are now receiving is far too small under present conditions. This matter has been brought to the attention of the organization, but so far no change has been agreed on. When I brought this matter up in the House a few days ago I expressed the opinion that there was a necessity for some arrangement whereby these different funds or benefits to the employees should be consolidated in one law in order to provide that employees in any part of the country might receive the same benefits as those elsewhere. I have made inquiries concerning the nature of the organization of the Canadian Northern Railway as regards the insurance fund—for this is really an insurance fund—and I find that it is entirely different from the Provident Fund of the Intercolonial Railway. The Grand Trunk Railway employees also have a different system, and if we could bring them all under one organization or under Government ownership a considerable advantage to all would acrue. When the Compensation Bill was discussed last year I stated that I had consulted the members of the Provident Fund who had expressed themselves at that time as being perfectly satisfied with the Bill, and I added that if the Act were found in practice to be unsatisfactory in any respect it could be amended at this session. Now the two main objects of this Bill are these: First, to provide for the payment to each province of its proportion of the cost of operation of the Compensation Act; and, second, in respect of cases in which employees were killed who had not elected, prior to the accident, what fund they would take advantage of. There was no way by which the dependents of such men could obtain the benefits of the Compensation Act or the Provident Fund. Two such cases were called to my attention by the hon. member for Kamouraska, and for that reason I have inserted the clause making it retroactive.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I do not want to be over critical of the Bill because I am heartily in favour of it, but I am still inclined to believe that there is a class of employees in the Government railways who are not provided for at all under this Bill. To say that they are provided for under the existing law is not strictly correct. Under the Provident Fund the only accident for which there is provision is permanent disablement. Am I correct in that statement?

Mr. REID: I do not think so.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): There is no provision in the Provident Fund Act for a man temporarily disabled. If a man loses a finger or has his leg broken, there is no provision for him under the Provident Fund which, as I understand it, provides for old age pensions and men permanently disabled. Men who are permanently incapacitated are put on the same basis as pensioners. That exhausts the Provident Fund. Now we come to this Compensation Bill. The minister tells us that the men who are provided for under this compensation are permanent employees of the railway. I do not think that is very satisfactory. To give an illustration. A man who was working in connection with a steam shovel gets injured while engaged in such work. If he is not a permanent employee of the railway he does not come under the Provident Fund, neither does he come under this fund. If I understood the minister correctly he said that permanent employees—

Mr. REID: What I said was this: Any employee of the Intercolonial or the Government railways, even though he is a labourer and has been at work only a day, if he is employed on the Intercolonial railway at the time of the accident then he comes under the Compensation Act of last session. So that every employee of the Intercolonial railway or the Government railways will come under one Act or the other. I think I have made myself clear. The Provident Fund applies only to permanent employees.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): It is stated in this section what class of people this Act applies to. It will apply to any

one who is employed within the meaning of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway Employees Provident Fund Act. The Minister says that that includes every person working for the Government railways, even a labourer.

Mr. REID: I did not say that.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Well then, this Act does not apply because it specifies those who are employed within the meaning of the Intercolonial and Prince Edward Island Railway Employees Provident Fund Act.

Mr. REID: That is right.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If the labourer I referred to in my illustration is not an employee in the sense of this Act, then this does not apply to him.

Mr. REID: The Provident Fund Act does not apply.

Mr. SINCLAIR: There is no provision under this Act for any man unless he is a permanent employee.

Mr. REID: The hon. member is quite right. A temporary employee would not receive any benefits from the Provident Fund. He would receive it under the Compensation Act.

Mr. SINCLAIR: If so that is quite satisfactory to me.

Mr. JACOBS: When the Act of 1918 was passed I raised an objection to the restriction which was inserted in the Bill limiting the responsibility of the Government railway to only one of these funds. The question now comes up again. It is declared in this Bill that the injured party must make election as to which fund he intends to draw from and if he is to draw anything under the Compensation Act he is not entitled to come under the Provident Fund. As the minister has just stated, a very large proportion of this Provident Fund is contributed by the employees themselves. It is nothing more or less than insurance. The employees pay for this. Although there have been clauses inserted in the Provident Fund Acts relating to railway companies, (not under the control of the Dominion) limiting the responsibility of the railways and declaring where a party becomes a member of the provident society he renounces any claim to other damages, the Privy Council has decided that it is absolutely illegal and that the Provident Fund is an insurance fund. The employees pay for participation in that fund and they are entitled to its benefits irrespective of the responsibility of the company under the Compensation Act. Why should the Government attempt to restrict its responsibility to the Compensation Act or to the Provident Fund where the ordinary railways are responsible under both? That is something that the Government has attempted to enact by legislation which is denied to it under the common law. The Grand Trunk Railway Company to-day have a provident fund. It is declared that it is an insurance fund and the question of election or not does not cut any figure. Why will the Government insist upon putting itself in a better position than the ordinary railways of the country? It is quite wrong and the portion of the Bill which declares that the employee must elect which of the funds he is to draw from should be struck out. I would therefore move in amendment that the words:

"Unless he elects to accept prior or subsequent to the injuries such compensation in lieu of the allowance payable under the provisions of the Provident Fund Act, section twelve, Class D, and gives notice in writing of such election."

That the words "unless he elects to accept prior" be struck out.

In that way the employee will be entitled to participate in both funds. One is the Act under which he pays for insurance and the other is the Compensation Act, and which provides for the compensation to which he is entitled.

Mr. McMASTER: Is this Provident Fund composed altogether of contributions from the men, or does the Government also contribute?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The Government pay $100,000 a year towards this fund, and, therefore, if this amendment is carried, the Government will be paying twice. They will be paying the money that they are paying into this Provident Fund and they will also be paying under the Compensation Act.

Mr. McMASTER: I think that a middle ground should be taken in regard to this matter. I think it is quite unjust and unfair to ask a man, in order to avail himself of a right which the law gives him, to waive his right to a fund to which he himself has contributed. It would seem that the proper attitude for the Government would be this: A man, if he is hurt should be entitled to have the proportion of the fund that his subscription would bear to the whole fund. The Government should not be obliged to pay twice, but I think a certain portion of the fund should be given a man as the insurance to which he has contributed and then he ought besides to have the right of

compensation that any other employee has from his employer.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That would put the railway employee in a different position from every other class of employees in the country?

Mr. JACOBS: Because he pays for it?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): He does not pay for it entirely because the Government contributes a certain amount annually. That was done because at that time there was no compensation law applicable to the railway employee.

Mr. McMASTER: I quite accede to the proposition that the Government should not be obliged to pay twice, but it seems to me that a man should not be obliged to give up rights in a fund to which he has contributed in order to get his rights in another fund. There should be some allowance made for the man. He should receive something from the Provident Fund as well as getting the ordinary compensation under the law. You might express it in this way: A man who works for an ordinary employer is hurt. He has been carrying an accident insurance policy. He is entitled to certain payments under that accident insurance policy and he is also entitled to ask his employer to indemnify him for the loss he has suffered under the ordinary law of the land. In this case if the employee has contributed to a provident fund he should be entitled to withdraw a certain amount from that fund, and he should also be able to get compensation under the law of the land. Inasmuch as the insurer has also subscribed to the fund, in the case of the Government, the Government should not be obliged to pay twice, and it would be quite fair when a man is to take his compensation qua employee that he should not be paid full compensation from the Provident Fund. But he should not be obliged to waive all his rights to the Provident Fund in order to avail himself of his rights to compensation as against the Government who happens to be his employer.

Mr. REID: With regard to the Provident Fund and Compensation Act, I have had these matters up with the employees and there has not been any question raised. The employees are satisfied. We have been trying to make the Provident Fund Act and the Compensation Act satisfactory to them. This Bill is all that they have asked for or suggested. I would think

5 p.m. that it would be better to carry out the wishes of the employees. I take the same position to-day that I did last year. Let this Bill go through, see how it works out and if it is found that the employees are not receiving the benefits that they should receive under either of these Acts, I have no hesitation in saying that I will come back again and ask that the Act be amended so that there will be no injustice to any employees and that they may receive all the benefits under these Acts. Then again, I think we will probably have to have a new Act to apply to the whole of the railways. I would not like to interfere with the Provident Fund Act at this particular time without again taking it up with the employees. As I have been trying for some time to make it satisfactory to them and to cover every point they raised, I would not like to amend the Bill now.

Mr. JACOBS: I pointed out to the minister last year that the law is directly against his contention. As to whether the employees are satisfied or not, that is not the question before us to-day. Sometimes the employees of a railway company are perforce obliged to be satisfied, or they may find themselves looking for a job. As I indicated to the minister last year, the decision of the Privy Council was to the effect that money paid out of a Provident Fund is no compensation at all to the employee; it is purely and simply an insurance. Why should this employee be obliged to pay into the Provident Fund, this insurance fund, and afterwards elect as to whether he is going to take the ordinary compensation which is provided for by the common law, or take this insurance for which he pays? Why should he pay a penny for this insurance if he is not going to get anything out of it? He could put his money into his pocket, he could buy two per cent, if he wishes, and fall back on the ordinary compensation law. But here he pays into the Provident Fund and gets nothing. He puts his penny into the slot and takes nothing from it. I say that if you take this money from this man as an insurance you are obliged to pay him the whole, or part of it, irrespective of the compensation to which he is entitled under the common law. As to being satisfied with it, is not a question for this House. This is a question of right and justice.

Mr. REID: I take issue with the hon. gentleman. The House has voted $100,000, and we are putting up that amount each year as insurance under the Compensation Act.

Mr. JACOBS: The men have a right under the law of the land to get it. How much are the men paying into the fund?

Mr. REID: I admit it, but they are not paying one dollar into the compensation fund. They will receive greater benefits under the fund we are subscribing to as an insurance. I have not got the figures here, but I do not think they are paying any more.

Mr. JACOBS: The minister told us a few minutes ago, that a very large percentage of the Provident Fund is paid for by the employees.

Mr. REID: They do pay a large percentage, there is no doubt about it at all. At all events, we are paying $100,000, and if the employees wish to take advantage of the Compensation Act there is no reason why they should not do so. However, I took this matter up with some of the employees and discussed it with them, and they think it is fair; I have never heard one of them complain yet. Now, until the matter is brought up and discussed with the employees and they say they are not satisfied, or until we get an opportunity of enacting a statute that will give the same treatment to an employee in Halifax as to an employee in Vancouver, I am in favour of continuing as we are. I want to do everything I can for the employees.

Mr. JACOBS: Then agree to my amendment.

Mr. REID: Agree to your amendment?

Mr. JACOBS: Yes.

Mr. REID: I will agree to any amendment that the employees and the management of the Government railways will say is fair and just, but so long as the employees themselves have not raised the question and say that the present plan is fair and just, I am going to accept their views and not those of the hon. gentleman.

Mr. MURPHY: When the minister says he has taken the matter up with the employees and discussed it with them, I assume that he is speaking generally. The hon. gentleman, does not, I assume, intend to convey to the committee that he has taken up and discussed with the employees the special clause covered by the amendment of the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs).

Mr. REID: What I have done is what any man would do. I have taken the matter up with representatives of the Provident Fund and with the employees.

Mr. MURPHY: Generally.

Mr. REID: There was a representative here last year, and instead of taking it up with him I asked the solicitor of the department to go into the whole matter of the Provident Fund and deal with it, and then come back with a memorandum saying what the employees wanted, in order that I could assure the House that the employees were satisfied. He came back with this memorandum signed by eight or ten of the heads of the Provident Fund. Until I receive a complaint of some kind or another, some evidence of dissatisfaction, or some complaint such as was brought to my attention by the hon. member for Kamouraska (Mr. E. Lapointe) last year to show that an injustice might be done to employees, I prefer to carry out their wish as they have submitted it to me. If this is so important a matter, why has there not been a complaint made to me by the employees? I have never heard of it from the time the hon. member (Mr. Jacobs) raised the question last year, and the hon. gentleman knows that every word he said then, and every word I said—indeed every word that has been said here to-day—is taken cognizance of by the committees of the Provident Fund. If the employees have any complaints, I am willing to come back to Parliament and apply for legislation to remedy their grievances, and make that legislation retroactive, until such time as the Compensation Act can be introduced. That is what I am trying to carry out, I do not think there could be anything fairer.

Mr. JACOBS: Does the minister wish the House to believe that he took up this question with the employees of the railway, and pointed out to them that this Provident Fund was an insurance, and that they would be entitled to that in any event, under the judgment of the Privy Council, irrespective of the Compensation Act, and did the employees who were interviewed say they were satisfied with one fund and not with the two funds?

Mr. MACLEAN: The Provident Fund is not altogether an insurance scheme, because Section 12 of the Employees' Provident Fund Act provides as follows with respect to Class D:

> Those who are permanently disabled from following their usual occupation in the service as a result of injuries received while on duty and actually at work in the service.

I assume that was to provide a scheme for workmen's compensation for injuries.

Mr. JACOBS: They pay for it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): At the time that Act was adopted I do not think there was in force in any province in Canada a workmen's compensation act providing compensation for injuries. Now there is such legislation in force in every province, but, unfortunately, it is not applicable to the employees of the Government railways. Therefore the Government, in order to put their employees in as favourable a position as the employees in other industries, was obliged to pass the legislation of last year, which is virtually a Federal workmen's compensation act, to take care of those railway employees who are injured in the railway service of the Government. It strikes me, without having given the subject a great deal of consideration, as hardly a fair proposition to say that an employee is entitled to the provisions of practically two workmen's compensation acts.

Mr. JACOBS: That is what the Privy Council decided.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I am not quite satisfied that the point was ever before the Privy Council.

Mr. JACOBS: Look at the case of Miller and the Grand Trunk Railway decided about ten years ago by the Privy Council.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I daresay some matters which involved the Provident Fund Act were before the Privy Council, but I am very doubtful whether the particular point we are discussing was ever before that tribunal.

Mr. JACOBS: I think so.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think it is a matter for Parliament to say whether an employee of the Government railways is entitled to compensation from two separate funds,—that is, to be a beneficiary under the Act of last session and under the Provident Fund Act. I quite agree that he should not lose his rights under the other provisions of the Provident Fund Act. There is something in that contention.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): The case of Miller and the Grand Trunk was an action for damages on behalf of an employee of the Grand Trunk who had been killed, and the Grand Trunk sought to evade its responsibility by pleading that the man was a member of such a fund as the Provident Fund (which has been created for the Government railways); that it was contributing to that fund every year, and that the employee agreed not to sue the company for any damages because of that contribution. The Grand Trunk succeeded before the courts of this country, but the Privy Council decided that the Provident Fund was to be considered as insurance, and that the agreement signed by this employee did not relieve the company from its liability.

Mr. REID: In that case was the man killed?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Yes.

Mr. REID: The Provident Fund does not apply in such a case, and the Compensation Act was brought in for that reason.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): But the Privy Council decided that it was to be considered merely as insurance; that the employee was paying an amount every month to that insurance, and that the company was obliged to pay damages in addition to the amount of the insurance. This is the law in respect to the other railway companies. An employee of the Grand Trunk or the Canadian Pacific is a member of a railway provident fund, and if he is killed in a railway accident, and the company is responsible in damages, he receives the amount provided for by the Provident Fund as well as the compensation.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Might I ask if the Grand Trunk scheme provided for a system of compensation for injuries?

Mr. JACOBS: No; that is the common law.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Was it in anyway analogous to the amounts the Provident Fund provides?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): No, the Grand Trunk was liable under the law of the land.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I assume the Privy Council was perfectly right. All Compensation Acts strictly provide that no employee may contract himself out of his rights under the Act.

Mr. JACOBS: The Government is contracting itself out of its obligations.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think the Railway Employees Provident Fund Act was a step in the right direction, but since that Act was passed all the provinces have enacted Workmen's Compensation Acts. Later the Government of Canada was obliged, as it did last year, to pass legislation of a similar nature to cover its employees. Upon what principle does my hon. friend contend that these employees —in this case railway employees— are en-

titled to compensation from two separate funds?

Mr. JACOBS: One is compensation and the other is insurance.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think it would be unfair to those who contribute to the Provident Fund to enable those who suffer injuries to receive compensation from both sources. I can quite understand why those who contribute to the Provident Fund would object to that suggestion which my hon. friend makes, and, furthermore, inasmuch as we contribute to that, I think it is perfectly right that we should take care not to treat one class of employees who suffer injuries differently from other classes.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Does it not seem reasonable that the employees of the Government railways should be placed in exactly the same position as the employees of privately owned railways?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes.

Mr. REID: They are.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): That is all my friend asks.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Allow me to draw the attention of my hon. friend (Mr. Maclean) to the fact that every employee of the Intercolonial Railway is required by law to pay 1½ per cent of his wages into the Provident Fund. There is no necessity of his doing so when we adopt this Workman's Compensation Act, because provision is made for insurance under it on a more liberal scale than under the Provident Fund. So the man would be better off if we allowed him to keep his money in his pocket for he would be paying into the Provident Fund without prospect of any return.

We are exacting from the employees of the Intercolonial Railway money which we do not exact from the employees in machine shops, in saw-mills, or in any of those industries carried on in the same territory. They get their compensation under the Compensation Act without paying anything into the fund of the company.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But they contribute their money for other purposes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Why should we collect this money at all from the Intercolonial Railway employees?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It was an insurance scheme worked out between the railway management and the employees.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That is true, but it does not exist now.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The reason for the Provident Fund still continues.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): For old age purposes?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): For old age purposes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That is all.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But so far as compensation for injuries is concerned it is not very applicable.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That is why I raised the point.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): That is quite true, but I assume that the employees would still want to continue the Provident Fund for those other purposes, and I do not imagine they would want to cut down their contribution. It really helps the Provident Fund to have the Government of Canada assume all financial responsibility for injury to employees, because there will be more available for compensation for general insurance purposes.

Mr. FRIPP: Does the Government of Canada contribute to the fund in the province of Nova Scotia under the Workmen's Compensation Act there.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, nor to that of any province. The Bill was introduced last year to take care of Federal employees.

Mr. FRIPP: The case of Miller and the Grand Trunk was determined before any Compensation Board was organized in the provinces.

Mr. JACOBS: That is so.

Mr. MICHAUD: In the case of an employee in any industry, he insures his life in an accident company, and if an accident occurs he goes to the company and gets compensation, and he also receives compensation under the Compensation Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): How does he get compensation from his employer?

Mr. MICHAUD: Under the Compensation Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): He does not get it from his employer.

Mr. MICHAUD: He would in the province of New Brunswick.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I know; but he does not get it from his employer. All

employers of a certain class contribute to the Compensation Fund, and the man is paid by the province out of that fund.

Mr. MICHAUD: Under the common law, he would get it from the employer.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, under the common law he would probably get nothing, at least without a law suit.

Mr. MICHAUD: And also under the Compensation Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It was very rarely that a man ever got any compensation for injuries under the common law. The Employers' Liability Act first gave him relief from the common law limitations, and then later came the Workmen's Compensation Act.

Mr. MICHAUD: In this case a railway employee should be in the same position as any other employee.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It should be remembered that under the workmen's compensation schemes, as in force in all the provinces, certain classes of employers contribute to a fund, and all the contributors of a given class are insured against accidents to their employees. The Government, on the other hand, contributes nothing to a general fund with other railways insuring against accidents to railway employees. Other railway companies may make contributions to the various funds in the different provinces, but we do not. I suppose there would, in any case, not be much purpose in our contributing to a fund, because we are responsible, we are in a little different position from the ordinary contributor to the Workmen's Compensation Fund.

Mr. HARRISON: Are the Workmen's Compensation Fund and the Provident Fund separate and distinct?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes.

Mr. HARRISON: The minister told us this afternoon that the Government paid $100,000 into this Provident Fund last year.

Mr. REID: Every year.

Mr. HARRISON: The employees paid $167,000 last year. Is it fair that a man who has been contributing to that fund for twenty, twenty-five or thirty years, should get no benefit from it?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): He will.

Mr. HARRISON: In what way? He has to choose between the Compensation Act and the Provident Fund Act.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Let me read this section of the Provident Fund Act with which the hon. member may not be familiar:

> The following classes of persons shall, upon the recommendation of the Board and the approval of the minister, but subject to this Act and to the rules and regulations of the Board, upon being retired by the minister from service, be entitled for the remainder of their lives to monthly allowances as provided for in this Act:—
>
> Class A. Those who have attained the age of seventy years after being fifteen years in the service;
>
> Class B. Those who, after being fifteen years in the service, become physically or mentally incapacitated from following their usual occupation in the service;
>
> Class C. Those who have attained the age of sixty years after being fifteen years in the service, and request to be retired from the service;
>
> Class D. Those who are permanently disabled from following their usual occupation in the service as a result of injuries received while on duty and actually at work in the service.
>
> Class E. Those who, previous to the coming into force of this Act, entered the service at such an advanced age as to cause them to reach the age of seventy years before being fifteen years in the service; provided that on attaining the age of seventy years they have been at least ten years in the service.

The proposed Bill does not destroy the rights of members of the Provident Fund. All contributors to the Provident Fund are entitled to receive relief under classes A, B, C and E, in any event. An employee may avail himself of his rights under class D, and he would do that only when it would be more favourable than would be the provisions of the proposed Bill.

Mr. HARRISON: He has the privilege of choosing whether he will come under the Provident Fund Act or the Compensation Act.

Mr. REID: This Bill really applies only when an employee has been permanently disabled and goes out of the service or when an employee has been killed. Otherwise, he has the other benefits of the Provident Fund.

Mr. HARRISON: On some parts of the Grand Trunk system they are paying exactly along this line.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I do not know that.

Mr. HARRISON: I think that is the case. Of course, I have not gone into this question very thoroughly, but it seems there is an opportunity here for an employee to be a loser.

Mr. REID: I disagree with the hon. member. I have not had any such complaint from the employees, and I think the hon. member will agree with me that if there were anything defective in the measure, or if the employees were not receiving their just rights, the matter would be brought to my attention and would, of course, receive consideration. I want to emphasize that fact. I do not want it to go abroad that I am trying to interfere with the rights of the employees. Under the Provident Fund they have and will continue to have benefits, but this Bill improves the condition of the employees very much and they are satisfied.

Mr. McMASTER: I do not think it is a complete answer for the minister to say: "I have no complaints," when we point out to him an injustice which stares one in the face. It is the most elementary principle of justice that it is wrong to say: I offer you a benefit, but in order to receive this benefit, you must renounce another. This Provident Fund is something into which the men have paid in larger proportion than the Government, and I presume old employees have been paying into this fund for years. Let us take a concrete case to make the matter clear. Smith and Jones have been hurt in an accident. Smith has been working for twenty years with the company, and has had 1½ per cent deducted from his wages for twenty years, while Jones has been working for three months. They are both offered compensation under the Compensation Act, the understanding being that they are to waive whatever rights they have to the Provident Fund. Jones says: All right; it does not make any difference to me; I have been paying into the fund or having 1½ per cent deducted from my wages for only three months. But the case of Smith, who has been paying into this fund for twenty years is very different. To him, the Government says: You have rights, if you wish to exercise them; but, if you exercise your rights in connection with the Provident Fund, you will not get anything under the Compensation Act. That is grievously unfair. I grant this, that as the Government has been accustomed to contribute to the Provident Fund, it would not be fair to ask the Government to pay again, but it could easily be found by an actuary what the Government's share was as compared with the men's share, and the man could get the compensation to which he is entitled under the Compensation Act, and he should also get his share out of the Provident Fund, as the share contributed by the men represents the share contributed by the Government.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): How could the hon. member work out his suggestion? I understand him to say that the injured employee should receive some portion of the money he has paid into the Provident Fund, which money would be applicable to those who are entitled to compensation under class D. This does not take away the rights of the employees to compensation under the other classes, A, B, C and E, and it would be very difficult to determine what a man would be entitled to for injuries under the Provident Fund, even if he were permitted to draw compensation from both sources. I do not see what the Minister of Railways can very well do in the matter to meet the suggestion of my hon. friend. There are only two contributors to this fund. the Government and the employee, and the Minister of Railways has had before him the employees in the person of the officials who administer the fund. They say to him that they are perfectly satisfied that any person permanently injured should not draw compensation from both sources. If any Act should be amended it should be the Provident Fund Act and not the one we are considering.

Mr. McMASTER: That may be. I am not saying which should be amended, but I am drawing to the attention of the committee the flagrant injustice of what is proposed to be done. The minister has asked me how I would suggest the thing should be done. I say that an actuary could easily calculate what proportion the Government had contributed toward the building up of the fund, and what proportion the men.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): But not how much was applicable to permanent injuries.

Mr. McMASTER: I presume that could be established too, but I am not prepared to discuss that this afternoon. What I want to lay before the Committee is this: It is flagrantly unjust to make compensation under the provisions of the Compensation Act dependent upon a man's renunciation of his rights in a fund which his money has helped to build up.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): He does not renounce his claims upon the fund; he is only renouncing his rights in respect of a certain class of claim.

Mr. GAUVREAU: I should like to see the employees get benefits from both the Provident Fund and the Compensation

Act. We must not forget that this legislation is brought down to better the condition of employees on the Intercolonial Railway. The minister says that the employees have been consulted in the drafting of this Bill, and further, that if it does not work out satisfactorily in practice, he is prepared to amend the Bill next year. I should like to see the Bill pass, even if it was only for the clause providing that, "for the future," dependents will be paid.

Mr. J. D. REID: If my hon. friend's amendment was accepted, employees might be compelled to pay more into the Provident Fund, and I should not like to undertake that responsibility. After all, the employees are contributing towards these benefits, and I think the question raised by my hon. friend is of such importance that I do not care to accept his amendment before consulting the employees. But the very fact that it might compel the employees to contribute more seems to me sufficient justification for not accepting the amendment at this time. Surely, there cannot be anything fairer than that. All the employees will read this discussion and if they desire to pay more into the fund, the Act can be amended accordingly. This Act applies only to those who are permanently injured and out of the service, and to those who are killed. Under the circumstances, I would ask the hon. member not to press his amendment.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: I would suggest that as there is no great rush for this Bill to be passed, it should stand over for a week or possibly until after Easter to give the minister an opportunity of consulting with the employees. There is another point I wish to draw to his attention, and that is the definition of the word "employee." I notice there are a number of employees of the railway working at Port Borden who have not been paid according to the McAdoo award. Are these men considered employees of the railway under this Bill?

Mr. J. D. REID: I could not say as to these men. Those who contribute to the fund come under this Bill.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: They are freight handlers.

Mr. J. D. REID: Any permanent employee, receiving a monthly wage, can contribute to the fund and come under this Act. The men who would not contribute are those employed only for a temporary period.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): I think the minister should accept the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Read) and let the Bill stand until he has had an opportunity of consulting with the employees. I admit that this Bill is a great improvement on the legislation of last year, and if the pressing of the amendment would prevent the adoption of this legislation, I would ask my hon. friend to withdraw his amendment. The minister said last year what he has said to-day, namely, that the employees were well satisfied with the measure he proposed, but he admits now that that legislation was susceptible of improvement.

Mr. J. D. REID: I stated last year that I had consulted with the employees, and they were satisfied with the legislation. Since the Act has been in operation, they have discovered the defects that were pointed out by my hon. friend from Kamouraska.

Mr. JACOBS: They are not trained lawyers.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): The minister says that he consulted with the employees last year and they were satisfied with the legislation as proposed, but now they have found the defects which the minister says I pointed out to him. He is now amending the Act to avoid the injustice it was doing to the dependents of employees. Under the old Act the widow of a man who had been killed and who had not elected to come under the provisions of the fund could not receive anything, because she had not waived her rights, so to speak, to something she was not entitled to.

My hon. friend realized the manifest absurdity of this and in the present Bill he is remedying that condition. We submit that the employees of the Intercolonial Railway or the Canadian Government Railways ought to be placed in exactly the same position as the employees of the Canadian Pacific Railway and the Grand Trunk Railway. My hon. friend says they are in the same position, but we know that they are not. It should be a very simple matter to find out conditions as they really are before this Bill comes again before the committee, and the suggestion of my hon. friend (Mr. Reid) ought to be accepted; that we wait for eight or ten days and ascertain in the meanwhile how the Canadian Pacific employees are dealt with.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): How are they dealt with?

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): They are receiving compensation for damages according to the law of the land, and they are also entitled to benefit under the Provident Fund, which exists in the other companies as well as in the Canadian Government Railways, and which has been considered by the Privy Council to be merely an insurance.

Mr. J. D. REID: I have made inquiries, and notwithstanding what the hon. member says, I believe that the employees of the Intercolonial Railway are in equally as favourable a position as those on the other railways, and my opinion, I think, is just as good as the hon. member's, on that question. I have taken this matter up and have had my assistants take it up during the Recess, and after consultation with the railway employees I am informed that this is what they desire. If the committee does not want to pass the Bill I would rather withdraw it this session than have any further amendments.

Mr. LAPOINTE: I prefer this Bill, but—

Mr. J. D. REID: I would much rather withdraw the Bill than that there should be any possibility of injustice to the employees.

Mr. JACOBS: I hope that is not a threat on the part of the hon. minister.

Mr. MORPHY: I have listened to this debate with considerable interest and I would not like to see the Bill withdrawn, because it is admittedly a substantial improvement on the existing law and I think that the minister is entitled to some credit for progressive legislation in the interests of the men. What struck me particularly was the frank way in which the minister, following his usual custom, consulted the employees of the roads through their representatives. They have approved the Bill, and as far as I have heard from hon. members there has been no protest from the men. Hon. members on the opposite side of the House deserve credit for seeking to better the conditions of the employees, but if we were to encourage a practice of suspending every Bill for a week until somebody had an opportunity of stirring up trouble, I do not see how the minister could possibly make any progress. The Bill is admitted to be in the interests of the men, and I might as well, if I desired to be factious, raise an objection to the Government giving the $100,000. All the employees are evidently satisfied, and in view of the assurance of the minister that should anything be found unsatisfactory between now and next session the Bill could be still further improved, I think we should proceed. If the question raised by some hon. members should prove to be in accordance with the wishes of the employees, they would no doubt be given the credit to which they would in that event be entitled.

Mr. ROBB: The day before yesterday we spent debating whether or not $5,000 which it is claimed was legally paid out should be refunded, and I suppose the discussion cost the country $25,000. We spent yesterday discussing the advisability of rising an hour earlier in the morning, and that I suppose cost us another $25,000. Now we are discussing a Bill in regard to which there does not seem to me to be any real complaint from those interested, and to expedite matters I think it would be better for my good friend to withdraw his amendment and let us get through this resolution, bearing in mind that when the flowers bloom and the weather is hot we may at a late hour at night rush through millions of dollars with but little discussion, I think we should get along with the business before the House.

Mr. JOSEPH READ: When I requested the minister to suspend the matter for the time being I had no idea that he would threaten to withdraw the Bill altogether. I would be sorry to see it withdrawn, for half a loaf is better than no bread. The suggestion that we have no complaint from the railway men is not according to the facts. I represent a great number of railway men, and know that they are not receiving what they should under the McAdoo award. However, I am glad to hear the minister's statement that he intends to stand by the employees, and I trust he will remedy that matter. I refer to the freight handlers and others at Port Borden.

Mr. JACOBS: In view of the threat made by the hon. minister to withdraw the Bill altogether, I am prepared to withdraw my amendment. As my hon. friend from Prince Edward Island aptly puts it half a loaf is better than none.

Amendment withdrawn.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): Last year the point was raised—I think by my friend (Mr. Jacobs) that this Bill did not provide for any service upon the Crown or upon the Board of Railway Commissioners, or the Department of Justice.

Hon. Mr. REID: I know the point the hon. member refers to. Later there will be

introduced a Bill in connection with railways covering the point.

Bill reported.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

House resumed at eight o'clock.

PRIVATE BILLS.

THIRD READING.

Bill No. 12, respecting W. C. Edwards and Company, Limited.—Mr. Fripp.

SECOND READINGS.

Bill No. 34, respecting the Canadian Pacific Railway Company.—Mr. Thomson (Qu'Appelle).

Bill No. 36, to incorporate Grain Insurance and Guarantee Company.—Mr. Blake.

FISH INSPECTION ACT AMENDMENT.

On motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries) the House went into committee on the following proposed resolution.—Mr. Boivin in the Chair:

Resolved, That it is expedient to amend the Fish Inspection Act, chapter forty-five of the statutes of 1914, and to provide that the said Act shall apply to pickled herring, alewives, mackerel, and salmon other than mild cured salmon, and the containers in which such fish are packed and marketed; that the Governor in Council may order that the provisions of the said Act shall extend and apply to any other kinds of fish, whether pickled or not, and the containers in which such fish are packed and marketed; excepting, however, fish packed in cans or other hermetically sealed containers, and fish packed by fishermen or others for their own use and not for sale or intended to be used for any other commercial purpose; that regulations may be made prescribing the size and make of such containers, and the manner in which and places where they shall be inspected and marked, and also prescribing how fish shall be graded, packed and inspected, and the place and manner and by whom fish are to be inspected, and other provisions relating thereto; that no container shall be used unless inspected and marked in accordance with the regulations, and all fish shall be graded; that all fish imported into Canada from other countries shall be packed in containers of a similar character and equal quality to those required under the proposed legislation; and shall be clearly marked with the kind, grade and weight of fish they contain, and with the name of the country of origin, provided that when such fish are imported into Canada for exportation it shall only be necessary that the container in which such fish are packed be marked with the name of the country of origin; that with certain limitations an appeal to the minister may be made in case of disputes between an inspecting officer and the packer, owner or other person: that inspectors shall have the right to enter upon any premises, vessel or boat for the purpose of enforcing the provisions of the Act as amended; that penalties may be imposed, and containers and fish forfeited and seized for violation of the Act or regulations; and that the proposed legislation shall come into force with respect to fish caught on the Pacific coast on the first day of November, 1919, and with respect to fish caught on the Atlantic coast on the first day of April, 1920.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Substantially the proposal under this resolution is the compulsory inspection of fish. The subject of course will be controversial but I wish to promote the measure a stage so that it can be referred to the Fisheries Committee to be thoroughly inquired into. I assume that the committee will ascertain what public opinion is on the matter. I do not know if it has ever been discussed in the House before in the form of a resolution or a Bill.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a law now in connection with fish inspection, but it is not compulsory. This is compulsory inspection?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The proposal contained in the resolution is that the inspection shall be compulsory. The legislation now in existence was passed in 1914 and it provides for a system of inspection upon the request of any applicant. It is not compulsory. The results under this system of permissive inspection are as follows:

	Barrels inspected.	No. of packers requesting inspection.
1915	1,320	16
1916	7,213	73
1917	8,977	80
1918	16,667	103

Mr. DUFF: Has the minister the localities in which this inspection took place?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, I have not that information.

Mr. DUFF: Are you referring to the Atlantic coast?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It would all, apparently, be on the Atlantic coast, because I do not think there was any inspector on the Pacific coast. There an inspector was appointed in 1918. There are seven inspectors on the Atlantic coast. I give these figures to show the number of packers who availed themselves of the privilege of inspection year by year. I am informed by the officers of the department that there is quite a substantial demand throughout the country for compulsory inspection.

Mr. DUFF: Have you that report?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes, we would have it.

Mr. DUFF: May we have it?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Certainly, I shall see that it is made available to hon. members. I do not know that I can say anything further on the resolution. I would like to get it passed so that the Bill may be introduced and printed. I admit that it is a highly controversial matter.

Mr. LEMIEUX: From whom did the request for this legislation come—boards of trade and merchants?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The Canadian Fisheries' Association is one body that made a request for it. The department sent out 122 inquiries to fishermen, coopers, packers and dealers, of whom 117 replied in favour of compulsory inspection. However, that would not indicate a great volume of public opinion behind the proposal.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Were they all favourable to it?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Out of 122 inquired of, 117 were favourable.

Mr. McKENZIE: To what class of that people was that inquiry sent?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Fishermen, coopers, packers and fish dealers.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Does the inspection refer to the barrels?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It refers to the container.

Mr. SHEARD: Would the minister tell us what an alewife is?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It is a fish.

Mr. DUFF: I am not quite sure what the procedure is in a resolution of this kind, and therefore I would like to have an assurance from the minister that opportunity will be given for a full discussion of this matter either in the Marine and Fisheries Committee, or in the House after the Bill has been introduced.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Certainly, ample opportunity for discussion will be afforded. I only wish that it was not necessary to ask for the passing of a resolution of this kind. It seems to be a great waste of time, and it is hardly fair to the House because hon. gentlemen have not the opportunity of knowing in advance what the Bill contains. However, there will be opportunity for discussion when the Bill goes to committee.

[Mr. Duff.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: I represent a fishing constituency, and I do not object at all to this measure, although I have heard no expression of public opinion with respect to it. I learned last fall, however, that some fish were inspected at the Magdalen Islands by an inspector from Prince Edward Island, to which inspection my constituents objected very strenuously, contending that the inspection should be done by a man from their own district. On the whole I think this is a fair measure and that it will satisfy public opinion, but the minister will be expected to give full information with regard to it. For example, if the measure passes will there be a large number of inspectors appointed to carry out its provisions, or will the department utilize the good services of some of its present officials? In the present financial state of the country I would not favour any wild expenditure for inspection purposes. The department should avail itself of the services of the present staff of inspectors or officers and thus avoid any additional expenditure.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The system of inspection to be adopted is the really important and serious feature of the Bill. If fish were to be inspected immediately they were put in the containers, it would mean employing a tremendous army of inspectors, which would be undesirable and make the administration of the Act very expensive. I shall read a memorandum given me with respect to that by an officer of the department:

> That with respect to the fish a system of inspection similar to that applied to fruit should be adopted, by which means the packers would be required to cure, grade and pack their fish in accordance with the standards set; that they, not the inspectors, would be required to mark the packages with the kind, grade and weight of the fish contained, but that the inspectors would be empowered to thereafter examine the fish at any convenient time or place, in order to ascertain whether they are correctly designated by the marks on the package.

That appears to be about the only system of inspection that could be worked out, and it would not be necessary under it to have a large number of inspectors.

Mr. CHISHOLM: There are certain inspectors now.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Seven.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The trouble is that every fisherman on the coast is also a packer. The blue-book tells us there are some eight thousand fishermen whose operations cover about five thousand miles

of coast, and the difficulties in connection with administering regulations of this kind would be very great on account of the scattered way in which the work is done. If the packers of fish operated like the packers of fruit, and there were places where fish was handled in large quantities, as is done in the case of fruit in the Annapolis valley and other points, the task would be a much easier one. I understand that in many places fruit is sold on the trees, and the packer comes along with his crew of men, and the necessary boxes and barrels, and the fruit is picked and packed under inspection.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I think it is inspected at the warehouse largely.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): That may be so, but the conditions under which fish is packed differ greatly from those under which the packing of fruit is carried on. A man may be living in a little harbour in an isolated place. He catches the mackerel and packs it himself in barrels, which are sometimes made by himself, and the difficulty of getting an officer to go to that man's place and inspect the fish after it is packed will be very great indeed. If the inspection work is done in that way it will require an army of officials and will prove very expensive.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I quite agree with my hon. friend. But ultimately these fish are forwarded to some centre; for instance, in my hon. friend's own constituency a great quantity of pickled fish would reach Canso at one time or another, and would be inspected there.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Then the inspection would be in the interest of the dealer and not in the interest of the individual fisherman.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The Bill provides for regulations which will set up standards. The packer will assign the standard or grade of fish himself, and he will place that mark on the barrel. Later when the fish reach a certain place they will be inspected by the regular inspector.

Mr. CROWE: Why should the proposed legislation come into force on the Pacific coast in November, 1919, and in the Maritime Provinces not until April, 1920?

Mr. DUFF: On the Atlantic coast the fishing is over in September and October, and consequently there are no more fish to inspect until the following spring. Therefore, the ensuing April would suit Atlantic coast conditions.

Mr. McKENZIE: I would suggest to the minister that this measure is capable of causing a great deal of hardship to fishermen. Take my own county. There is a large fishing establishment in the northern part of Victoria county which puts up five hundred barrels of what they call No. 1 Herring, and which they sell as such to Smith Brothers, or some other big fishing firm, in Halifax, at say $8 a barrel. The firm believe that they are selling No. 1 Herring, and they have so put it up. However we have not yet reached the millennium in commercial matters, nor the acme of perfection in square dealing. It is quite possible, therefore, that some person who desires to get cheap herring may have those herring examined in Halifax by an inspector who will say that they are not No. 1 Herring, and then the whole fat is in the fire. The people who sold those herring as No. 1 herring cannot get the price for that grade, although they acted quite honestly in the matter. I would say that the inspection must take place before the fish is shipped, if it is to take place at all, and before delivery is taken, otherwise there will be no end of trouble, lawsuits and dissatisfaction, and much heartburning among the poor fishermen.

As the hon. minister is aware, deep-sea fishing is a very arduous occupation, entailing long hours and, sometimes in our part of the country, facing the full sweep of the Atlantic in all its terrors, and the fisherman has enough to contend with at present without inflicting this inspection upon him, for it will make things worse than they are now. Therefore, in the interest of everybody concerned, I would enjoin upon the hon. minister the greatest possible caution in dealing with this matter to avoid creating unnecessary difficulties.

To-day a very excellent quality of fish is being sold in Nova Scotia, and it is in our own interest to sell good fish, for we have to compete with Newfoundland, Sweden, Norway and other countries. I hear very little complaint about the quality of fish sold in Canada brought either from the Pacific coast or from the Atlantic coast.

I would suggest to the hon. minister to do what he proposes to do about that small can and big Act of Parliament. He proposes to cut down the big Act of Parliament to suit the can. In this case, if there are too many officials and they have nothing to do I think it would be well to find something else for them to do or send them about their business. Do not try to legislate difficulties

in order to give them work; have greater care for the fishermen than furnishing unnecessary labour for too big an army of officials.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I quite agree with the point my hon. friend makes, and I apprehend there will be a great deal of criticism in reference to this Bill just upon the point to which he refers. However, if the Bill is eventually adopted, I hope it will not work an injury to the fishermen. If it results in placing upon the market a better fish it will also result, I think, in higher prices being secured by the fishermen.

Resolution reported, read and concurred in.

Mr. A. K. Maclean thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 41 to amend the Fish Inspection Act:

Motion agreed to and Bill read the first time.

WEIGHTS AND MEASURES AMENDMENT.

On the motion of Hon. A. K. Maclean (Acting Minister of Trade and Commerce) the House went into committee to consider the following resolution:

That it is expedient to amend the Weights and Measures Act, chapter fifty-two of the Revised Statutes of Canada, 1906, and to define more clearly what officers are included under the term "inspector," and the ratio and proportion of the foot, French measure or Paris foot, to the Dominion standard measures; and also to provide for the appointment of a Superintendent of Weights and Measures, with prescribed duties, for the examination of inspectors and certificate of qualification required; and for the fixing of inspection divisions; and further to prescribe by regulation when and how often weights and measures and weighing and measuring machines are to be inspected, verified and stamped; and that the Governor in Council may prescribe a fee to be charged for a specified period, not to exceed one year, instead of a fee for each inspection and verification; and further, to prescribe penalties for selling or delivering anything by weight, measure or number short of the quantity ordered or purchased; or for knowingly using any counterfeit weight, measure, weighing or measuring machine, or having, selling, or dealing in the same, except such as can, after adjustment, be admitted to verification.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The changes proposed in the Bill are not very numerous. The Weights and Measures Act heretofore was administered in the Department of Inland Revenue, but last year it was transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce. One of the amendments is to substitute the name of the Minister of Inland Revenue in the Act for that of the Minister of Trade and Commerce. There is a slight amendment in reference to the

French measure or Paris foot. In the province of Quebec the French foot is used in land surveying, but only in such cases, I understand. The French foot is defined under the amending Bill as equal to 12.789 inches instead of 12.79, a correction of .001. This amendment is made at the request of the Incorporated Society of Surveyors in the province of Quebec. Another amendment proposes annual instead of bi-annual inspection, but—

Mr. McKENZIE: Before the hon. minister leaves the former amendment, does it change the length of the surveying standard of measurement in the province of Quebec? It seems to me that in the description and measurement of lands that are already sold or may be under sale it may create a difficulty and possibly involve very serious losses.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think you could get much of a lawsuit out of .001.

Mr. McKENZIE: I know of a very serious lawsuit which arose out of the fact that the drip from the edge of the shingles on the roof of a man's house fell on to the other man's land. It was a case of trespass, so it does not require very much to cause a lawsuit.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): If there was any danger of the amendment provoking a lawsuit, it perhaps should not be in the Bill. If my hon. friend will think over the matter in the meantime, I shall be glad to have his views. The Bill will also provide for an annual instead of biennial inspection, but there will be power in the Bill to make regulations to the effect that scales which are not used frequently need not be inspected so often. One of the reasons for making an annual inspection is that in the case of public scales, mine scales, grain elevator scales, etc., which are in constant use, it is felt that the inspection should be more frequent. The law as it now stands requires the payment of the inspection fee immediately after the inspection is made, the Bill purposes giving power to the officers of the department to make arrangements by which these inspection fees may be paid annually. For instance, in the case of elevator companies which may own twenty to fifty elevators, it may not always be convenient to have the inspection fee paid at the place where the elevator is located.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Why?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): In many cases there may be no responsible representative

of the company there present to whom the money can be entrusted. It might not be convenient to make immediate payment, and such companies would like the privilege of paying the fees annually from their head office.

Mr. LEMIEUX: From the head office?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): This resolution provides for the appointment of a superintendent. Has the minister any person in view, and what will the salary be?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): This provision was made necessary because the Act was administered by the Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue. That position has been abandoned, and as there is now no such officer as Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue, it is necessary to put somebody in his place to administer the Act.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the French foot going to disappear, or is the Bill to be founded on this resolution simply defining it so as to make it tally with the Government standard measure in the Act?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): Paragraph 2 of the Bill will repeal the old section and substitute the following:

The foot, French measure or Paris foot, shall be held to contain twelve inches and seven hundred and eighty-nine thousandths of an inch standard measure.

That is the standard for land surveying purposes in Quebec only.

Mr. SINCLAIR: Is it intended to make the standard in the rest of the Dominion conform to the present standard in Quebec?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No, Quebec is the only province in which the French foot is the standard measure in land surveying.

Mr. MURPHY: You would not apply it in Ontario?

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): No.

Mr. PEDLOW: Is it the intention to insert in the Bill this provision which is contained in the resolution:

—and further to prescribe by regulation when and how often weights and measures and weighing and measuring machines are to be inspected, verified and stamped; and that the Governor in Council may prescribe a fee to be charged for a specified period, not to exceed one year.

Does that apply to measures of all kinds? For instance, in the drygoods business yard measures made of brass are used. These are and must be stamped by the Government at the time they are purchased and before they are put into use. Must they, under this Bill, be examined periodically in future? A yard stick made of metal cannot be stretched or varied, and as it has the Government stamp on it, why should it be necessary to have a periodical inspection of measures of that kind? There are no doubt other measures that are in the same class. Once a measuring article of that kind has been approved by the Government, it cannot vary unless a man deliberately cuts a piece off, and that would be absurd.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think this would include a measure of that kind.

Mr. PEDLOW: I think it would be wise to except measures of that kind in the Bill, because otherwise there would be no end of trouble to men using them. Inspectors would be coming along at irregular intervals and charging merchants fees for inspections that would not be necessary.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I do not think the Act applies to that at all.

Mr. PEDLOW: The resolution says "measures."

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): The hon. member might bring that matter up on the second reading when the Bill is printed.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not know whether the measures of electric currents and the inspection of meters come under this department or not. They used to come under the Department of Inland Revenue and they likely come under this department now.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): This is under the Department of Trade and Commerce, but I think a different set of officials inspect electrical measures.

Mr. LEMIEUX: When did that come under the Department of Trade and Commerce? It used to be under the Department of Inland Revenue.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): It was under the Department of Inland Revenue and was transferred to the Department of Trade and Commerce at the same time the Weights and Measures Branch was transferred.

Mr. McKENZIE: If this is not in the minister's department. I hope whatever department has charge of the work will take note of what I have to say. In our part of the country there is the greatest possible dissatisfaction in regard to these meters

and the calculating and reading of meters. It is believed there is a great deal of filching from the public by reason of defective meters, and there is no proper inspection at all. If I want to get a meter in my house tested, I do not know where to go. We have no inspections and we have no official who takes any cognizance of this sort of thing.

When you take into consideration that there are hundreds of thousands of these meters all over the country, on whose readings men are paying out large sums of money, it can be readily understood how important it is that they should be tested and kept in proper order. So far as I know, there is no system of inspection at the present time, and I take this opportunity of bringing the matter to the attention of the minister.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): I shall be very glad to bring to the attention of the proper officer the remarks of the leader of the Opposition, and I shall ask him to write my hon. friend a letter. There is an inspection of electrical plants by Dominion officers, but whether that includes an inspection of household meters I cannot say. I would think, however, that meters are inspected at some stage or other by a federal officer, but whether that is done at the installation or from time to time thereafter I do not know. I would think that there ought to be in every city some official who would be available to any householder for the purpose of testing the meter. I shall be glad to look further into the matter.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): Are not electrical meters under provincial jurisdiction, just the same as the wiring of houses and buildings and all that sort of thing?

Mr. FAFARD: The resolution proposes to define more clearly the ratio and proportion of the foot, French measure, or Paris foot. I understand that the Paris foot is the standard measure now. Why are we making a change?

Mr. MACLEAN: I think the hon. gentleman was not in the House when we were discussing this matter a moment ago. The change is being made at the suggestion of the Incorporated Society of Surveyors of the Province of Quebec. At the present time the Paris foot is defined as the equivalent of 12·79 inches. It is proposed to make it 12·789 inches.

Mr. FAFARD: It is 12·789 now. I do not think it ever was 12·79.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Resolution reported, read and concurred in.

Mr. Maclean (Halifax) thereupon moved for leave to introduce Bill No. 42, to amend the Weights and Measures Act.

Motion agreed to, and Bill read the first time.

SUPPLY.

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

Civil Government—Department of Customs and Inland Revenue Service—salaries, including Commissioner and Chairman, Board of Customs at $6,000, Assistant Commissioner of Customs at $4,500, Assistant Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue at $4,500 — Contingencies, $43,000, $463,387.50.

Mr. REID (Grenville): The salaries are the same as last year, except for the statutory increases, and an increase of $1,000 to the commissioner, and $500 to the assistant commissioner.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is the bonus included in that?

Mr. REID (Grenville): No.

Mr. PROULX: What is the reason for the increase of $1,000?

Mr. REID: Mr. McDougald is a deputy minister, and all the deputy ministers got an increase of $1,000 this year.

Mr. PROULX: Does not the minister think that is a large increase?

Mr. REID: I do not think so.

Mr. PROULX: It seems a large increase to me, especially in view of the finances of the country at the present time, faced as we are with a deficit. The deputy ministers are already getting a large salary, while officers in other departments who have families to maintain are getting only $1,500 or $2,000. These men certainly need an increase more than the deputy ministers, who are receiving $5,000. If a man cannot live on $5,000, he will not be able to live on $6,000. I think the Government should give more consideration to the under-paid, rather than to those already enjoying high salaries, but the Government seems to think more of the higher salaried officers. I for one am opposed to such an increase.

Mr. McKENZIE: Have any changes been made in the staff? Have there been any deaths or additions to the staff?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The staff is exactly the same, with the exception of the addition of the minister's private secretary.

Customs.—Salaries and contingent expenses of the several ports in the Dominion including pay for overtime of officers, notwithstanding anything in the Civil Service Act, and temporary Customs buildings and rentals, $4,000,000.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): There is an increase of $110,000.

Mr. REID (Grenville): That is to provide for increases in salaries during the coming year. In the Inside Service there is an annual increase provided for under the statute, whereas increases to the Outside Service are given by the department, and there has always been each year a certain amount put in the Estimates to allow for these increases. Instead of $110,000 it has generally been $200,000 or $300,000, but this year it has been reduced to $110,000 in order to allow of increases to those who, it is considered, are entitled to them having been in the service for a number of years. When the re-organization of the Civil Service is effected and the Outside Service is put on the same basis as the Inside Service, the statute will give them an annual increase of $50 or $100, and there will of course be no necessity for a vote such as this.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): How many officers are now in the Outside Service and how many were there a year ago?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The information will be available in a moment or two.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How much of this $4,000,000 is applied to rentals and temporary buildings?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I am unable to say offhand how much the rentals amounted, but they are practically all made through the Public Works Department. We have not a record of them in the Customs Department. If we want an examining warehouse in the city of Montreal, the Public Works Department secures the premises on our information as to the number of surface feet that we require, and other specifications, and the rental is paid through that department. Only occasionally, and in the case of a very small building is this work done through the Customs Department.

Mr. SHEARD: What proportion of this $110,000 represents salaries? Does it embrace any increase in salaries for the coming year? The reason I ask is because on inquiry I was informed that the entire salaries of the Civil Servants must be adjusted to a general ratio of increase. I think we ought to be informed as to what percentage is salaries, and what percentage rentals, and if the amount includes increases.

Mr. REID (Grenville): The increase of $110,000 is intended for increases to the officers of the Customs Department on the outside staff and not for any special salaries. The hon. member probably knows that during the present fiscal year ending March 31 salaries in the Outside Service were increased by way of bonuses out of the war vote put through last year. This $110,000 is not for that bonus, but for increases that are given every year. The departmental staff presents to the minister a report showing what in their opinion each member of the staff should receive by way of increase. In the past we voted about $300,000 or $400,000 for increases, but as I have stated we have reduced it this year. In my opinion, however, it should be as much as it was last year, but the bonus is to be considered. If we were to give every member of the outside staff about $100 increase it would take at least $300,000 The hon. member asked for the number of employees last year and this year. On March 31, 1918, there were 3,351 in the Outside Service, and at the present time there are 3,283, or 70 fewer than there were a year ago.

Mr. SHEARD: Does the minister say that the war bonus is included in this amount?

Mr. REID (Grenville): No. Last year the Government gave the Outside Service a bonus which was taken out of the vote of $2,000,000.

Mr. COWAN: The war bonus would have to be considered apart from this?

Mr. REID (Grenville): Yes.

Mr. COWAN: I understand that a number of Civil Servants from various parts of Canada gathered recently and decided to ask for increases. Will these increases satisfy those men?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The matter will have to come up later on in the session. The Civil Service Commission are now classifying the Outside Service and will probably put it on the same basis as the Inside Service. Parliament will have to consider whether we are to continue bonuses or increase salaries under this classification that is being made. We are not in a position to decide this matter just at this moment and are making this vote the same as last year.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Did all the outside officers share in the bonus?

Mr. REID (Grenville): All up to $1,880, but not over.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Only the officers who are permanent and not those who have been employed for six or seven months?

Mr. REID (Grenville): All that were employed, both permanent and temporary, previous to April, 1918.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Do I understand the minister to say that those, such as messengers, who are employed in the House during the session received the bonus?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I am only talking about the Customs Department.

Mr. ROBB: I understand that for some time there has been a staff of accountants from the United States employed making a survey of the different departments so as to advise the Government on the increases that are demanded, and this at considerable expense, notwithstanding that the Government had a report three or four years ago from accountants from Great Britain. What I particularly desire to draw to the attention of the minister, and more especially to the attention of the hon. Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), is the fact that we are starting to-night to vote Supply to this Government. It seems to me that before the Government ask for Supply they should first give to the people of Canada a correct and complete statement of our financial position. We should have a statement of the debt of the country, the assets that would be deducted therefrom, temporary loans, treasury bills and all the outstanding and unsettled obligations and engagements in connection with pledging the credit of Canada, including railways, docks and steamships; in short Mr. Chairman, whatever engagements the people of Canada are pledged to. I think it is due, not to the Opposition, but to the country as a whole that we should have a complete, fair and honest statement before any considerable amount is voted.

Mr. REID (Grenville): The hon. member is perfectly right in saying that Parliament should have that information at the earliest possible date. I am glad the hon. gentleman mentioned it this evening and I shall draw the attention of the Minister of Finance (Sir Thomas White) to his remarks to-morrow morning. The Minister of Finance will take advantage of the opportunity, no doubt, when the House is in Committee of the Whole on the resolution by which he is asking for a vote of $350,000,000, to give a full statement of the financial position of Canada.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Will the minister give us any information in regard to the accountants who are employed?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The Civil Service Commission had in hand the reorganization of the Civil Service, and they employed a staff of accountants. I could not say where they are from, I never made any inquiries, but I would suggest that the matter might be brought up when the vote in connection with the Civil Service Commission is under consideration. If the information is wanted at an early date I will have it brought up in Supply again.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I wish to draw the attention of the minister to a request from my constituency for an additional custom house at Port Felix on the Atlantic coast. This is a fishing village with something like 1,500 inhabitants who are engaged in the inshore and deep-sea fisheries. A number of small vessels are going in and out of that port but there is no custom house nearer than five miles at White Head. It is not convenient for the inhabitants to go that distance to do their business with the custom house. They are also shipping fish to the United States, and some statements have to be filed and entries made in regard to these shipments. It is quite a cost and a burden to have to drive five miles to make these entries. These small customs offices on the coast are very inexpensive. The salary of the officer is a mere trifle, something like $200, and it would be very little compared with the convenience it would be to the people of that locality to have a customs office there. I would be obliged if the Minister would ask the inspector in that district to go into that matter and see if anything can be done to promote the convenience of the merchants, shipowners and others in that district.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I shall have our inspector make an investigation to see whether we should be justified in establishing an office there. Of course, every office we open means more expense to us.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The salary would be very small.

Mr. McKENZIE: Would the minister be able to tell me about the number of the customs warehouses in the province of Nova Scotia, or what might be regarded as private warehouses? There is a great deal

of complaint about the improper use of customs warehouses in that province. It is said that liquors are stored in these warehouses and that in some manner they find their way out of them. The complaint is made that warehouse licenses are given to men who are engaged in the liquor business. There is absolute prohibition in Nova Scotia, and to find that large quantities of liquors are stored in Government warehouses, or in warehouses recognized by the Government, creates a great deal of adverse criticism. Last year I brought this matter to the notice of the Minister of Customs himself (Mr. Sifton) who is not present now, and he told me that no further recognition would be given to such warehouses. That you can find in Hansard. But they are still in existence and they are still a terrible nuisance particularly in that part of the country from which I come. I trust that the Government will not encourage the illicit sale of liquor by recognizing these warehouses. I would like to know how many such licenses there are, for what period they have been granted, and whether it is the intention of the Minister to cease granting them in territories where absolute prohibition prevails so far as it can be carried out by provincial enactment?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The policy adopted when I was Minister of Customs—and I think it is still carried out—was to grant no bonded warehouse licenses in any province without the consent of the provincial authorities. I remember cases where a private individual would apply for a bonded warehouse license—

Mr. McKENZIE: That is what I am complaining about.

Mr. REID (Grenville):—and our answer would be that it would only be granted after getting permission from the local Government. In Nova Scotia there are no bonded warehouse licenses granted, I venture to say, without such permission, and in that way we feel we are only giving effect to the provincial prohibition law. There may have been bonded warehouses where a person had a quantity of liquor stored when the Prohibition Act came into force, and possibly it may be a case of that kind to which the hon. gentleman refers. In that event we would allow the person to have a license until he sold the liquor on hand; but under no conditions would he be allowed to replenish the supply unless the necessary permission was forthcoming from the local Government. I can assure the hon. gentleman that no licenses have been granted in the province of Nova Scotia since last session, unless through the instrumentality of the provincial license board, or whoever is entrusted with the enforcement of the provincial liquor law.

Mr. McKENZIE: I asked the minister to state positively whether there are any bonded warehouses licenses outstanding today. I think there must be, and in that event I want the names of those who hold them. If there are no such licenses then the parties interested are imposing upon a credulous public, because they say they have the necessary authority. They certainly have such places and there are liquors in them. I can assure the minister that there is no such thing in Nova Scotia as a board, or a body of men, with authority to license anybody to sell liquor. Absolute prohibition exists there, except that medical men may sell liquor for sacramental purposes in accordance with the law. The municipal councils can also appoint a few vendors, as they are called, who are licensed to sell on a doctor's certificate. I believe that in the city of Halifax there is a board who have the power of appointing vendors within the city, but that is the extent of their jurisdiction. Apart from this, no body of men is authorized to grant licenses or deal in the liquor traffic in any way. The complaint of the good temperance people of Nova Scotia, particularly those of the county of Cape Breton, is that bonded warehouses or other places are loaded up at night with liquor brought in surreptiously in cars, under the pretext of being carloads of pressed hay. Upon complaining last session, the Minister of Customs assured me that these licenses would be cancelled altogether, but I find that that has not been done. I may tell the minister that in the county of Cape Breton there is a great deal of serious complaint about this matter.

Mr. REID (Grenville): There must be some mistake, because no licenses have been granted by the Customs Department except what we call Class 2 Bonded Warehouse Licenses, which are endorsed "Storage of Liquors not Allowed." Now, as to the charge which the hon. gentleman makes, he knows that the bonded warehouse is in the custody of an officer of the department, who alone keeps the key, and if access to that bonded warehouse is desired it must be obtained in the presence of the officer. Under Dominion statute liquors cannot be shipped into the province of Nova Scotia, neither can any one in the

province import them. It is suggested that someone in the city of Montreal, or the province of Quebec, where the right exists to load and ship liquor, has consigned a carload of liquor, under the guise of being a carload of pressed hay, to someone in Sydney or North Sydney, and that the officer in charge of the bonded warehouse, the only man who has the key, is in league with the owner of the liquor, and permits it to be taken into the bonded warehouse, and afterwards smuggled out and sold to people in the locality. I cannot come to any other conclusion from the statements which the hon. gentleman has made.

I can hardly think that the officers of the Customs Department would allow anything of that kind to go on. The whole responsibility for the observance of the law is in the hands of the officer, the man who has the key of the bonded warehouse. My officers sitting beside me tell me that at the present time they do not know of any licenses that have been issued for bonded warehouses in Nova Scotia for the storage of liquor. It is possible that some person may have had a license prior to the Temperance Act coming into force, and was allowed to keep his liquor in bond until it could be disposed of, but if the law is that liquor cannot be sold in Nova Scotia, it is still there, otherwise the officers of the department are not carrying out their duty. As a result of the statements made by the hon. member tonight, I shall at once instruct the officers of the department to see what bonded warehouses are still in existence where liquor can be stored, and if there are no such bonded warehouses, then they must ascertain whether there is any possibility of liquors being stored in bond. Because I quite believe the hon. member has been informed—probably it may be from stories not founded on fact—that liquor is going in in that way, and of course if any officers are implicated they would not be entitled to remain in the service. But I can hardly believe they would do that. It is quite possible that liquor is being shipped into Nova Scotia in violation of our prohibition law, just the same as it is being shipped into every other province. There is no doubt that liquor is being shipped from the province of Quebec, where there is no prohibition, into all the other provinces in violation of the law, but I feel that when we investigate we will find that liquor is not going into any building under the control of the Customs Department.

Mr. McKENZIE: I am informed that in the town of New Waterford, for instance, there is a private bonded warehouse; that in the town of Glace Bay there is more than one bonded warehouse; and I think that in the town of North Sydney, from which I come, there is at least one bonded warehouse, if not more. When the owners got their licenses I do not know, but they have had them for a long time. The Temperance Act, with its prohibitive clauses, was passed in 1916, and, except for a certain period in the city of Halifax, there was no part of the province where licenses could be issued or where liquor could be legally handled. I do not think there is any good ground in a prohibited area to allow the continuance of these licenses for nearly nine years, and unless the minister can find that there is very good reason for it they should be cancelled altogether. Because I tell him on my responsibility as a member that these bonded warehouses are refuges for the illicit handling of liquor. I am not making any charge against any officers, because I have not any information, but this thing is going on under the eye of the officers Whether they have any complicity in it I am not saying for one moment; all I say is it is going on and it should be stopped.

Mr. REID (Grenville): My officials tell me that there can not be a bonded warehouse at New Waterford because it is not a customs port. They hand me this official report of March 31, 1918, and inform me that no licenses for bonded warehouses have been granted since. This report gives the receipts for the attendance of officers at bonded warehouses for the twelve months ending March 31st, 1918, and the number of bonded warehouses. Of class 2, where liquors are not allowed to be stored, I find that in Halifax there are 29, in Sheet Harbour 1, in Lunenburg 5, in La Have 2, in Sydney 1, in Yarmouth 1. These are licenses granted for the storage of goods other than liquors. At Halifax they have warehouses of class 3, that is, general warehouses where half a dozen merchants can store any goods in bond except liquor; at North Sydney there is 1.

Mr. McKENZIE: Who has it?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I cannot give you that information; but whoever has that bonded warehouse has no right to have liquor in it, and if the officer in charge allows liquor to go into that bonded warehouse he should not only be dismissed, but he should be prosecuted for violating his office. In Sydney there are two bonded warehouses of class 3. Now, it may be possible that in North Sydney or Sydney some

official may be in league with the licensee of the warehouse. I have seen in the press, no doubt the hon. member has seen it too, that in some of the provinces—I do not mean Nova Scotia, but provinces west of Ontario, and probably in Ontario itself—charges have been made against Government officials that they were guilty of conniving with men engaged in the illicit handling of liquor. Possibly such a thing might happen with some of our officers in Nova Scotia, and in that way the information coming to the hon. member might be correct. As he has brought the matter before the House and shown that there may possibly be collusion on the part of our officers I shall make it a point to at once have a thorough inspection of all these warehouses in every province, and if there has been any such collusion in the past the officers should receive the treatment they deserve; but if we cannot find any dereliction of duty on their part, the very fact of the hon. member bringing the matter to the attention of the House, and our inspectors being instructed to investigate every bonded warehouse throughout the Dominion of Canada, will have the effect of stopping anything of that kind in the future.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I understand the minister to say then, that there are no bonded warehouses in the province of Nova Scotia where liquor can be stored. I am quite sure that there have been a good many such warehouses, but whether they exist to-day I do not know. I know a case in a certain town in Nova Scotia where the bonded warehouse was in the cellar of the hotel.

In some mysterious way the liquor seems to find its way from the cellar up to the bar where it is distributed to the customer. I do not think that is going on in that particular hotel at the present time, but it was certainly an abuse of the bonded warehouse system. The minister, I understand, read us a list of bonded warehouses, and he said that in not one of them can liquor legally be stored. The inference I take from that is that there is in Nova Scotia no place under the control of the Dominion Government where liquor can legally be stored. Am I right?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The information given to me by my officials is that in Nova Scotia there are no bonded warehouses in which liquor may be stored by any private individual. The hon. member might catch me just a little if I said that there is no liquor stored in any of those bonded warehouses, because if a customs officer in Nova Scotia gets word of a carload of liquor that is there against the law, it would be his duty to seize it and put it into a bonded warehouse. There might, therefore accidentally be some liquor there that was seized and not yet disposed of, but unless it is there under a seizure or at the request of the local government or on their authority. I do not think there is any liquor stored in any bonded warehouse in Nova Scotia. At all events we are not granting and will not grant licenses for bonded warehouses in Nova Scotia without the consent of the local government. I remember cases where licenses have been requested from Western Canada for the purpose of storing liquor. I think one request came from Manitoba, the party stating in his letter: There is no license board here and no one has any authority. I replied that authority would have to be secured from the deputy minister or the minister of the department, and I think in one case the party was successful in getting that authority. Licenses may have been granted on the suggestion of the local government of Nova Scotia, but if the Government of Nova Scotia has not consented, then I do not think there is a license in that province.

Mr. McKENZIE: I do not think the Government of Nova Scotia has, since 1910, consented to the granting of any license to any person in that province to keep a bonded warehouse for the purpose of storing liquor. I should like the minister, through his officials, to inquire into the matter. If there are any such licenses, or if the Government of Nova Scotia has consented to the granting of a license to any one for a bonded warehouse for storing liquor, I have a right to know it. I do not believe that such is the case.

Mr. REID (Grenville): Yes, the hon. member has that right.

Mr. McKENZIE: I shall be very much surprised, because the Government of Nova Scotia has been strongly in favour of temperance and been passing strong temperance laws, particularly since 1910, if that Government or any member of it has given permission to, or helped directly or indirectly any person to get a license for the purpose of evading their own law. If there is such a case, we want to know it, and I want, if possible, to know if the Government of Nova Scotia or any official of the Govervent is participating in any such transaction.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I agree with the hon. member that there should not be any such licenses, and I will write him a letter to-morrow, stating just what the situation is in Nova Scotia. When the prohibition Order in Council came into force, the only licenses that I remember were granted were licenses in St. John and Halifax for ships' stores or for export, but as soon as we passed that Order in Council, those licenses were cancelled. I remember the matter coming up about St. John. There were in St. John some firms whose whole business had been the storage of liquor for selling to vessels entering the port and going out again, and they felt sore in regard to the matter. Their licenses were allowed to continue in force only until they got rid of their stock, and then their licenses were cancelled and they went out of business. I shall be very much surprised if there is a license for storing liquor in Nova Scotia. The official sitting beside me, who has charge of those licenses, says there is none.

Mr. McKENZIE: If the minister will see that a vigorous campaign is instituted against the existence of such warehouses he will be doing a great service to the cause of temperance in Nova Scotia and will win the gratitude of the good people who are putting forth great efforts to suppress the evil of intemperance in that province.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I will certainly do that, and I will say further that I cannot understand how any one is going to get liquor into that province, because the Government railways cannot carry that liquor except in violation of the law. I gave orders that they were not to carry it, and that the officials were to have a vigorous compaign to see that no one was allowed to ship it in under the guise of some other article. No matter whether the liquor is being shipped to the province or in the province, it is in direct violation of the law, and I will again ask the officials to watch the matter very closely and to see that every possible precaution is taken to prevent violation of the law, either by transportation or importation.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): As the minister has mentioned the carriage of liquor by the railways, I want to point out to him that it is generally consumed by some person on the railway before it reaches its destination. I have not the slightest doubt that nearly every train leaving Montreal for the Maritime Provinces contains illegal packages. In 1916, the Government passed a law prohibiting the exportation of liquor from a province like Quebec, in which liquor can legally be sold, into a province like Nova Scotia which is a dry area. The law was made very positive that no liquor could legally be carried by the railway from one province to another in violation of the law of the province to which it was sent. At that time the question arose as to who was to prosecute, and a long discussion took place in the House as to how that should be dealt with. The attention of the Minister of Justice was drawn to the fact that the violations occur, let us say, in the city of Montreal, and the prosecutions in the Maritime Provinces are under the control of the municipalities, and it would be very difficult for a local municipality to prosecute a wholesale merchant in Montreal who had illegally shipped liquor into Nova Scotia. We, therefore, put into the Act a clause making it the duty of the Justice Department to carry on these prosecutions and to see to it that no violation of the law of 1916 took place.

That step was hailed with great delight by the temperance people throughout the Maritime Provinces, and the clergymen thanked the Lord that we had a Government that not only passed a law prohibiting the carriage of liquor, but also gave us the Minister of Justice of Canada to enforce that law. It looked very good on the face of it. Ever since that Act was passed it was known by everybody down there that liquor was going into the Maritime Provinces every day; there were two trains every day, and my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition has told the committee that the liquor was packed in the centre of carloads of hay, and that great quantities were shipped in that way. This has been going on for the last three years, and the other day I ventured to ask the Acting Minister of Justice how many prosecutions had been brought by the Minister of Justice since 1916, the year in which the Act was passed. And what do you think was the reply? The answer was, none. The Minister of Justice has done nothing, although the railway has carried the liquor and the railway employees have been drinking it as it went along. The Minister of Justice has gone to sleep, and the good people who prayed for him and thanked the Lord we had such a minister have been deceived.

Mr. NICHOLSON (Algoma): The accusation just made by the hon. member for Guysborough (Mr. Sinclair) is a very sweeping one, and if it is correct some recogni-

tion must be taken of it. I gather from what he says that information has been laid before the Justice Department by some responsible person, that violations of the law have taken place, and that the Justice Department has refused or failed to act. If that is the case, the House and the country should know it. If it is merely a case of hearsay, the House and the country should also know it. I do not think the hon. member would suggest that the Minister of Justice should go down to the province of Quebec or the province of New Brunswick or Nova Scotia and act as detective while the cars are being unloaded, but if any responsible citizen has laid an information, as the law provides for, and the Justice Department has failed to act, we should certainly know it.

Mr. REID (Grenville): Perhaps the hon. member for Guysborough will bring this matter up when the Estimates of the Justice Department are under consideration.

Mr. DUFF: This talk of bonded warehouses and kindred matters is apt to make us rather dry. With regard to the item under discussion, I should like to know what percentage of the item is accounted for by the statutory increases in the Outside Service of the Customs Department.

Mr. REID (Grenville): There are no statutory increases in the Outside Service. In the Inside Service, there is a statutory increase of about fifty dollars a year until the maximum of the class is reached. In the Outside Service, the matter of salary increases has been left to the minister in the past, but now the Civil Service Commission are classifying the whole Service, Inside and Outside, and it is expected the Outside servants will get a regular statutory increase. The officer at a small port might start at a salary of $1,000 a year, and rise by annual increases of $50 up to $1,500, or whatever was the maximum for that port.

Mr. DUFF: I understood the minister to say earlier in the evening that the increase of $110,000 was practically accounted for by salaries. That would be about twenty-nine per cent of $3,000,000. I do not think the increases should be as high as that.

Mr. REID (Grenville): There are 3,283 officers, and the increase would average about $35.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a vacancy in the staff at North Sydney caused by the death of an officer by the name of McLeod. I should like to know if anything is being done to fill that office, and whether preference will be given to returned soldiers in making the appointment.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I understand that it is not necessary to fill that office, but if it is to be filled, the appointment will be made by the Civil Service Commission. I understand that the Minister of Customs (Mr. Sifton) is carrying out the policy I insisted on when in charge of the Customs Department. During the last two years I was in charge, every vacancy was filled by a returned soldier who had served at the front, and I made about 380 appointments during that time; I understand that about 200 appointments have since been made. I understand that the Civil Service Commission are giving preference to returned soldiers in every case, and they are certainly doing it in regard to my department, because I insist on it being done. I think every member of this House will agree that the men who have served at the front must get the positions if they can fill them, and they will get them.

Mr. DUFF: I am very glad to hear that the minister has carried out that policy but certainly the Minister of Customs is not carrying it out, as I can prove by a case in my county last year.

Mr. REID (Grenville): All appointments are made by the Civil Service Commission, and they are carrying out the policy of giving returned soldiers the preference.

Mr. DUFF: I called the attention of the Minister of Customs to this vacancy before the appointment was made.

Mr. REID (Grenville): Where was it?

Mr. DUFF: At Riverport.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Last year a vacancy occurred in the Customs service at Port Hastings, in the county of Inverness. I called the attention of the Minister of Customs at the time to the fact that he had appointed an aged gentleman to the position without examination. The minister had assured me that whoever was chosen for the position would have to take the examination, but I do not think this old gentleman did take it; I do not think he could. What I want to ask the minister is this: In that case would it not be proper for him to have this position filled by a returned soldier? There are many of them who are well qualified for the position, and in making such appointment the minister would only be doing what was right.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I have just made inquiry and am informed by one of my officials that in March, 1918, a man named W. H. Skinner was appointed at a salary of about $300. He must surely have some other occupation, because he could not possibly live on $300. I do not know how the appointment was made, but I suppose it was by the Civil Service Commission.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Was the appointment permanent?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I shall have to ascertain why the appointment was made and just what the situation is. In some small places it has been found difficult up to the present time to get returned soldiers. Some of these places pay small amounts ranging from $50 to $300, and they could not get returned soldiers to take the positions owing to the smallness of the salary, while in many cases no returned soldiers were available. It is necessary to get a man living near who has some other occupation, and an appointment of that kind may have been made temporarily until a returned soldier could be found. You can hardly expect a returned soldier to go into a port and live on $300. You would have to secure a man who had some other means such as a pension, but there are positions of the kind which undoubtedly would offer great assistance to a returned soldier who had been seriously wounded and whose pension, being insufficient to support him, would be augmented by some $200 or $300. I think that is being done; in fact, I know of one case in which a returned soldier superseded a man who was willing to give way to and help the returned man, although the salary was not large.

Mr. CHISHOLM: I think this is nothing more nor less than a political appointment, because I understand that the regulations of the department call for an examination. I had the assurance of the minister last year that there would be an examination, but it was never held, and this old gentleman was appointed. The man who filled the position previously—I think his name was Forbes—had held it for a number of years, and his son, the only support of a widowed mother, acted for three or four years before his father's death. One would expect that it would be only natural for the department to allow this young man to continue in the service, as he requested to be allowed to do, until he could have an opportunity of taking an examination. The department did not see their way clear to grant this request but appointed this particular friend who was a very active politician in the district. I am not scrupulous enough to say that this was very reprehensible if the Government were pretending to be appointing men to office on account of their political persuasion. But when we have a Government who claim to have abolished patronage and who appoint men to positions of this kind although they have not fulfilled the regulations, I certainly must take exception to their action. They are not living up to the standard which they have set. Apart from this however, there are several soldiers there who have been home for some time and, if I mistake not, there was a returned man in the vicinity at the time the department made the appointment. I suppose the soldier did not care to make application for the position, but there are soldiers there now who would be glad to get it. It is not necessary that the soldier should be a cripple in order to get an appointment. If he is back from the service and is working on a farm I think it would be only a reasonable recognition of the part he has played in the war to give him an opportunity of filling any of these positions if he cares to take it. Under these circumstances, therefore, I say that this position was filled for political purposes, and for no other reason. I corresponded with this young man and told him the examination would be held, and although I wrote the department requesting them to notify him when the examination would take place—I think it was to be held in Sydney—he never received a notice. However I understand my friend is permanently appointed.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I hardly believe the Minister of Customs would countenance political patronage. At all events the appointment was before the Civil Service Act came into force, and at that time it was necessary to fill the position by the minister. He had to take recommendations from the best source that was available to him, and no matter what means he took to obtain the best man he could, he would be open to criticism.

Mr. READ (Prince): I desire to say a few words on this question. I think the whole country has gone crazy on this matter. If I had an enemy, or if I wanted to do the soldiers a dis-service, I would endeavour to get them into the Civil Service. If there is any calling in the country more degrading than another, it is the Civil Service. Put a man into the Civil Service, and, as a general rule, you spoil him for anything else. But apart from that, he is bereft of all ambition and his career

is destroyed. You might as well commit economic suicide as enter the Civil Service. There are soldiers coming across the seas who are persuaded by this propaganda —whether it is political or otherwise, I do not know,—that the Civil Service is a desirable thing to get into. But I would not put a dog into it.

Mr. FIELDING: There being no statutory increases for the outside service, by what method is it proposed to discover who are entitled to increases and who are not? What is the modus operandi by which increases are granted?

Mr. REID (Grenville): During the time I was Minister of Customs,—and I suppose the practice is the same at present and will continue unless we can get the classification through the present session,—the position was this: The officials of the department, that is, the commissioner, the assistant commissioner and the inspectors, knew those who were entitled to increases and made a list which they submitted to the minister, and I think in almost every case the recommendations were acted upon. Some one may ask: Why some and not others? In posts where men have reached their maximum their salaries remain stationary. Under the old Civil Service Act there were several classes. There was a maximum for inspectors, one for assistant inspectors, messengers, etc. That is why I say it would not probably apply to every officer in the outside service.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The minister has told us that all these appointments are to be made by the Civil Service Commission?

Mr. REID (Grenville): Yes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I can understand how the Civil Service Commission can make an appointment after examination. If they want to fill a position they can examine the applicants and find out the one best qualified. But there is another class of cases where that cannot be done. In my own constituency the position of harbour master of Canso became vacant a few months ago.

Mr. REID (Grenville): That is in the Department of Marine.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I do not care where it is; I want to get at the principle upon which the commission act. To my knowledge there are three or four applicants for the position, all good men, but not one is known to the commission. How are the commission to decide between these three or four applicants, a thousand miles away, men they never saw and know nothing about? Is it by some rule of thumb in the office here? It would not be proper to correspond with anybody down there; it would not be proper, under the system which my hon. friend says is such a splendid one, to ask me who is the best man, and I would not venture to say anything about it. But how do they arrive at a decision in a case of that kind?

Mr. REID (Grenville): Again I must ask my hon. friend to bring that up on the Civil Service item. But there have been a good many appointments in the department I am administering.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Without examination?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I never ask them that at all. The only inquiry I make when a man is sent to me to fill a position is whether he is a returned soldier. If I get the answer "yes," I ask no questions as to what steps the commission have taken in examining him for the position. I know he is qualified in one way and I am willing to give him a six months' trial. If he does not prove himself to be qualified he must then make way. As long as they are carrying out that part of the law I feel satisfied that we have a proper system of examination.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): My hon. friend has not dealt with my point. I think he will admit that there are a number of appointees in his department that are not subject to examination; for instance, those at small ports where there are salaries of $200 or $300. He must be satisfied that such appointments are made by the commission without knowing anything about how they are made. Let us put aside altogether the question of the returned soldier, because if a returned soldier is available for a position everybody will say, let him have it. The case that I mention is one with which a returned soldier is not concerned at all. None of these men is a returned soldier. Every one is well qualified for the position. Then, take a case in the department of my hon. friend where there is no clerical work to do and no examination. How do the commission arrive at a decision where there are two or three parties applying for the same position?

Mr. REID (Grenville): There is no trouble about that. Take a small port in Nova Scotia. There are several applicants

for a $300 position. The commission suggests that the inspector go to the place, examine the applicants, take their papers and send them back to the commission. Then, the commission may decide which man they believe is the best. In addition to that the inspector himself can examine the applicants after the Civil Service examination has taken place. It is no trouble for the Civil Service Commission to hold an examination in several places in Nova Scotia. In a small place where the salary is only a few hundred dollars they can depend on the inspector examining the applicants and making a report as to their qualifications.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): In the case to which my hon. friend from Guysborough refers, the position of harbour master of Canso, of which I have no knowledge, the Civil Service Commission would ask for applicants. An application form would give the age, previous occupation, and qualifications of each applicant and he would also be required to give three references. If they did not seek advice from any other source they would arbitrarily decide which of the applicants would seem to be the best qualified for the position. It may be a very arbitrary method of reaching a decision but that is what they do. In the case of appointments to the post office, particularly rural post office, the commission always seek the assistance of the inspector for the province. I imagine that in most cases the inspector would make some personal inquiry himself before advising the commission. In the case of a harbour master I do not think there would be any provincial official with whom the commission could communicate.

Mr. FIELDING: Returning for a moment to the question of salary increases in the outside service, my hon. friend says they are made on the recommendation of the commissioner, the assistant commissioner and the inspector. In regard to the minor offices throughout the country the commissioner could not really know anything about them except by correspondence and the assistant commissioner would be no better off. The only official who would have any knowledge of the efficiency and the services rendered by these various officers would be the inspector. Can we assume that such increases are always made on the recommendation of the inspector?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The commissioner would have some knowledge of the amount of work in connection with these offices from the reports sent to the department.

Mr. FIELDING: Of the volume of business.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I mean the volume of business. Returns are sent to the department of the clearances of vessels and the work performed in the different ports. You might have a case where an officer might probably have received $150 at the time he took the position and when there would be only a dozen clearances during the year. But the work would have increased very much at that particular port. We would have that information in addition to the report of the inspector himself.

Then, of course, the inspector would be better able to judge because there are places where, although the record did not show much business done, the person appointed as preventive officer might have to travel over a long piece of coast in order to prevent smuggling. In the gulf of St. Lawrence there are cases of that kind, and the inspector would know what work the man was performing and be able to make a report concerning it. The commissioner would have to depend a great deal on the information which he gets in this way, and upon his own knowledge of conditions when he placed an official at certain work. I do not know any other way in which an estimate could be arrived at. This is what has been depended upon in adjusting the salaries under the rule for the last twenty-five or thirty years. Now the Civil Service Commission are endeavouring to see whether they cannot introduce an improvement, under which the officials in the outside service throughout the Dominion would be placed on a more satisfactory basis.

Mr. FIELDING: I quite agree with my hon. friend when he says that the revenue is not to be the only measure of usefulness. There are many places throughout our coast line where the collection of revenue would be small, but the service is important because of its preventive character, and if you did not have these officers there the revenue would lose a great deal. But the point I was coming to is, how the minister and his officials, whose good purpose I am perfectly satisfied with, can obtain any knowledge of the operations on the coast except through the inspector, and I am leading up in my own mind to the question whether these things are done through the inspector or otherwise. If my hon. friend says it is done through the inspector, I think that is a fair answer.

Mr. REID (Grenville): We have a report from the collector of the port as well as from the inspector. In the province of Nova Scotia, as in the other Maritime Provinces, all these officials in the out ports are under one particular collector who makes a report to the commissioner of the work performed by each. It is the only way that I can see whereby we can come to a conclusion as to what is fair and right in the matter of remuneration. There may possibly be cases where there has not been absolutely fair treatment, but I think while I was administering the department the officials as a rule were satisfied that the staff was being fairly treated, and I believe that policy will be continued.

Mr. McKENZIE: With respect to the vacancy in the port where I live, did I understand the minister to say it is not intended to fill it?

Mr. MACLEAN: I remember having a communication from some person in North Sydney many months ago in respect to this position, and I was informed upon inquiry, I think by the Customs Department, that it was considered unnecessary to fill it.

Mr. McKENZIE: This man McLeod was the customs officer at the railway station, and another officer may have been transferred to take his place. If that is so, I have nothing to say, but there should be an officer there.

Customs: — Miscellaneous — Printing and stationery, subscriptions to commercial papers, etc., $200,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is a large increase here. To what is it due?

Mr. REID (Grenville): It represents the regular increase based on the higher cost of materials and labour.

Customs:—To provide for expenses and maintenance of revenue cruisers and preventive service, $105,000.

Mr. DUFF: What is the reason for the increase here?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The Customs Department had a large steamer, the Margaret. It was a new boat and had only arrived on this side of the Atlantic a few months before the war broke out. The Naval Department requisitioned the steamer and took it to Halifax where it was placed on service in adjacent waters. This vessel has now been brought back and re-commissioned for her regular route.

Mr. DUFF: How many steamers are there engaged in this service, and what work do they perform?

Mr. REID (Grenville): This vote covers other vessels besides the Margaret. If I remember aright, we bought a steamer for cruising operations around Sydney. I can recall a discussion which took place with reference to that vessel when I was Minister of Customs.

Mr. McKENZIE: That was the Alert.

Mr. REID (Grenville): That was the Alert. There is no danger now of illicit operations because importations of liquor are prohibited.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is the Alert still sailing the seas?

Mr. REID (Grenville): Yes.

Mr. DENIS: How many of these revenue cruisers are there?

Mr. REID (Grenville): There are the Margaret, Alert, Winamac and Zaidee.

Mr. DENIS: This item is also for preventive service. Are we to understand that the preventive service is carried on exclusively by the revenue cruisers, or is it done by other means?

Mr. REID (Grenville): This vote also provides for the salaries of the chief preventive officer, Mr. Wilson, and his staff, and their expenses.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Will the minister say if the vacancy created at Boylston by the dismissal of an officer some time ago has been filled?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I cannot find the names of any Government officer at Boylston.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I am told there was an officer there, but he was dismissed.

Mr. REID (Grenville): There is no officer there now.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Is there any intention of appointing one?

Mr. REID (Grenville): No.

Mr. MORPHY: Will the hon. minister inform me as to the duty of the preventive service in a case like the following: According to press reports a large cargo of whisky, or alcohol and white whisky, was wrecked on the coast of Nova Scotia and considerable quantities of it were taken inland and cached; some of it has since been discovered. Does the preventive service operate at sea to prevent smuggling; does the Customs Department get any

revenue out of this liquor when it is found; and are they taking any steps to find it, or are they going to leave it to Nova Scotia?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The vessels that I have just mentioned are employed in that service and it is the duty of officers in command to seize any such liquors. I noticed that item in the newspapers. The people who cached that whisky did so before the preventive officers arrived on the scene, otherwise they would not have had a chance to seize it.

Mr. MORPHY: Is it too late now to get the revenue from that cargo?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The whisky is gone; that is the trouble.

Mr. MORPHY: I suppose the preventive authorities will take care of that?

Mr. McKENZIE: I am sure it is the intention of the hon. minister to have an efficient service from those boats.

Mr. REID (Grenville): Oh, yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: I take it for granted that wherever he is paying out public money for the preventive service it is his intention to get value for it? I would like to find out something about the Alert—not the old stories they used to tell about her, for I believe she has quite reformed and is leading a much better life, and far it be from me to remind her of her old sins. But suppose a steamer is attempting to smuggle liquor from St. Pierre, which is a little island only sixty miles from our coast where they have the right, under the law of France, to handle liquor, I presume the Alert is maintained for the purpose of preventing that smuggling, and is presumed to have sufficient speed to overhaul any steamer trying to get away from her. I would like to know the horse-power of the Alert, her age, tonnage, and particularly her speed, and also some information about her seaworthiness, because I am told that the Alert is not of much use beyond lying in harbour and cruising on fine days when the sea is very, very calm, and that when it comes to chasing she cannot chase herself very far. I think men who have very fast boats and know they can outsail the Alert go over to St. Pierre, load up with liquor and smuggle it into the locality. I would like the minister to make inquiry and see whether he is getting value for the money he is paying for the maintenance of this boat.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I will be very glad to do that. Of course, it was difficult to get any steamer during the last two or three years. The officials say the Alert has been doing good work in preventing smuggling in that locality.

Mr. McKENZIE: If they are ready to give me information I will be delighted to hear of one thing the Alert has done.

Mr. REID (Grenville): The hon. member will remember, when she did good work according to his statement. The hon. member will remember the trip which he discussed in this House.

Mr. McKENZIE: Oh, yes. This is a new Parliament; perhaps they did not hear about that. The hon. member knows that she was in this service at that time and he was paying the salaries of the crew. Under his supervision she was permitted to load with rum at North Sydney, and it was used for corrupting the electorate in the northern part of Victoria county. That is the service she rendered.

Mr. REID (Grenville): The hon. member said she did well. A few minutes ago the leader of the Opposition brought up a question as to whether there were any licensed bonded warehouses in Nova Scotia, and the statements I made in answer were what I had from the Customs Department, which were correct. However, I communicated with the Inland Revenue Department in order to see whether there might be any possibility of bonded warehouses under that department. I now have an official of the Inland Revenue Department beside me. Of course, the hon. gentleman (Mr. McKenzie) will understand that I know nothing of the Inland Revenue Department so far as its administration is concerned. The Assistant Commissioner of Inland Revenue tells me that in Nova Scotia there are the following bonded warehouse licenses issued by the Inland Revenue Department: John A. McKay, New Waterford; Pius Gannon, North Sydney; A. S. Taylor, Glace Bay; The P. Doherty Co., Ltd., Sydney; H. Conter, New Waterford; G. Martinello Co., Ltd., Sydney; Mayflower Bottling Co., Ltd., Sydney; King Bottling Co., Glace Bay; John A. McRae, Glace Bay; Michael Nolan, Glace Bay; Mendel Maganet, Glace Bay; Felix Dipenta, Sydney; G. Martinello Co., Ltd., Sydney. The Assistant Commissioner tells me that these parties had licenses issued to them prior to the passing of the Order in Council prohibiting the importation or sale of liquor throughout the Dominion of Canada.

They had a quantity of liquor in store, and the licenses were extended simply in order that they might hold the liquor in

store. Instructions were sent to the officials of the Inland Revenue Department that those people were not to be allowed to take in any more liquor than what was in store at the time the licenses were granted, and they were to hold it until they could export the liquor or dispose of it in accordance with the laws of Nova Scotia. The liquor had to be exported or sold or destroyed; it was not allowed to be disposed of in any other way. I think the hon. member will agree with me that the information I had from the Customs Department is correct, and if the information the hon. member has given to the House is correct, namely, that some of these bonded warehouses are allowing liquor to be put into them in violation of the law—because they cannot accept it in accordance with the law—then some official or officials in the Inland Revenue Department or some officers who have charge of the keys of the bonded warehouses must be in collusion with those who own the bonded warehouses. The statement of the hon. member in regard to the bonded warehouses is very serious, and it is the duty of the Inland Revenue Department to investigate every bonded warehouse in Nova Scotia and other places where there are bonded warehouses in order to find out whether there is any truth in his statement. If those bonded warehouses are in existence, some means should be taken to see that the liquor is exported or destroyed or disposed of in the province legally, and those bonded warehouses should be got rid of at the earliest possible moment.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): The bonded warehouses mentioned by the minister are all in the island of Cape Breton. Can he give us the names of owners of bonded warehouses on the mainland of Nova Scotia?

Mr. REID (Grenville): McCullough and Creelman, Truro; the National Drug and Chemical Company, Halifax. The latter have a bonded warehouse for medicine. No others appear on the list in Nova Scotia. Something may not be altogether right in the list I have given, but we shall have a thorough investigation into all those bonded warehouses. I promise the hon. member I will send one of our best officials to investigate the whole situation in the bonded warehouses in Nova Scotia, as well as in bonded warehouses in other parts of the Dominion.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I understand a reference was made to an extension of the licenses. Have they been extended, and if so, for what period of time? How much intoxicating liquor was there in those warehouses at the time the prohibition Order in Council was passed and that extension was given, and how much is there now?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I cannot this evening give the hon. member that information. Those licenses were granted a year ago, and the assistant commissioner of Inland Revenue tells me that the minister in charge of the department informed him that those licenses will not be renewed; that the parties who have those licenses must, prior to the expiry of them, dispose of the liquor, either by exporting it or by disposing of it in the province legally. Otherwise the liquor will be destroyed .

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): When were those licenses issued?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The first of April a year ago.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Was not the Prohibition Order in Council passed a year ago?

Mr. REID (Grenville): I do not remember the date now. Even if it were passed about that time, if a large quantity of liquor was stored in those warehouses, the licenses would have to be renewed.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I understood the minister to say, at some period in this discussion, that the licenses were renewed. Are we to understand that they were new licenses that were given to those people within the year, or were they licenses that were renewed?

Mr. REID (Grenville): They were old licenses that had been in existence prior to April 1, 1918, and that were renewed. None of those was a new license issued either by the Minister of Customs or by myself within the last year.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): When will those licenses expire?

Mr. REID (Grenville): On the 31st of March, and they cannot and will not be renewed without the consent of the Government of Nova Scotia.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I suppose the minister has, in his department, information as to the quantity of liquor that was stored in those bonded warehouses a year ago and also the quantity there now.

Mr. REID (Grenville): An officer of the department has a full record of what was

there at the time and what has been disposed of since, and he should be able to put his hand on it in five minutes.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Will the minister give that information to the House when his Estimates are taken up again?

Mr. REID (Grenville): Yes.

Mr. McKENZIE: There is, in my part of the country, a general impression that liquor was put into those bonded warehouses for a purpose. Notice was given by the Government that on a certain date a certain Order in Council would be passed, and there was a most desperate rush to get hundreds of thousands of dollars worth of liquor into those bonded warehouses in Nova Scotia, although the people who shipped it in had a full knowledge that the Order in Council would be in force on a certain date. The impression is that, by some influence or another brought to bear upon the department, those licenses were either renewed or permitted to exist under those circumstances after those places were filled to the rafters improperly and illegally, and with the full knowledge that the Order in Council was to be passed. There is a feeling abroad amongst the temperance people in that part of the country that is not at all amicable to the department, because the officials of the department are blamed, justly or not, with being in league with those parties and helping them to move their liquor into those places from which it is being doled out. It cannot get out except when an officer is there. All those people who have those licenses are old-time rum sellers, and it is the most extraordinary thing that only such people have those licenses, when for the last ten years, indeed, for the last twenty years there has been no permission to sell liquor in that province. We had the Scott Act in 1910, and the minister knows how old the Scott Act is. For the last thirty years, I might say, there have been no means of selling liquor in the county of Cape Breton except illegally.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I am glad of the discussion this evening. I am satisfied, from what the assistant commissioner tells me, that everything has been done to prevent illegalities in all the provinces. The prohibition order came into force about the middle of March last year, and I have no doubt that large quantities were shipped in immediately prior to that. People would import it in the hope of selling it to the local governments for medicinal purposes, for instance. Of course, attempts are made in different parts of Canada to violate the law. The result of this discussion to-night will be vigorous efforts on the part of officers of the department to ascertain just what is going on and to take greater precautions, if that be possible. When the stocks in these bonded warehouses are disposed of, the licenses will be cancelled, and no more will be issued.

Mr. READ (Prince, P.E.I.): How many of these bonded warehouses are there in Prince Edward Island, and what are the names of the parties controlling them?

Mr. REID (Grenville): There are none in Prince Edward Island for liquor; only for tobacco.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): I suppose these licenses and the renewals are in writing? When the minister brings down the information that has been asked for, I should also like to know what was the quantity of liquor stored in these warehouses at the time the licenses were issued, also the quantity on hand at the present time; and the form of license, so that we can see the conditions under which the sales are to be made.

Mr. REID (Grenville): I will bring down that information, and will also give it personally to my hon. friend and to the leader of the Opposition, because it is in that part of the country where a large number of these warehouses are. If we ascertain the quantity on hand when prohibition came into effect, and the quantity now on hand, we shall be able to find out whether there has been any collusion or not, so far as those figures will show; but it must be remembered that if there has been collusion the parties would probably try to cover it up. At all events, I shall bring down the information.

Excise—Travelling expenses, rent, fuel, stationery, etc., $100,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What accounts for this increase?

Mr. REID (Grenville): It is on account of the extra expense in travelling, hotel bills and so forth.

Excise—Stamps for imported and Canadian tobacco, $125,000.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): What does this item for stamps mean?

Mr. REID (Grenville): It is for printing.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Is not all the printing done under contract with the Finance Department?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The Finance Department have a contract with the American Bank Note Company, but this department pays for its share of the stamps.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Guysborough): Has a settlement ever been made with the merchants in connection with the stamps on matches? There was a good deal of confusion in connection with the new law. It was not clearly understood when it was coming into effect, and the dealers were instructed to stamp all the matches they had in stock at a certain date. Some of them did so, at a considerable expense. Then they discovered that the Act was not to come into force until some weeks later, and that they had spent their money needlessly. I understood that a refund was to be made. Has the department ever settled with these people?

Mr. REID (Grenville): The Assistant Commissioner tells me that all these cases have been settled satisfactorily.

Excise—Preventive service—Salaries, $110,000.

Mr. LEMIEUX: How does the minister account for this decrease?

Mr. REID (Grenville): Distilleries have been closed up, and not so many officers are employed.

Mr. DUFF: Have many seizures of illicit stills been made by the department?

Mr. REID (Grenville): Since prohibition has come into force the seizures have increased by 1,100 per cent.

Mr. CHISHOLM: Has the department appointed any officers whose duty it is to look after these illicit stills?

Mr. REID (Grenville): Now that the illicit stills have increased by 1,110 per cent, the hon. gentleman can readily understand that it takes more officers to hunt them down than were required before prohibition came into effect. The department is doing everything it can to put an end to these illicit stills. If it were not for these illicit stills, we could get along with considerably fewer officers.

Mr. DUFF: Where are these illicit stills located? How many seizures have been made?

Mr. REID (Grenville): In Ontario there are 37; in Quebec, 25; in New Brunswick, 1; in Nova Scotia, 3; in Manitoba, 6; in Alberta, 13; in Moosejaw, 7; in Vancouver, 11; in Victoria, 2.

Mr. READ (Prince): Are there any in Prince Edward Island?

Mr. REID (Grenville): No. The seizures were ten last year, and this year 110.

Excise—To enable the department to supply methylated spirits to manufacturers, the cost of which will be recouped by the manufacturers to whom it is supplied and to pay rent, power, freight, salaries, etc., $400,000.

Mr. McKENZIE: It is the desire to have this item of $400,000 stand.

Mr. REID (Grenville): Then the whole item will have to stand.

Mr. McKENZIE: Is there any great urgency about these votes for excise? We need not go over it all again. The Chairman will remember that we have discussed it all except this item of $400,000. I am willing that the next, $500, shall be dealt with and carried.

Mr. LEMIEUX: What became of Mr. Vincent, Deputy Minister of Inland Revenue?

Mr. REID (Grenville): There is now only one deputy minister. Mr. Vincent was given his salary of $5,000 for this year and is receiving the salary of deputy minister as in the Estimates.

Progress reported.

On motion of Mr. Reid, the House adjourned at 11.03 p.m.

Monday, March 31, 1919.

The Speaker took the Chair at Three o'clock.

GRAND TRUNK PACIFIC RAILWAY RECEIVERSHIP.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I beg to lay upon the table of the House, Mr. Speaker, certain information asked for in connection with the receivership of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company by my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition, consisting of the following documents and correspondence:

(a) Copies of the important correspondence passing between Grand Trunk officials and members of the Government in connection with the negotiations that were carried on;

(b) Copies of communications between the Receiver and officials of the Grand Trunk Pacific;

(c) Copies of certain communications that have passed between Grand Trunk officials and the Government since the passing of the Order in Council;

(d) Copies of the Order and an amending Order dated March 13, 1919;

(e) Balance sheets of the Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Company and of its subsidiary companies, and statements of revenue and expenditure of the system.

FURTHER SUPPLEMENTARY ESTIMATES FOR 1919-20.

A message from His Excellency the Governor General transmitting further Supplementary Estimates for the year ending Mach 31, 1920, was presented by Sir Thomas White (Acting Prime Minister), read by Mr. Speaker to the House, and referred to the Committee of Supply.

JUVENILE DELINQUENTS ACT 1908.

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice) moved the first reading of Bill No. 40, (letter G of the Senate), intituled: "An Act to amend the Juvenile Delinquents Act, 1908." He said: This is a Bill from the Senate. Its purpose is to remedy a defect in the Code whereby officers in charge of the enforcement of these provisions were not subject to the ordinary restraints against bribery.

DAYLIGHT SAVING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX (Maisonneuve): With your leave, Mr. Speaker, in view of the adoption of daylight saving by several of our municipalities, and in view of the change in the time table of the railway systems of this country, might I ask the Acting Prime Minister what the Government intends to do in the matter having regard to the vote of this House last week?

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): The Inside and Outside Civil Service has always conformed to local municipal regulations with regard to time. Therefore the Civil Service will, so far as practicable, conform to local time as established by municipal regulation.

With regard to the sessions of Parliament, which now begin every afternoon at three o'clock, except upon Wednesdays, when the session begins at two o'clock standard time, it has not yet been intimated to the Government what official action will be taken by the city of Ottawa;—that we shall know by to-morrow.

We also desire to await the decision of the Board of Railway Commissioners on the question of railway time tables, which will be before it for consideration to-morrow. The House will therefore meet to-morrow by standard time, as it has met to-day. After we have received official information as to the action taken by the City of Ottawa and the decision of the Board of Railway Commissioners, I shall announce to the House the course which will be suggested by the Government with respect to the hour of the meeting of Parliament, having regard to the convenience of members.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I should like to ask a question concerning another aspect of this matter. Railway corporations undoubtedly have the right to change their time tables, but has the Government considered what authority these corporations have for changing the time?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: That question is at present before the Board of Railway Commissioners for determination.

Sir SAM HUGHES: They may change their time tables, but not the time.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I understand that it is the question of change of time tables that is before the Board of Railway Commissioners.

Sir SAM HUGHES: Is it the question of time tables, or the question of a change of time on the part of the railway companies? Any railway system may change its time table, but they may not change the time.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The railways have changed the time and that question will come before the Board of Railway Commissioners to-morrow for determination as they may deem proper.

PRIVILEGE—Mr. GAUVREAU.

Mr. C. A. GAUVREAU (Temiscouata): I rise to a question of privilege. In Friday's Hansard I am reported as follows, in connection with the Bill brought down by the Minister of Railways (Hon. J. D. Reid) to provide compensation to Government employees who are killed or injured:

> I should like to see this Bill pass, and the only provision to which I take exception is that providing that "for the future" dependents will be paid.

If Hansard had reported me as saying just the reverse, Mr. Speaker, it would have reported me correctly, because the Minister of Railways is my witness that I helped him to pass the Bill. What I said was that if only for the sake of that very provision to which Hansard reports me as taking objection, I should be glad to support the Bill. I am sorry to have been reported as I was, because many railway employees in my riding will get the impression that I objected to the clause providing for future dependents.

Mr. SPEAKER: I will see that the necessary correction is made.

MILITARY SERVICE ACT DEFAULTERS.

On the Orders of the Day:

Mr. GAUVREAU: Is the Acting Minister of Justice aware of the feeling of unrest which prevails throughout the country because of the imprisonment of young men who are unable to pay the $500 fine imposed by the last Order in Council with reference to defaulters under the Military Service Act? Is it the intention of the Government to take less drastic steps in this matter or to grant a general amnesty to all concerned?

Hon. ARTHUR MEIGHEN (Acting Minister of Justice): The Government is not aware, so far as I know, of any very general unrest in this connection. The question of amendment of the regulations and of the law is, of course, one thing, while the question of amnesty or clemency is another. Certain well-defined rules have been adapted on the latter subject, which, I think, do not err on the side of being too drastic. The matter of amendment to the law is not under immediate consideration.

PAYMENTS TO SIR CHARLES FITZPATRICK.

On the Orders of the Day:

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I desire to read to the House a letter which I have received from Right Honourable Sir Charles Fitzpatrick:

March 29, 1919.

Sir:

Mr. Edward's resolution

In view of the statement which you made to the House, Wednesday last, and which is clearly correct in fact and in law, namely, that the money provided by the two votes in 1915-16 and 1916-17 was paid to me by way of special allowance, was received by me in good faith, and was legally and regularly so paid in monthly payments by the officers of the Finance Department upon the authorization of the Auditor General, and in view of the fact that some members of the House state that they understood the two votes in question in a sense different from that which their language clearly bears and from the sense in which I understood and was justified in understanding it, I enclose herewith my cheque for five thousand dollars in your favour as Acting Prime Minister to be paid over to the Dominion Treasury.

Yours truly,

C. Fitzpatrick.

The Hon. Sir Thomas White, K.C.M.G.,
Acting Prime Minister,
Ottawa, Ont.

I have received the cheque in question and have endorsed it over to the credit of the Receiver General of Canada.

PROGRESS OF DEMOBILIZATION.

SIBERIAN EXPEDITIONARY FORCE RETURNING.

On the Orders of the Day:

Major-General MEWBURN (Minister of Militia): As a matter of public interest I wish to advise the House as to the progress of demobilization up to date.

So far during the month of March we have moved from overseas and demobilized 42,232 soldiers and 4,850 dependents. In addition to that, 8,078 soldiers are now on the ocean.

Since the date of the armistice, up to and including to-day, including five ships now on the ocean, we have brought back 109,248 soldiers. Including those in Canada we have demobilized since November 11, the date of the armistice, 164,621 men.

Mr. LAPOINTE (Kamouraska): The minister told the House the other day that our soldiers in Siberia would probably be returned at an early date. Have any steps been taken in that direction?

Major-General MEWBURN: I did announce that. Arrangements have been completed for the return of the Canadian Siberian Expeditionary Force. I shall be very glad to give the hon. member private information on the subject; we have been requested by the War Office not to specify the exact date of their return.

PRIVATE BILLS.

SECOND READING.

Bill No. 33, respecting The Calgary and Fernie Railway Company.—Mr. Richardson.

QUESTIONS.

(Questions answered orally are indicated by an asterisk.)

VOCATIONAL TRAINING IN PROVINCE OF QUEBEC.

Mr. MARCIL (Bonaventure):

1. Is it the intention of the Government to furnish vocational training and re-education in the French language to returned soldiers in the Province of Quebec?

2. If so, has any action been taken in that respect, and what is it?

3. If not, when will action be taken?

Mr. HUGH CLARK (Parliamentary Secretary):

1. The practice of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment is, and always

has been to give vocational training in the French language to returned soldiers in the province of Quebec whenever it has been found necessary to do so.

2. In the Montreal school the instructors in stenography, motor mechanics, commercial work, carpentry, shoemaking and machine shop work are all thoroughly conversant with the French and English languages. Re-training students who speak French only are always placed in classes where the instructors are fully conversant with both the French and English languages.

3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

DENNIS BUILDING, HALIFAX.

Mr. DUFF:

How much has the Government paid for offices and floor space in the Dennis Building, Halifax, since 1914?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

Department of Militia and Defence: The 5th and 6th floors of the Dennis building are rented from the Dennis Realty Corporation of Halifax at a gross rental of $6,224 per annum, which is paid by the Public Works Department.

Department of Public Works, $38,441.18.

Department of Railways and Canals: Fiscal year 1914-15, $393.42; 1915-16, $533.55; 1916-17, $401.10; 1917-18, $414; 1918-19, $175. Total, $1,917.07.

Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment, Board of Pension Commissioners for Canada: For space occupied by the Board of Pension Commissioners, $1,097.53.

DORCHESTER COUNTY LEVEL CROSSING ACCIDENT.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the Government been informed that two persons have died from the effects of an accident which occurred at a level crossing of the National Transcontinental Railway, in the Parish of Ste. Claire, County of Dorchester, during the fall of 1918?

2. If so, has the Government taken any steps to prevent the repetition of such accidents so as to further safeguard the public?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes; Octave Corriveau, aged sixty-four, and Cleophas Valliere, eighteen years of age, killed September 29, 1918, when train No. 501 struck team.

2. Appropriation covering installation of loud ringing bell at this crossing is already approved and should be erected immediately.

MR. EMERIDE GIRARD.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. On what date was Mr. Emeride Girard appointed postmaster at St. Gedeon, in Lake St. John District?

[Mr. Hugh Clark.]

2. Is the Government aware that said postmaster is a son of the ex-member of Parliament for Chicoutimi and Saguenay?

3. On whose recommendation was the appointment made?

4. Is the Government aware that the great majority of the ratepayers of the locality were opposed to said appointment and that a petition to this effect has been transmitted to the Civil Service Commission?

Hon. Mr. BURRELL:

1. December 12, 1918.

2. Yes.

3. Post Office Inspector for the district submitted the names of Mr. Jos. Morrisette and Mr. Emeride Girard, but as the office had been transferred to Mr. Girard and the inspector reported that he was competent and of good character, and that no complaints had been received as to his management of the office, the commission approved of his appointment.

4. A petition was received at the department protesting against the appointment of Emeride Girard, a copy of which was transferred to the Civil Service Commission and was received by them on the 26th July, 1918.

ICE AT NAPADOGAN, N.B.

Mr. COPP:

1. Has any quantity of ice been stored at Napadogan, N.B., on the line of the Canadian National Railways during the winter of 1919? If so, how much?

2. Who supplied same?

3. What price was paid per ton to the person or persons supplying same, and where was said ice to be delivered?

4. Were public tenders called for this work? If so ,who were the tenderers, and what was the amount of each tender?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes; 557 tons.

2. Hartley G. Steeves, Moncton, N.B.

3. $1.10 per ton f.o.b cars, Berry's Mills.

4. Yes. Isaac Lajoie, Edmundston, $1.75 per ton f.o.b. cars, Edmundston; J. B. Boulay, Sayabec, $2 per ton, not stated in tender how delivery was to be made; H. G. Steeves, $1.10 per ton, f.o.b. cars, Berry's Mills.

THE MILITARY SERVICE ACT, 1917.

Mr. DEMERS:

How many men in pursuance of the Military Service Act of 1917, have been conscripted and sent to the front?

Major-General MEWBURN: The number of those who went to the front is not available at present, but the number sent overseas, 47,509.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many police officers were employed by the Government in the county of Richmond in

connection with the administration of the Military Service Act, 1917?

2. What were their names, and how much salary did each one receive?

3. Are they still employed?

4. Upon whose recommendation were they appointed?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. The number on duty in this area on date of disbandment was—7 men employed in the County of Richmond, but 4 of these did duty at Danville and Bishop's Crossing, places shown as Richmond and Wolfe. Previous to this, the numbers varied according to requirements, and the personnel also at times changed.

2. E. McIver, $3 per day, Richmond; G. H. Moore, $3 per day, Richmond; W. J. Ewing, $3 per day, Richmond; G. M. Hall, $3 per day, Bishop's Crossing; F. Barlow, $3 per day, Danville; J. J. Barlow, $3 per day, Danville; H. S. Brown, $3 per day, Danville.

3. They are no longer employed by the Militia Department.

4. The Provost Marshal.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. How many police officers were employed by the Government in the County of Wolfe in connection with the administration of the Military Service Act, 1917?

2. What were their names, and how much salary did each one receive?

3. Are they still employed?

4. Upon whose recommendation were they appointed?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. The number on duty in this area on date of disbandment was —4 men employed, 3 at Danville and 1 at Bishop's Crossing, both places being shown as Richmond and Wolfe. Previous to this, the numbers varied according to requirements, and the personnel at times changed.

2. F. Barlow, $3 per day, Danville; J. J. Barlow, $3 per day, Danville; H. S. Brown, $3 per day, Danville; G. M. Hall, $3 per day, Bishop's Crossing.

3. They are no longer employed by the Militia Department.

4. The Provost Marshal.

Mr. SINCLAIR:

How much was expended by the Department of Militia and Defence in connection with recruiting up to the date of the passing of the Military Service Act?

Major-General MEWBURN: Claims for recruiting have never been segregated from other items of war expenditure under the same headings, and to separate these charges now would necessitate wading through some hundreds of thousands of vouchers, and would occupy the time of a very large staff of clerks for a considerable period.

MONTREAL REGISTRAR'S OFFICE.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Has the Montreal Bureau of the Registrar for military conscripts been definitely closed? If not, what are the respective names, occupations and salaries of persons employed?

2. In respect to the kind of work which was being done during the period subsequent to the 26th of December last, what has been its usefulness, since the Quebec Bureau had been closed for several weeks prior to said date and the closing of the Hull Bureau which afterwards followed; and why were some employees of the Montreal Bureau dismissed on said 26th of December last, when upwards of one hundred persons were kept on at work till the 15th of February?

3. What has been the expenditure incurred for said work at Montreal during the periods extending from the 15th of September, 1917, to the 26th December, 1918, and from the 26th December, 1918, to the 15th of February, 1919, respectively, giving the amount received by the Registrar, the Registrar's assistant, Mr. J. C. Petitclerc, and all the other employees?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. No.

E. H. Godin, K.C., registrar, no remuneration; J. C. Petitclerc, asst. registrar, $400 month; Paul Emile Fleury, statistician, $27.50 week; O. Boiteau, defaulter records clerk, $32.50 week; J. M. Hicks, protection, $25 week; L. B. Tooke, certificate clerk, $25 week; H. Archambault, fiat clerk, $25 week; M. Bellerose, fiat clerk, $25; J. E. Poulin, fiat clerk, $25; Miss A. Brodeur, fiat typist, $15 week; Miss H. Castonguay, typist, $20 week; Miss D. Leblanc, typist, $15 week; Miss M. Grant, typist, $17.50 week; N. Deschamps, day guardian, $25 week; J. N. Poupart, night guardian, $25 week; Lucien Gendron, legal adviser, $62.50. (The salary of Mr. Lucien Gendron is to be refunded by the Police Department.)

2. The Quebec office of the Registrar under the Military Service Act is not and has not been closed.

The Hull office of the Registrar under the Military Service Act is not and has not been closed, although practically all work and files of that office have been transferred to the Kingston, Ontario, office.

There has been a steady reduction of Registrar's staffs since November 11, 1918.

All Registrar's offices have been employed since November 11, on several important duties.

(1) The issuance of a uniform protecting certificate to all registrants—including 19 class and Americans—in good standing on registrar's records on November 11, 1918.

Some 70,000 have such been issued at Montreal.

(2) The drawing up, circulation and check of nominal rolls of supposed defaulters in order to secure a finally authentic list of such.

(3) The preparation of certificates and applications for fiats of Attorney General for the prosecution of all groups 11 and 111 defaulters. It has been necessary to prepare some 10,000 of these certificates in the Montreal district, in which district moreover, the magistrates require the regimental number and number of registered letter in which orders were sent by the Registrar, together with sundry other information which has not been required in other districts.

(4) Co-operation with the police for the prosecution of defaulters.

(5) Compilation of statistical returns.

(6) Answering a very large correspondence, generally with employers inquiring as to the status of prospective employees and of registrants in doubt as to their future military status.

3. September 15, 1917, to December 26, 1918:

Salaries	$215,702 68
Printing and Stationery	15,069 27
Rent and Light	12,340 99
Telephone and Telegraph	1,929 31
Postal Notes	6,464 00
Sundries and Expenses	9,232 31
	$260,738 56

3. December 26, 1918, to February 15, 1919:

Salaries	$ 28,315 15	
General Expenses	1,265 62	$ 29,580 77

Included in the above totals for salaries are the following amounts paid to the registrar, Mr. Godin, and the assistant registrar, Mr. Petitclerc, for the periods indicated:

Mr. Godin—October, 1917, to June 11, 1918, $350 per month	$3,114 99
June 12, 1918, to Jan. 31, 1919, $425 per month	3,244 17
February, 1919, no remuneration desired	
Total	$6,359 16
Mr. Petitclerc—Oct., 1917, to Jan. 31, 1918, $250 per month	$1,000 00
Feb. 1, 1918, to Sept. 30, 1918, $350 per month	2,800 00
Oct. 1, 1918, to Feb. 15, 1919, $400 per month	1,800 00
Total	$5,600 00

[Mr. Meighen.]

Mr. JOHN DAFOE.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

Does Mr. John Dafoe, of Winnipeg, hold at this very time, or has he recently held, a position in France, to which he was appointed by the Government of Canada?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: Mr. Dafoe does not hold any position under the Government at the present time, nor has he since he left France on the 6th day of March, 1919. Mr. Dafoe, at the request of the Government represented the Department of Public Information overseas in connection with the work of the Peace Conference. Mr. Dafoe gave his services without compensation.

DEPARTMENT OF SOLDIERS RE-ESTABLISHMENT.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Honourable the Minister of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment represented in the House by an officially appointed Parliamentary Secretary?

2. If so, what is the name of the member occupying the said position?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. No.

2. Answered by No. 1. The President of the Council, assisted by Mr. Clark (North Bruce), Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Militia and Defence, who is assisting the Minister of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment in the work of his department, will take charge of the work of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment in the House.

THE POSTMASTER GENERAL.

*Mr. ARCHAMBAULT:

1. Is the Postmaster General represented in the House by an officially appointed Parliamentary Secretary?

2. If so, what is the name of the member occupying the said position?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1 and 2. The Postmester General is represented in the House of Commons by the President of the Privy Council.

CANADIAN GOVERNMENT SHIPS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Are the ships owned by the Canadian Government engaged solely in the carrying trade of Canada?

2. Are any of the said ships under charter to parties in the United States?

3. If so, what are the names of the ships owned by the Government that are now on voyages between ports in the United States and ports in countries outside of Canada?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. So far as the Department of Marine and Fisheries is concerned there are no

ships under its control engaged solely in the carrying trade of Canada. The Canadian Government ship "Canadian Voyageur" which was built under the supervision of the Department of Marine and Fisheries but which is now under the control of the Canadian National Railways, is at present so engaged.

The SS. "Aranmore" was employed on the Boston-Yarmouth route for several months during the fiscal year 1918-19 to meet the trade requirements because there was no other boat available for that service. The SS. "Aranmore" is ordinarily engaged in lighthouse service work.

The SS. "Stanley," as has been customary for some seasons past, made trips during the winter and early spring from Pictou, N.S., to the Magdalen islands, P.Q. The SS. "Champlain" is ordinarily engaged in lighthouse service work. The SS. "Champlain" is continuously engaged in ferry service between River Ouelle and Murray Bay, P.Q.

2. No, as regards the "Aranmore," "Stanley" and "Champlain."

3. So far as the Department of Marine is concerned there are none.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

1. Are the ships owned by the Canadian Government engaged solely in the carrying trade of Canada?

2. Are any of the said ships under charter to parties in the United States?

3. If so, what are the names of the ships owned by the Government that are now on voyages between ports in the United States and ports in countries outside of Canada?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Two vessels, viz: the "Voyageur" and the "Sheba" are engaged, solely, in Canadian trade, and two others, the "Drummond" and the "McKee" are not.

2. Yes.

3. The steamer "McKee" was in dry dock for repairs in New York. When taken out of the dry dock was chartered for a cargo, one trip to South America and return. The steamer "Drummond" is chartered to the West Indian Steamship Company. Charter expires May 10.

SEYMOUR NARROWS NAVAL BATTERY.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. At the outbreak of hostilities did the captain of H.M.S. "Newcastle" take charge, lay out, and pay for the establishing of a Naval Battery at Seymour Narrows and the placing of mines further north?

2. Did officers and men of the Royal Canadian Naval Volunteer Reserves do this work?

3. If so, who issued the necessary instructions to these officers and men to do the work?

4. Was the Canadian Government aware that this work was being done?

5. If so, who issued the necessary instruction for the withdrawal of this northern defence?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. This was a work jointly undertaken, and paid for by the British and Canadian Governments.

2. Yes, with the assistance of certain technical ratings lent by H.M.S. "Newcastle."

3. Commander Shenton, R.C.N., was in charge of the work.

4. Yes.

5. The Department of the Naval Service.

TRAWLER NO. 30.

Mr. DELISLE:

1. Was Trawler No. 30 in the service of the Canadian Navy Department during the summer of 1918?

2. If so, were any refits necessary to this boat during the summer of 1918?

3. On what dates was this boat laid up for refits?

4. Where was Trawler No. 30 on August 9, 1918?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.

2. No.

3. Answered by No. 2.

4. At Sydney, under routine lay-up.

LAND GRANTS TO RAILWAY COMPANIES.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. Were any land grants made by the Government of Canada to railway companies in lieu of subsidies from the 1st of August, 1896, to October 1, 1911?

2. If so, what companies received the said grants?

3. How much land was granted to each company?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

1. Yes.

2 and 3.

Company.	Acres.
Alberta Railway and Coal Co.	898,665.43
Calgary and Edmonton Railway Co.	1,441,282.66
Canadian Northern Railway Co.	2,885,563.40
Canadian Pacific Railway Co.	18,454,904.99
Great North-West Central Railway Co.	320,000.00
Manitoba and North-Western way Co.	1,283,663.41
Manitoba and South-Eastern Railway Co.	679,000.68
Manitoba South-Western Colonization Ry. Co.	1,352,558.83
Qu'Appelle, Long Lake & Saskatchewan Ry. and Steamboat Co.	1,144,957.43
Saskatchewan and Western Railway Co.	98,880.00

BRITISH REMOUNT COMMISSION.

Mr. JACOBS:

1. Did the British Remount Commission establish a depot for the purchase of horses for the British Army at Montreal?
2. If so, who composed the said commission?
3. How many horses were purchased by the said commission?
4. Were any horses so purchased by the commission in Canada from November, 1916? If so, how many?
5. Were horses required by the Canadian army purchased for such army by the British Remount Commission from November 1916 in the United States? If so, how many?
6. Did the Government take any steps to induce the British Remount Commission to purchase horses in Canada? If so, what steps?
7. If horses were purchased in the United States by the British Remount Commission what reason so impelled such purchase when a depot was established in Canada?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. It is understood that a British remount depot was established near Montreal (Lachine).
2. Information not available. Latterly Brig.-Gen. Sir Charles V. Gunning was the O. C. British Remount Commission.
3. 31,402 in Canada.
4. Yes. 3,142.
5. No. ....
6. Offers were made by the Government to provide certain credits for the purchase of horses in Canada.
7. The Government has been informed that whenever possible the commission in buying horses gave Canada the preference. Buying in Canada, it is stated, was interrupted at intervals for various reasons, viz.: at times when purchasing was being done by Canadian Government; because of lack of horse-ships; because of large reserves of horses on hand by War Office, and because of financial reasons.

LACHUTE CUSTOMS HOUSE.

Mr. McGIBBON (Argenteuil):

1. How many men were on the pay-list in the Customs House at Lachute, Quebec, during the month of February, and what salary was paid to each?
2. What was the net profit collected at said office during the same period?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Two, $104.16 and $87.50 respectively.
2. Customs revenue collected during February, $6,572.54; Customs revenue after deducting salaries, $6,380.88.

"KENT HOUSE" SITE.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the Government leased from the Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company what is known as the "Kent House" site near Montmorency Falls, Quebec?

[Mr. Meighen.]

2. If so, on what terms, and for how long?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to cancel said lease? If so, for what reason?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes, for the Militia Department by the Department of Public Works.
2. At $500 a month for eight months, terminating the 1st June, 1919.
3. On the termination of this lease, it is proposed to vacate these premises as accommodation will be available elsewhere.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the Government leased from the Quebec Railway, Light, Heat and Power Company what is known as the "Kent House" site, near Montmorency Falls, Quebec?
2. If so, on what terms, and for how long?
3. Is it the intention of the Government to cancel said lease? If so, for what reason?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. From 1st November, 1918, to 1st June, 1919, for a temporary hospital at $500 per month; the lessor paying taxes, water rates, lighting and extra heating.
3. Being no longer required, premises will be vacated on 1st June, 1919.

FEDERAL BUILDINGS ON "GRANDE ALLEE," QUEBEC.

Mr. CANNON:

1. Has the Government constructed any buildings near the armoury, on the "Grande Allée," in the City of Quebec?
2. If so, what was the cost of said construction, and what was the name of the contractor?
3. For what purpose were said buildings constructed?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.
2. (a) $337,305.14 to date; (b) contractors for buildings: Bate, McMahon & Co., and for water system, sewers and gas main, M. Lonergan.
3. For demobilization, but it is now intended to convert a portion of the buildings to be used for hospital purposes.

THE ROSS RIFLE FACTORY.

Mr. POWER:

1. Was the Ross Rifle Factory at Quebec leased to any person or firm during the year 1918?
2. If so, to whom, and at what price?
3. Has the rent been paid? If so, how much?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes, for 18 months.
2. (a) North American Arms Company, Ltd., (b) $75,000 quarterly.
3. (a) Yes. (b) $150,000.

ALLEGED USURIOUS INTEREST CHARGED SOLDIERS.

Mr. POWER:

1. Has it been brought to the attention of the Government, that in certain of the large cities of Canada, notably Montreal and Toronto, there is an organization on foot for the purpose of advancing money to returned soldiers at usurious interest, against their post discharge pay and war service gratuity?
2. If so, does the Government intend to take any action in the matter?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. The Militia Department has no knowledge of the organizations referred to, and assignments against War Service Gratuity are not recognized.
2. Answered by No. 1.

EXCESS WAR PROFITS TAXATION.

Mr. MAHARG:

1. What was the amount levied under the Excess War Profits Tax?
2. What are the names of the firms or corporations subject to such tax?
3. What are the respective amounts each are liable for?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. $73,167,443.

2 and 3. The policy of the Government is not to disclose amounts of individual assessments under the Business Profits War Tax Act and The Income War Tax Act unless upon motion for return after satisfactory reason has been given for calling for such return. See Hansard 8th August, 1916, pages 4245, 4246 and 4247. Members of the House desirous of obtaining information as to individual assessments may do so by applying to the Commissioner of Taxation.

PROCEEDS FROM SALE OF GOVERNMENT BONDS.

Mr. MAHARG:

1. What amount of money was secured by the sale of Government Bonds in 1917 and 1918, respectively?
2. What amount of this loan was used to finance the Canadian Munitions Board in each of these years?
3. Was the western wheat crop financed entirely out of this loan during the years 1917 and 1918?
4. If not, where was the balance secured for this purpose in each of the above years?

Sir THOMAS WHITE:

1. (As shown by the books of the Finance Department.) Cash received during the fiscal year:

From	1916-17.	1917-18.
1916/31 Loan ..	$97,789,580 17	
1917/37 Loan ..	18,100,482 48	$123,807,158 65
1917 Victory Loan..		393,623,697 70

2. Advanced to Imperial Munitions Board for purchase of munitions, supplies and foodstuffs, from General Cash Account. Fiscal year:

1916-17.	1917-18
$125,000,000	$271,000,000

3. No.
4. It is understood the money was provided by Great Britain from other sources.

DAMMING ST. CHARLES RIVER, QUEBEC.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

1. Has the contract existing between the Quinlan and Robertson Company and the Government, for damming the St. Charles River at Quebec, been cancelled?
2. If so, on what date, and for what reason?
3. What is the amount spent to date for the St. Charles River works?
4. Is it the intention of the Government to continue these works? If so, when?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Yes.

2 and 4. (a) 12th July, 1918; (b) was originally suspended on account of the war, but now the question of continuing and completing the work is left for future consideration.

3. $1,683,094.16.

CANADIAN NATIONAL RAILWAYS.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the Government to make use of the new railway bridge recently constructed across the St. Lawrence at Quebec, for the purpose of bringing the passenger trains of the railways on the South Shore of the St. Lawrence into the City of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. REID: Present time tables as given to the public by the Board of Management shows the present operations of the C.N.R. system and will be changed from time to time as the public interest demands.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the Government to avail itself of the shortening of the distance by rail between Halifax and Winnipeg by 200 miles by running the trains of the Government railways between Halifax and Winnipeg over the Quebec bridge?

Hon. Mr. REID: Present time tables as given to the public by the Board of Management shows the present operations of the C.N.R. system and will be changed from time to time as the public interest demands.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the Government to comply with the terms of the Act of Confederation which provided for a railway from Halifax to Quebec by running the passenger trains of the Intercolonial Railway into the city of Quebec?

Hon. Mr. REID: There is no intention of changing the present arrangement of running the through trains between Halifax and Montreal.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the Government to put in the estimates for construction and betterments for the Canadian Government railways, has a sum been provided for the improvements to be carried on at Quebec for the terminals of the Transcontinental, for which the Government, according to a contract passed with the city of Quebec, in August, 1910, is bound to make improvements to the amount of two millions?

Hon. Mr. REID: The Canadian Government Railways will proceed with any improvements at the city of Quebec as may be urgent under present war conditions.

QUEBEC AND LAKE ST. JOHN RAILWAY.

Mr. LAVIGUEUR:

Is it the intention of the Government to purchase the minority stock held by the city of Quebec and other cities of Quebec, New York, London and elsewhere, in the Quebec and Lake St. John Railway Company, and the Great Northern Railway of Canada, which companies owned lines now operated as part of the Government Railway System?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: The Government is not considering the question of the purchase of the minority stock referred to.

THE STEAMER MONTCALM.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. Who has been appointed Captain of the Steamer "Montcalm," and on whose recommendation was he appointed?
2. In charge of what steamer was he prior to his appointment to the "Montcalm"?
3. What other names were recommended for appointment by the Department of Marine at Quebec?
4. Who were the applicants for this position of Captain?
5. At what salary was said Captain appointed?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. (a) Captain John T. Hearn, (b) Department of Marine and Fisheries.
2. Chief Skipper R.N.C.V.R.—formerly in department's employ, and from January 24, 1918, to March 14, 1918, acting captain of the Montcalm.
3. Captain Oscar Mercier.
4. Captain Antoine Fournier, Captain Oscar Mercier.
5. $135 per month.

CANADIAN DUTIES ON U.S. BOOTS AND SHOES.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What is the rate of duty on boots and shoes imported from the United States into Canada?

[Mr. Lavigueur.]

2. What is the rate of duty charged by the United States Government on boots and shoes exported from Canada into the United States?

Hon. Mr. REID:

	Tariff 1907	Tariff 1915
1. Boots and shoes, pegged or wire fastened, with unstitched soles close edged	25%	+7½ War Tax
Boots, shoes, slippers and insoles of any material n.o.p.	30%	+7½ War Tax

2. Under United States Tariff, 1913:

	Per cent.
Boots, made wholly or in chief value of leather	Free
Boots, cotton	30
Boots, india-rubber	10
Boots, silk	50
Boots, silk and india-rubber	50
Boots, wool	35
Shoes, leather	Free
Shoes, leather and woollen, wool chief value	35
Shoes, rawhide, metal nails	15
Shoes, india-rubber	10
Shoes, wool	35
Shoes, felt	35
Shoes, cotton	30
Shoes, silk	50

MAJOR NAPOLEON L'HEUREUX.

Mr. SAVARD:

1. Has the name of Major Napoleon L'Heureux been struck off the Militia List?
2. If so, for what reason?
3. Was Major Napoleon L'Heureux's name struck off after a regular court of inquiry had been held?

Major-General MEWBURN:

1. Yes.

2. This officer was retired owing to his conduct in connection with certain irregularities which occurred in the administration of the 167th Overseas Battalion while he was serving as an officer in that corps.

3. No official court of inquiry was assembled regarding the case, but Major Napoleon L'Heureux was retired from the militia following an official investigation into the affairs of the corps, and which produced sufficient evidence to show that this officer's conduct had not been such as to justify his retention as an officer of the militia.

CANADIAN REGISTRATION ACT.

Mr. DUFF:

1. How many persons, in compliance with the regulations of the Canadian Registration Act, expressed willingness to help harvest the farmers' crops for 1918?
2. How many were subsequently notified to do so?

3. What was the total expenditure in connection with the Canadian Registration Act?
4. What was the total expenditure in connection with the previous National Registration Act?
5. How many paid officials were employed in connection with the work of Canadian Registration Act.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1, 2, 3 and 4. Answered March 26, 1919, page 883 unrevised Hansard.

5. The members of the Canada Registration Board gave their services without compensation except payment of expenses. The secretary and accountant for the board were paid officials as were seventeen superintendents who supervised the organizing generally, and one registrar in each of the 230 constituencies, making a total of 249 paid officials. In addition to this there were approximately 46,000 persons who gave service as deputy and assistant deputy registrars, much of which was given voluntarily, except in the provinces of Quebec and Nova Scotia, where most of the service rendered was paid for.

CONVEYANCE OF MAILS IN MONTREAL.

Mr. LESAGE:

1. Did the Government receive any tenders on the 4th October, 1918, and the 7th February, 1919, for the conveyance of mails to and from the different post offices and railway stations in the city of Montreal?
2. If so, what are the names of the persons who tendered?
3. What was the amount of each tender?
4. To whom was the contract awarded, and at what price?
5. Why was this contract not awarded to the lowest tenderer?

Hon. Mr. ROWELL:

1, 2 and 3. The following tenders for the conveyance of mails between Montreal post offices and railway stations and wharves were opened on the 4th October, 1918:

J. E. Laurent, 53 Esplanade street, Montreal, $46,975; General Transfer Co., 209 Beaver Hall, Montreal, $44,000 (for contract of one year); General Transfer Co., 209 Beaver Hall, Montreal, $40,000 (four years); O. Constantineau, 96 McCulloch street, Montreal, $45,000 (one year); O. Constantineau, 96 McCulloch street, Montreal, $42,500 (four years); Canadian Transfer Co., Montreal, $43,900 (one year).

4 and 5. The Canadian Transfer Company at $43,900 for one year, it being considered advisable in view of unsettled wartime conditions to enter into a contract for one year only. Tenders were due at the Post Office Department on the 7th February, 1919, for the Montreal postal stations and street letter boxes service. As the contract in this case has not yet been awarded it is not considered in the public interest to furnish at the present time the information asked for.

PORT MANN.

*Mr. PROULX:

1. Has a Canadian Northern Railway Terminal been established at Port Mann?
2. If not, will such terminal be established and when?
3. Is the Government aware that agents representing McKenzie and Mann are said to have disposed of hundreds of building sites at Port Mann upon the representation that the Canadian Northern Terminal was to be built there?
4. Has the Government received any representations or complaints on the subject of the terminal mentioned?

Hon. Mr. REID:

1. Port Mann is a divisional point of the Canadian Northern Railway.
2. Answered by No. 1.
3. The Government has no information.
4. No.

COST OF REGISTRATION IN L'ISLET COUNTY.

Mr. FAFARD:

1. What was the cost in connection with the registration of military conscripts in the county of L'Islet?
2. How many names were registered?
3. How many buildings were rented for such purposes, giving the names of the proprietors and the amounts paid them?
4. How much was paid to the assistant registrars and the other employees, stating the amounts paid to each?

Hon. Mr. MEIGHEN:

Our statistical records are tabulated for no territories smaller than military districts and it is impossible to give them by counties.

DOGFISH REDUCTION WORKS.

Mr. DUFF:

1. Have the dogfish reduction works at Canso and Clarke's Harbour, N.S., been sold?
2. If so, to whom, and at what price?
3. If not, who are the caretakers and what remuneration do they receive?

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN:

1. Yes.
2. Canso Dogfish Reduction Works sold to J. A. Farquhar, Halifax, $6,755.

Clarke's Harbour Dogfish Reduction Works sold to Frank E. Davis Company, Gloucester, Mass., for $5,000.

3. Answered by Nos. 1 and 2.

SEED GRAIN.

Mr. TOBIN:

1. What quantity of seed grain was purchased by the Department of Agriculture or by the

department's Seed Grain Purchasing Commission or officials during the years 1917 and 1918, respectively?

2. What was the average cost per bushel?

3. What was the expense per bushel of purchasing cost?

4. What was the average selling price?

5. What was the expense of making sales?

6. Was a profit made on the seed grain transaction? If so, how much?

7. Was a loss made on these transactions? If so, how much?

8. Was the grain so bought all sold for seed?

Hon. Mr. CRERAR:

1. 1917: Wheat, 629,355 bushels and 50 pounds; oats, 408,366 bushels and 16 pounds; barley, 1,566 bushels and 44 pounds.

1918: Wheat, 500,831 bushels and 35 pounds; oats 2,569,256 bushels and 17 pounds; barley, 94,970 bushels and 14 pounds; corn, 12,895 bushels; peas, 46,243 bushels; beans, 1,000 bushels.

2. 1917: Wheat, $1.76⅔; oats, 59¼c.; barley, 88¾c.

1918: Wheat, $2.19 4-5; oats, 96c.; barley $1.77; corn, $4.31; peas, $4.33½; beans, $8.64 9-10, for unclean grain delivered at Canadian Government elevators.

3 and 5. The Dominion Seed Grain Purchasing Commission purchased and sold the above seed grain. Their services and expenses in this connection were as follows: 1917, $10,557.25; 1918, $18,046.13.

4. 1917: Wheat, $1.84½; oats, 70c.; barley, $1.10.

1918: Wheat, $2.39; oats $1.03; barley, $1.81; corn, $3.26; peas, $4.60; beans, $7.39.

6. Yes, the sum of $28,808.46 on these transactions.

7. No.

8. No.

QUESTIONS PASSED AS ORDERS FOR RETURNS.

Mr. SINCLAIR (Antigonish and Guysborough):

How many Civil Servants were in the employ of the Government of Canada on January 1, 1917, January 1, 1918, and January 1, 1919, respectively?

Mr. TOBIN:

How many persons were employed in the entire Civil Service of Canada on the first day of October, 1911?

Mr. CANNON:

1. What are the names of the officers of the Canadian Dental Corps in Canada, and what are their respective salaries?

2. At what places are such officers located?

3. Does the Government propose to reduce the staff attached to said corps?

[Mr. Tobin.]

Mr. PROULX:

1. What were the names of the canvassers for the Victory Loan of 1918 in South East Grey, and what amount was paid each as commission?

2. What amounts were paid to Toronto brokerage firms for commissions in connection with the said Victory Loan, and what are the names of such firms?

Mr. PROULX:

During the year ending March 26, 1919, what amounts were paid by the Government for advertising to the following papers: Dundalk Herald, Flesherton Advance, Markdale Standard, Durham Chronicle, Hanover Post, and Grey (Durham) Review?

Mr. PROULX:

What amounts were paid the Toronto Globe and Toronto Star, respectively, for Government advertising during the year ending March 26, 1919?

Mr. POWER:

1. Into how many districts was the Dominion divided for the purpose of the flotation of the Victory Loan?

2. How many persons were employed in each district, and what are their names?

3. What is the exact expenditure incurred by each district association?

4. What amount did each organizer or canvasser receive?

5. What brokers were employed throughout the Dominion?

6. What is the actual amount of bonds credited to each broker?

7. What remuneration did each receive?

UNDISCUSSED AND UNOPPOSED MOTIONS FOR PAPERS.

Mr. TOBIN:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence between the Honourable N. W. Rowell, President of the Privy Council, and Commissioner R. H. Pringle, K.C., in any way relating to the Pulp and Paper Inquiry conducted by the said commissioner.

Mr. BROUILLARD:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams and other correspondence between the Militia Department and Aetna Chemical Company of Canada, Limited, concerning a contract for explosives.

PRINCE EDWARD ISLAND STARCH MANUFACTURERS.

Mr. READ (Prince) moved:

For a copy of all letters, telegrams, correspondence and other documents, exchanged between the Starch Manufacturers of Prince Edward Island and the Finance Department, or any other department of the Government, in 1911, in reference to the then proposed reciprocity agreement between Canada and the United States.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no knowledge of the correspondence referred to in this motion, but if there are on file any letters not of a private nature, they will be brought down. The order may therefore go

through as far as the Government is concerned.

Motion agreed to.

CIVIL SERVICE POSITIONS.

MOTION BY MR. McCURDY THAT WOUNDED SOLDIERS BE GIVEN PREFERENCE.

Mr. F. B. McCURDY (Colchester) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, the Civil Service Act should be amended so that, while having full regard to efficiency, a preference in appointments to the public service shall be afforded to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who have become casualties in a theatre of war.

He said: All hon. members know that from 1914 to 1917, while appeals were being pressed on the manhood of Canada to voluntarily enlist in the military forces, undertakings both direct and implied were given from every recruiting platform to those who were being urged to join. Intending recruits were assured that, come good, come ill, Canada would see that after the war every reasonable consideration would at all times be afforded to those who responded to the call. I confidently state that these commitments were made with the practically unanimous consent of all Canada. And furthermore, were a similar world condition to confront Canada to-morrow, and should it become necessary to raise a large army by voluntary enlistment, I have no doubt that similar undertakings would again unhesitatingly be given.

The Government has not been at all idle in preparing to honour the country's obligations. It has created a good deal of machinery designed to facilitate the return of the soldier to civil life. It has provided medical and instructional services, established an elaborate pensioning system, and is now engaged in the establishment of a Soldiers' Land Settlement organization. But much remains to be done, and it must be particularly remembered that the best results can be assured only when all agencies dealing with the problem are fully or-ordinated and harmonized. For the purpose at which this resolution is aimed, the practice of the Civil Service Commission must undoubtedly be in concord with the policy of the Government.

Quite recently I was requested to make inquiry of the Civil Service Commission regarding the appointment of an officer in the public service in Nova Scotia. In response to notices sent out by the Commission two applications had been lodged. Both were from discharged soldiers, one having got as far as England and from there returned to Canada for discharge, while the other, who had been wounded in France, had incurred a permanent partial disability of his left hand. Somewhat to my surprise I learned that, in practice, both these classes of returned soldiers were regarded by the Commissioners as possessing equal claims to appointment so far as their service records were concerned. That, the Commissioners advised, was the interpretation placed on the Civil Service Act. While we all appreciate the admirable spirit that impelled those who did not get further than England—as it did others—to enlist, it is undoubtedly in the public mind that those active service men who have sacrificed and suffered most best deserve preferment at the Government's hands. I am advised that in view of the decision of the Civil Service Commissioners, any alteration or rectification in cases such as I have referred to can be effected only by amendment to the Civil Service Act.

I will not give any opinion as to whether or not the Civil Service Commission are correctly interpreting the Civil Service Act, or whether or not they are following the policy of the Government in this matter. If they are facilitating a Government policy, then I am bound to say that in my opinion the Government has not correctly interpreted the opinion of hon. members of this House. Indeed, if the Civil Service Act really bore the interpretation that the Commission has placed upon it I feel that the Government would have been supported by this House in altering by Order in Council under the War Measures Act this detail in order that the most deserving class should be fully protected. However, what is past is gone, and I am advised that it will largely meet the present situation if hon. members will support the resolution proposed. To them I confidently appeal.

In urging the particular claims of those who have become casualties, I do not for a moment wish to prejudice the rights,—already acknowledged by statute,—of any other one who has been on active service. I am satisfied that the purpose can be accomplished without creating any injustice anywhere.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, I would ask: Is it not eminently fitting that, efficiency granted, the public service of Canada should, to as great an extent as possible be carried on by those who have already served their country in a vastly more difficult and sterner field of activity? And, as a matter of course, those who in the discharge of their military duties had incurred physical disabilities would, I take it, be

as gladly supported for preference by the public generally, as they are by their equally gallant but more fortunate unwounded comrades.

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Would there be any objection to extending the resolution to include Canadians who have served in the British Expeditionary Force and in the Air Service?

Mr. McCURDY: I see no objection.

Mr. DANIEL LEE REDMAN (Calgary East): As I said some time ago, the main problem underlying the demobolization of our returned soldiers is that of employment. This is a duty which the people of Canada must seriously consider, if we are to avoid any difficulties with our returned men. The Government must also regard it as a duty which they owe these men, because they were instrumental in sending them overseas. When the State undertakes the disposition of certain classes of its citizens in various fields of activity, and, as in this case, send men to war, they must assume responsibility for the care of those who return with disabilities that handicap or prejudice them in the occupations which they formerly followed.

I think, further, that it is perfectly reasonable to say that returned soldiers should go into the Civil Service. Ordinarily, we do not recommend our friends to go into the Civil Service, but men who have been overseas for the last three or four years, who have suffered somewhat in their mental capacity because of their experiences and the shocks which they have received, or who have suffered physical disabilities, require that sense of security and steadiness which can be obtained in the Civil Service, perhaps, to a greater extent than any other line of activity in Canada. The Government, as the hon. member who has just spoken has stated, has given promises in that regard and I feel that the Government will take exactly the same view of this matter that they took when they made those promises.

I have no fault to find with the administration of the Civil Service Commission, but I do say that the Civil Service Act is not as well suited as it might be to the purpose of giving to returned men employment in the Civil Service. That Act was passed last year. I think I am correct in saying that every hon. member of this House is anxious that all returned soldiers who desire to enter the Civil Service, having regard to the efficiency of the service, should be given that opportunity. I think the House will be willing to consider how the Act passed last year has fulfilled the desire of the House and the country in regard to the employment in the Civil Service of returned soldiers. Previous to the passing of this Act, and under the old patronage system, every member gave the positions coming under his control to returned men. Under the old system the member was amenable to the pressure of public opinion and he was directly responsible to the returned soldiers and to the people in his own community. Did that system still obtain, returned soldiers would to-day have practically all the positions in the Civil Service which become vacant. But, under the Civil Service Act, that element of responsibility on the member of Parliament has been eliminated.

We might look for a moment to see what the results have been under the Civil Service Act since that Act has been in force. We find by the figures which have been issued by the Civil Service Commission itself, that the following appointments have been made since the Act came into force:—

Permanent	1,672
Temporary	14,570
Total	16,242

Of that 16,242 appointments made in one year 1,834 were returned soldiers. I must say in fairness to the commissioners that a large number of these appointments were stenographers which is a class of employment in which the soldier does not as a rule compete. However, I think that these figures in themselves are a fair indication of the truth of what I say. I do not believe that the returned soldiers are getting a sufficient number of positions in the Government service under the Civil Service Act which Parliament passed last year. The first point in the Act which I think might well be amended is this. It is provided by paragraph (a) of section 39 of the Civil Service Act that soldiers who have obtained sufficient marks in examination to pass shall be placed on the list at the head of all other candidates.

While it is true that many civilians are being appointed to positions in the Civil Service, the Commission have been doing what they could to provide soldiers with the necessary qualifications with positions. But, especially in the West advertisements come out only a day or so ahead of the time that a man must send in his return in order that it may be received within the prescribed limit of time. We have coming back to Canada some 500,000 men and I do not think I will be going too far when I ask

this House to put it up to the Civil Service Commission to confine the appointment of male employees to returned soldiers. If that were put up to them they would know exactly where they stood, and they could send out the notices as to vacancies earlier. They might use the machinery of the Soldiers Civil Re-Establishment department, act through their labour representative in each district and get in touch with the returned soldier who might be available so that when a position is open a soldier will be ready for it. We might amend this Act for one year; or, we might amend it from year to year so that the condition would not extend for a longer time than was necessary, but for one year at least we might provide that none but returned soldiers should be allowed to compete in an examination where male employees are required. That is the first proposition I would make. Perhaps some honourable members may think that in proposing that I am going too far, but even if they take that viewpoint I would say to them that such a position would be much easier to maintain than the present position, which is certainly not going far enough.

Under section 15 of the Civil Service Act it is provided that the Civil Service Commission may appoint to positions requiring technical or professional knowledge without examination. That refers to positions requiring the knowledge of some profession or some other kind of technical knowledge. The Commission themselves, I must say, have gone as far as they could under that provision. They are not appointing without competitive examination all the people requiring technical or professional knowledge but they are as far as possible holding competitive examinations under that section. But there are under that clause, positions which are being filled without any examination and when no examination is held no preference is given returned soldiers. The Stead case, which was discussed in the House a few days ago, came under section 15 of the Act. While a competitive examination is required for all the lower positions in the service, and while it is in this class that preference is given to soldiers, in dealing with technical or professional positions no preference whatever is given to soldiers and we have the Stead case as an illustration of this. In addition to that, in the city of Calgary, we had some time ago, a civilian young man appointed to the position of assistant receiver general. There is no question in the world that a soldier could have been obtained properly qualified and trained to fill that position. Nothing to my mind creates such a feeling of distrust or sense of unfairness among soldiers as to see a young civilian appointed to a position which a soldier could have filled. Usually that feeling is not manifested on the part of the particular soldier who wanted the position but on the part of other soldiers who have returned and who feel that it is the duty of the Government to provide for those who are not quite so well able to fight their own battles as those who have not suffered the shock of war. If there is any one thing that causes a feeling of distrust on the part of the soldiers, it is the appointment—in violation of the promises which this Government and this Parliament have made—of a civilian to a position which a soldier could have filled.

There is no preference whatever given to the dependents of soldiers. We should not throw the preference open to all relatives of soldiers but there is one class of soldiers' dependents who are well defined, a class who are in effect wards of the State, and that is the class who are obtaining pensions. By paying them pensions we admit that their male relatives, on whom they are dependent for support, have either been killed or have received such injuries in the war that these dependents have been deprived of their means of support. I think that this Act should contain a clause that those soldiers' dependents who are receiving a pension should be put in the same class as soldiers in competitive examinations and have the same preference as they have. In the case of soldiers there really is no age limit because any one who has been admitted into the army has to undergo a medical examination and is pronounced quite fit and able to carry on, but as to dependents there would have to be an age limit.

Another point that has created a great deal of difficulty is that of promotion. Section 45 of the Act provides that :

> Vacancies shall be filled, as far as consistent with the best interests of the Civil Service, by promotion.

Now we must all admit that promotions within the Civil Service should be a very tower of strength to it—that is to say, the hope of promotion should inspire the civil servant with ambition, and with the desire to do better work. But the soldiers' viewpoint is this: Under the present Civil Service Act practically every higher position in the Civil Service is being filled by promotion, and when we explain that to the soldiers they say. "When we went away, these positions used to be filled on the

recommendation of the local member; you tell us that you are going to give all vacant positions to soldiers; and yet you ask us to consider a scheme whereby you argue us out of these appointments, and the only positions we can get to-day in the Civil Service are the very lowest ones, and not all of those." In Calgary a famous case came up—famous as far as I was concerned because even yet, although it happened a year and a quarter ago, protests against that appointment have not ceased. That was an appointment made to the Banff Park superintendency, which was made clearly in accordance with the Civil Service Act. Previously that position had been filled on the recommendation of the member for the constituency, as I think practically all other appointments in the Outside Service were made. To-day, however, those appointments are made by promotion, and my view is that it would only be fair to the soldiers to say that hereafter these appointments should be given to them, and not only that but they should be eligible for those positions which are now regarded as promotions under the Act. Of course that could only go on for a year or two until the soldiers are absorbed into civil life, and my idea in urging this is that in the meantime the soldiers shall not suffer.

At the present time there are two classes of casualties in the country going to make up the total of two hundred thousand in our Army. The first class consists of those men who were wounded but that recovered to such an extent that their ability to carry on their ordinary work is by no means impaired. The second class consists of those whose wounds have been such as to unfit them in varying degrees to carry on their previous occupation. I feel, as the hon. member who proceeded me felt, that even over other soldiers the preference should be given to these casualties. That class can be very easily defined: they are the class to whom we pay pensions and an exact limit can be placed upon them. Not only should we give them a preference over other soldiers, but I think we should go even further. We should, if necessary, provide positions for these disabled men, not by making new positions, but by granting power to the Civil Service Commission to dismiss, if necessary, young men who had been appointed to the Civil Service since 1914, when war broke out. Let me make my position clear: I think that the Civil Service Commission should have the right to use their best discretion and select for dismissal, as likely to do the least harm, the young unmarried man, who was appointed while the war was in progress, and replace him by a soldier who has been so disabled that he is unable to carry on his previous avocation. That is, perhaps, a drastic proposition to make, but I believe it to be the duty of this Government towards these men who have been disabled in the country's service. I believe the Government can do that without any great amount of unfairness to any individual who was so appointed, and without violating any principle.

Sir SAM HUGHES (Victoria): Will the hon. member kindly define what he means by a "casualty"?

Mr. REDMAN: Technically it means any one who has appeared in the Army Orders as a casualty.

Sir SAM HUGHES: You do not include shell-shocked men in that category.

Mr. REDMAN: No. Such a man is not an offcial casualty. One would have to be a mind reader to determine all such cases.

Sir SAM HUGHES: That is the point I want to see explained.

Mr. REDMAN: There may be cases that are not casualties that are suffering from these disabilities, and if any way could be devised to include them in the classes of men meriting better treatment, I should be only too pleased.

I have enumerated the different points I had in my mind with respect to this matter. I want to make it perfectly clear that I am not indulging in any criticism of the Government, or of the Civil Service; I am simply pointing out to the House the defects which I think exist in the Act passed last year, defects which should be remedied since we all have the intention of doing full justice to the returned soldier.

I do not think anything which I have suggested will weaken in any way the efficiency of the service. It is rather a question of seeing that those who are more entitled than others to positions in the Civil Service are given that preference to which they deserve. I do not think there is anything to-day which is causing more distrust amongst returned soldiers than the appointment of young civilians to positions in the Civil Service.

4 p.m.

Sir SAM HUGHES: I heartily endorse the views expressed by the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) and the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy). I would go a little further and broaden the

word casualty so as to include those who saw active service in the trenches—that is men who fought in the trenches—because the fact that a man may have got a slight wound in the arm does not give him any better claim to a position over the soldier who fought alongside him for three years and happened to miss being hit. But that is merely a detail, which is covered by the remarks of the hon. member for Calgary.

I want to point out—while I am sorry to see the returned soldiers all looking for Civil Service positions, I would rather see them take their place in the broad fields of life and become more useful citizens to the country than civil servants can possibly become—that the remarks of the gentleman (Mr. Redman) are worthy of most serious consideration. I have been making inquiries throughout the country, as to whether the soldiers who have returned from the trenches have been reinstated in their old positions by the employers, or have taken other work, and with one or two exceptions, where men had been more or less disturbed by shell-shock, I have received most gratifying reports. I was speaking to the hon. member for Haldimand (Mr. Lalor) the other night and he mentioned that every man who had returned to his service, and he has many of them, is an infinitely better man than he was before he went overseas. As an old educator I have always been opposed to technical examinations for promotion, and I think that every educator in the country, who has studied the matter, will agree that technical examinations constitute no test of efficiency whatever, or very little. I would like to have the Government consider the matter from that viewpoint, that is, instead of having an applicant examined for a position by gentlemen who know nothing about the qualities of a soldier and mighty little about the duties of the office to which the applicant is aspiring, that these examinations should be limited practically to returned soldiers, and that the commission should give the benefit on every occasion to the returned soldier who is applying. Because, mark my words, the man coming back from the front is a much stronger and better man, nine times out of ten, except by reason of his physical incapacity, than if he had never gone to the war. The best men are those who had gone through the furnace of war

I would also like to draw the attention of the House to the fact that it would be well to have regard to the honourable casualty. There are casualties that are not very creditable but, thank fortune, they are very very few. A friend was telling me about a man who had made a great to-do about getting a position. My friend asked him for his medical sheet and his service record—his crime report; he never got them, and the man ceased applying. He had not been to the front at all. I think it would be well to make sure that we are getting the very best of these splendid fellows appointed to these positions. I thought all these positions were being filled by returned soldiers, and I was very much surprised to hear that that is not being done. I think the returned soldier is entitled to everything that can be given to him. I suggest that the motion should be enlarged so as to take in the men who have served at the front.

Mr. ROBERT JAMES MANION (Fort William and Rainy River): I wish to support the motion of the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) and the hon. member for Calgary (Mr. Redman). My recollection of the passing of this Civil Service Bill was that if say ten men passed the examination for a Civil Service appointment, and one of those men was a returned soldier, that he, would be given the preference, no matter where he stood on the examination list. If I understood wrongly, then I think such a rule should be put in force.

The hon. member for Brantford (Mr. Cockshutt) made a point during the debate to the effect that the Canadians who had enlisted in the Imperial forces should be considered in filling these positions. I think any resolution to be passed by this House should embrace those men. I believe in filling all these positions with returned men. For instance, supposing in my constituency there is a vacancy in the Civil Service, but there is not in the neighbouring constituency an eligible man, I think some effort should be made to get a returned soldier from some other part of Canada for that position.

There is one little point more or less in connection with this that I would like to mention here. It is in regard to returned soldiers already working in some branch of the Civil Service. In my city at the present time a number of men on the grain inspection staff are laid off after the rush of the season is over. Last year and the year before among the men laid off were a number of returned soldiers. The Great War Veterans' Association opposed this very vigorously, and perhaps they de-

manded more than the department could see its way to give, because I think the department wanted to be quite fair to these men. On each occasion I brought the case to the notice of the department in charge, and I explained that I thought they should keep on an efficient staff, and that in addition they should keep on, even at a loss, any returned soldiers who were working on that staff. In the past year out of 80 men between Fort William, Port Arthur and Winnipeg, it only meant keeping on some ten or fifteen returned soldiers. That may seem unreasonable, but we as members of this Parliament have been asking the private corporations of this country to do that very thing, and, to be consistent, the least we can do is to ask our Government to do the same. It is too late to remedy this matter this year. No doubt the department acted in good faith on the advice of its officials, but I believe that advice was wrongly given. I told the men who gave this advice in Fort William that I thought they gave it wrongly. They did not mean to be unfair, but they were unfair to the returned soldiers. I hope next year those returned soldiers will be retained in their positions as far as possible. I do not like to go so far as to suggest that other men should be laid off to give positions to returned soldiers, but I do not think returned soldiers should be laid off when we are asking private corporations to retain them.

One word in regard to shell shock, although there has been no extended discussion on that subject. Many men who have suffered from shell shock at the front are just as much casualties as the men who have been wounded. I have seen men come into my dugout in the front line who had seen some man wounded beside them; they were not wounded, but their nervous system was so completely shot to pieces, that they were in a much worse condition perhaps than the wounded man. Many of these cases are marked "shell shock wound" and are given a stripe to denote it, and a very large percentage deserve that stripe. I support very strongly the hon. members for Colchester and Calgary and hope that this resolution will carry.

Hon. MARTIN BURRELL (Secretary of State): Mr. Speaker, the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) has laid a resolution before the House which in fact advances the principle of a preference within a preference. It demands the sympathy of the House with respect to the matters it deals with, and that sympathy will not be any the less by reason of the fact that the resolution has been spoken to by two members of this House, both of whom have done gallant service at the front, and not only have they distinguished themselves there, but they have created a most favourable impression in this House.

I call the attention of the House to the fact that a resolution bearing on this matter was brought down by the hon. member for North Grey in 1916, though it did not go as far as the resolution now under discussion. That resolution read:

> That, in the opinion of this House, in all future appointments to the Civil Service of Canada, preference should be given to those properly qualified candidates who have served with the Canadian Expeditionary Force in the present war.

Although that resolution only spoke of a preference for Canadian soldiers generally, the hon. member who brought the resolution before the House at that time made this statement:

> As all those who return will not be able to secure appointments in the Civil Service, we shall have to create a preferential class among them, and in doing so, no doubt we shall take into consideration the fact that those who have been wounded, but who after a certain time will be able to perform the duties appertaining to civil servants, should be given preferential treatment among those who have served in the Canadian Expeditionary Force.

The Prime Minister also spoke in that debate and referred to the Order in Council which was passed on November 27, 1917: It is as follows:

> The Committee of the Privy Council, on the recommendation of the Right Hon. the Prime Minister, advise that in making appointments to the Government Civil Service, preference be given to the returned members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, especially those who through disability occasioned by active military service are unable to fill their previous occupations; such appointments to be subject to the provisions of the Civil Service Act and to be made with due regard to the capacity of any applicant to discharge the duties of the position to which it is proposed to appoint him.

Subsequently, as hon. members know, a provision was put in the Civil Service Act which, while not going as far, perhaps, as the resolution proposed by my hon. friend, did give general preference to returned soldiers. I sympathize with the view of my hon. friend, supported by the member for Calgary (Mr. Redman) that the policy of the Civil Service Commission should be in accord with the principles enunciated in that provision and laid down by the members who have just spoken. Of course, the mover of the resolution and the member for Calgary must recognize as we all do, the difficulties which surround this ques-

tion. I am sure that the Civil Service Commission are doing the best they can. Of course, there will be mistakes. Some time ago objection was raised because returned soldiers who were applicants for certain positions were required to show that they had had a number of years' office experience. Lately the regulations have been amended so as to dispense with that requirement where it can be shown that it is not necessary, and that the soldiers are sufficiently experienced in a broad way without requiring that specific number of years' office experience.

There may be a good deal in what the member for Calgary has said with regard to the commission giving proper notice and providing a proper length of time to enable soldiers to take advantage of the opportunity presented to them of getting a position.

As to the question of dependents, I would not like to say very much about that except to remark, in passing, that the dependent as ordinarily construed is one who is really a dependent; if he is able to earn a livelihood, in a sense he would no longer be a dependent. I assume what my hon. friend means that extra sympathy should be shown and attention given to those who are near relatives to soldiers who have seen service.

Mr. REDMAN: When a man receives a pension it means that he has lost certain means of support.

Mr. BURRELL: At all events, that will have full attention and sympathy.

The member for Victoria (Sir Sam Hughes) spoke of examinations and rather deprecated the holding of examinations for technical positions. I can understand the difficulties that might be encountered in that respect. If, for instance, a returned soldier wanted a position in mining, geological or entomological work, it is quite obvious that technical knowledge might be necessary in order to determine his usefulness in that line of work.

I should deprecate as much as the member for Calgary—the practice—I can understand it would arouse resentment if it were generally followed— of appointing young civilians to positions when it was possible to get returned soldiers who could anything like fill the positions. I doubt whether there are any cases where such civilians have been given the preference; where it has been done, the circumstances must have been very exceptional. Having regard to the enormous number of appointments under consideration, I have no doubt that occasional mistakes are made, but I am sure that the Civil Service Commission are in sympathy with the principles laid down in this respect. For myself, I feel, as the House generally does, that no consideration is too great for those men who crossed the seas in order to fight in those days of peril for the perpetuation of our institutions. There have been cases—I am sure my hon. friend would be the last to deny it—where soldiers have been given positions who have made it very difficult for the authorities to retain them because of their having shown little aptitude or desire to do the work; and it has been naturally a painful business to dismiss them by virtue of the fact that they are returned soldiers. Yet in some cases it has been practically impossible to retain such a man because of the manner in which he did the work. On the other hand, employers generally and the public should have the strongest and most abundant sympathy for men who have been wounded, especially, perhaps, for those who have been shell-shocked, and who having been given positions do the very best in them, but who cannot do as well as they might if they were restored to a normal state of health. The vast majority of men who have returned from the front whether wounded or unwounded—and one thinks more sympathetically of those who have been wounded —after facing the stark realities of life and death over there during three or more grim years of war, will not only be bigger men all round, but will, in the long run, do better than ever before in whatever particular class of work they were formerly engaged.

I do not suppose that the mover of the resolution intends to press it to a vote, because the Civil Service Act is going to be amended. Amendments will be brought down within the next few weeks, when these and other points may very well be taken up. In the meantime the attention of the Civil Service Commissioners will be directed to the motion of my hon. friend and to the discussion that has taken place on it. When the amendments are brought down opportunities will be afforded to the mover of the resolution, and to those who have spoken, to press the points on which they have touched.

Mr. W. F. NICKLE (Kingston): Before the member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) takes advantage of his right to close this debate or decides whether or not he will withdraw his resolution, I should like to

make a few remarks on the matter under discussion.

I have listened with a great deal of interest to the discussion this afternoon, more particularly to the remarks of the minister (Hon. Mr. Burrell). When he said that the matter would be taken into sympathetic consideration, he reminded me of a story I read some years ago of a colonel, who, passing down the Strand in London, saw a private of his regiment selling mutton pies by the street side. He stopped and spoke to him, and discovering the condition in which the man was, said: "You have my deepest sympathy"; to which the man replied: "Darn your sympathy; buy a pie." It is not sympathy that the returned soldier wants or that those of us who are speaking this afternoon on his behalf, desire. What he wants is recognition by way of appointment, recognition in the Civil Service, recognition throughout the country.

Hon. Mr. BURRELL: I hope my hon. friend is not arguing that I offered plain sympathy without asserting any intention of doing anything in a practical way, for such is not the case.

Mr. NICKLE: Not at all. I simply want to point out that the matter has really got beyond the point of sympathetic consideration. I regard the problem that confronts the country to-day,—and I trust to make it clear before I sit down,—as one of the most serious that we in Canada, particularly in Ontario, have to face.

The minister is quite correct in saying that an Order in Council was passed on the 27th of November, 1915. But it is to be remembered what the conditions were in this country when that Order in Council was passed. At that time patronage was within the gift, so to speak, of the private member on his recommendation to the Government, which, as a rule, was followed. The Order in Council of 27th November, 1915, stated that preference was to be given to the returned soldiers of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, especially those who through disability occasioned by active military service were unable to engage in their previous occupations, such appointments to be subject to the Civil Service Act and to be made with due regard to the capacity of any applicant to discharge the duties of the position to which it was proposed to appoint him. That Order in Council was confirmed by an Order in Council passed on the 12th of October, 1916, which read as follows:

> In making all appointments to the Civil Service, whether in the Inside or in the Outside Service—

The reason why that was put in was this. Some discussion had arisen as to whether the order of the 27th November, 1915, applied to the Outside Service as well as to the Inside. The new order was therefore made to read:

> In making all appointments to the Civil Service, whether in the Inside or in the Outside Service, preference shall be given to those candidates who have served overseas in His Majesty's forces during the present war, and who have been honourably discharged therefrom, especially to those who through disability occasioned by active military service are unable to follow their previous occupations. Heads of departments, deputy-heads of departments and the Civil Service Commission shall within their respective jurisdictions over appointments be responsible for establishing systematic methods for ensuring that such preference is given.

And the Order in Council of the 27th November was repealed. The net effect was this: That the members, who had the right of recommendation to the Government, were told by the Government—because if my memory services me correctly, a copy of these orders was sent to the members—that if a member's recommendation was to be filled it must respect the principle laid down, and I must say that in the great majority of cases the Order in Council last passed really expressed the feeling of hon. members from one end of the country to the other, that the returned man must get the preference, and the one whose capacity had been impaired should be given priority.

But when the Civil Service Act was passed—and most of us were in the House when that Act was passed—I doubt if we fully understood all that was comprised within the four corners of the measure. Section 38, Part III, declared:

> Except as herein otherwise provided..... appointments to positions in the civil service shall be by competitive examination..... in accordance with regulations to be made by the Commission.

Section 39, sub-section 2 says:

> Immediately after each examination, a list of the successful competitors in the case of a competitive examination, and of the successful candidates in order of merit in other examinations shall be made out, and the list of successful competitors and candidates shall be published in the Canada Gazette.

Put briefly, that meant that there were to be two classes of examinations: Those to fill positions where competition was to prevail, in which the honours went to the competitor making the largest number of marks; and secondly, where examinations were held for the filling of more than one position, the candidates with the required

minimum number of marks should be entitled to secure recognition. A further proviso was made by paragraph (a) to this effect:

Providing, however, that in all examinations persons who have been on active service overseas on the military or naval forces of His Majesty or of any of the allies of His Majesty during the present war; who have left such service with an honourable record or who have been honourably discharged; and who obtain sufficient marks to pass such examinations, shall, irrespective of the marks they have obtained, be placed in the order of merit on the list of successful candidates above all other candidates.

That meant that in all examinations where a minimum standard was required the returned soldier, provided he received the required minimum number of marks, should be entitled to be placed at the head of the list, and in that order should be entitled to recognition.

Mr. MORPHY: Is not that exactly what the Civil Service Commission are doing?

Mr. NICKLE: If my hon. friend will allow me to proceed I will explain my position in a few moments. The net result of paragraph (a) was this: That where the minimum number of marks was obtained, the soldier should go to the top. But, in part, the difficulties arising at the present time are in connection with professional or technical positions, which, as the hon. member for Calgary states are filled without an examination being held. In that class of cases the Commission have no such regard for what I might call the preferential treatment set out in paragraph (a) of section 39, or by section 45 which established a principle that was not recognized when patronage was in the control of private members. Then, promotion was not an essential of recognization: it was a question of selection, and not necessarily of promotion. But section 45 provided that:

Vacancies shall be filled, as far as is consistent with the best interests of the Civil Service, by promotion.

To put the matter briefly it comes down to this. Where there is an examination, either competitive or otherwise, marks being the determining factor, the returned successful soldier goes to the top of the list, but where it is a question of technical or professional qualification, the Civil Service Act makes no provision for such recognition of the returned or disabled soldier; and where it is a question of promotion, no recognition is given to the returned soldier as such.

Recently I have received from three organizations in my riding three resolutions. The first is a resolution passed on the 11th day of March by the Great War Veterans' Association, and reads as follows:

That this association is of the opinion that the present practice of the Civil Service Commission in not carrying out its avowed policy in dealing with returned men deserves strong condemnation.

Another resolution was passed by the Soldiers' Aid Commission for the city of Kingston, and as you know, Mr. Speaker, the Soldiers' Aid Commission is organized for the express purpose of aiding and obtaining employment for the returned soldier. This resolution reads:

That this branch of the Soldiers' Aid Commission of the province of Ontario should go on record as favouring a change in the existing regulations of the Civil Service Commission, making it possible for returned men to secure government positions and appointments with the least possible amount of difficulty, having due regard for the efficiency of the service; that every opportunity should be given at all times for the returned soldier to qualify for Civil Service positions, and that in the filling of positions rendered vacant by any cause, a returned soldier, all other things being equal, shall have the preference, and shall be given every chance to qualify.

The Army and Navy Veterans' Association also passed a resolution unanimously supporting the resolution as moved in this House this afternoon by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy).

The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) asked me a question a few moments ago, and it was a very, very pertinent question and merits, I think, a careful answer, and I want for the edification of the House as well as of the hon. member to read two sets of letters which I think will make clear that the Civil Service Commission, while they may be endeavouring—to give them every credit—to carry out the principles of the Civil Service Act—are through the details of the regulations and the restriction of sections 15 and 45, not able to implement as fully as the House would desire the rights of the returned soldiers. In reading these letters, I do not intend to give the names of the soldiers mentioned therein. One letter dated December 23, 1918, was written by myself to the Chairman of the Civil Service Commission, Ottawa:—

Kingston, Ontario,
December 23rd, 1918.

Chairman,
Civil Service Commission,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Mr. Roche:

Mr. X. of this city went overseas as a member of the C.E.F. and had the misfortune to

lose his right arm close to the shoulder. Prior to going overseas, he had had excellent experience in his father's factory and is thoroughly conversant with the management of men, general manufacturing, and ordinary commercial bookkeeping work and methods. He now desires to devote his energies to something that offers a prospect of advancement. I suggested some position akin to that of assistant postmaster, assistant collector of customs, or other work requiring honesty, energy and application. I wish you would send me the necessary form of application and also advise me if you know of any vacancy. I can speak in the highest terms of the young man who expects shortly to return to England to be married, and is therefore anxious to know something definite in regard to his future.

To which I received the following reply, dated December 27th:—

December 27, 1918.

Dear Sir,—I beg to acknowledge yours of the 23rd on behalf of Mr. X.

I am enclosing you a form of application for temporary employment which Mr. X. might fill in and return to the Commission, so that we may have his name on file in the event of temporary help being requisitioned for by any of the departments in the line for which Mr. X.'s qualifications would fit him.

As you are aware, under the Civil Service Act 1918, all clerical positions of a permanent character must be filled after passing the regular Civil Service examination. We will have a large list of eligibles as a result of our examinations held on the 13th instant. There are other positions, however, of a special or technical character that you no doubt see advertized in the Canada Gazette from time to time and which advertisements are copied into the press of the country and are also sent to public institutions and to all the branches of the Great War Veterans' Associations, etc., which positions do not require the passing of the regular academic examination but are thrown open to public competition and selections are made on merit, returned soldiers of course being given the preference, all other things being equal.

The hon. member for North Perth (Mr. Morphy) will now realize why I did not answer his question at the moment he asked it. That letter of the Civil Service Commission stipulates a provision that is very detrimental to the returned soldier, namely, that if he has not passed the examination held at the regular period he is prevented from recognition until another examination is held. And as these examinations are held only every two or three months, or, perhaps, every five or six months, the man who came back on the 27th of December, 1918, according to the terms of that letter in so far as I have read it—and I purpose to read it to the end, was denied recognition at least until the next examination was held. Now I shall proceed with the letter:

There is at the present time no request before the Commission to fill such positions as you have mentioned, namely assistant post-

master, assistant collector of customs, etc., but such positions are filled by promotion if there is any person on the staff qualified to fill same. If new appointments of this nature are required to be made, open competition is invited.

The letter is concluded in the formal manner.

As regards recognition by promotion, the gentleman on whose behalf I wrote had no chance whatever unless he began at the bottom, no matter what his capabilities were. Because he had given up a position of ease and affluence and gone to the war, in which he lost an arm, he was in an infinitely more disadvantageous position than the man who remained at home and held his position in the Civil Service. The latter receives promotion, whereas the man who went overseas, was injured and could not resume his former employment, would be obliged to start at the bottom with $500 or $600 a year. The man who stayed at home is promoted to a position that is worth $2,000 or $2,500 a year.

Hon. Mr. MACLEAN: Suppose he were an elderly man who could not go overseas, and who could not be expected to do so, should he not be given promotion?

Mr. NICKLE: I will say frankly that I think each case must be considered on its merits in relatinn to the situation that exists at the time. If the man who holds a position in the Civil Service is an aged man with a family, and has given honest and faithful service, while the man desiring recognition is a young man, I think in all fairness the elderly man should get the preference, and if possible the younger man be given the position next vacant. But if a young man holds an important position won by ability and application, and the man returned from overseas is married and has two or three children, the recognition should be given to the man who has been to the front. Underlying this, the broad principle should be that the returned man, particularly if he is capable, should be regarded with singular care and sympathy by this House, by the Government and by the commission. I shall now read another letter writen by me on March 17, 1919, to the Civil Service Commission.

Kingston, Ontario,
March 17, 1919.

The Civil Service Commission,
Ottawa, Ont.

Dear Sirs:—Mr. Y. now lives at X. street, having returned from the front where he went in 1916. For eight months he was laid up with a broken leg and an injured neck as the result of concussion but is now quite himself again.

He desires to be appointed as letter carrier and appears to have all the qualifications that that position would require. As he is married,—his wife and children living here with him—he would prefer an appointment to the Kingston staff, if an opportunity offers but would, if such were not available, go elsewhere. He tells me he sent in an application through the Postmaster over a month ago but has heard nothing in reference to the matter.

Please be good enough to see this letter is filed for reference.

Yours sincerely,

W. F. Nickle.

On March 20, I received this reply:

Ottawa, March 20, 1919.

Dear Sir:

I have your letter of the 17th instant, respecting the case of Mr. Y., a returned soldier, who desires a position as Letter Carrier, if possible in Kingston Post Office. I am sending Mr. Y. an application form asking him to fill out and return it at his convenience. I may add, however, that vacancies are filled as far as possible from the lists of successful candidates at the regular examinations. When these lists are exhausted, however, other applications are considered and I can assure you that Mr. Y's case will be given every attention.

Yours truly,

(Sgd) W. Foran,
Secretary.

Mr. W. F. Nickle, Esq. M.P.,
House of Commons,
Ottawa.

The net result is that, attaching so much importance to academic qualifications as demonstrated by examinations the returned soldier, if he is here, and successful may go to the top of the list. We are demobilizing men at the rate of 30,000 or 40,000 a month, and these men are not in a position to get recognition in examinations until the regular examination is held. The provision is also made by the Civil Service Act subsection 5 of section 39:

If there remain from a previous examination successful competitors who have not received appointments, their number shall be deducted in making the computation, and their names, in the order of merit, shall be placed at the top of the list to be prepared in accordance with subsection 2 of this section.

In other words if all the positions have been filled and there are ten or twelve civilians unappointed after the first examination, should the Civil Service Commission decide to have a second examination those civilians who were successful at the first examination take priority, although soldiers may have passed in the second examination. I do not believe this was the purport of the legislation passed last session, and the Act should be amended to carry out what was undoubtedly the principle that moved this House, namely that the returned man, particularly when disabled, should be given the preference. Now in regard to the point taken in one of these letters; "all other things being equal," I remember once having heard a shepherd remark that no two sheep were alike, and that he could distinguish each by its face. I think the same thing holds true with men; no two men are exactly alike, neither have they exactly the same qualifications. The difference between some men are remarkable, and between others, trifling. But there is always a difference. If the principle is going to be laid down that the returned soldier shall get the preference only when all other things are equal, it practically means that he will be given no preference at all; because it is only when two men are equally qualified and equally entitled to a position that the returned soldier gets the preference. That nicety of selection simply means that the recognition of priority for the soldier is destroyed. I think there is a tendency to attach too much importance to academic qualifications as demonstrated by marks obtained in examinations. The academic qualification is valuable in that it indicates training and intellectual status.

Academic qualifications are all right as far as they indicate training and intellectual status but they are not all right when you attach so much importance to them that you forget what one might call aptitude, ability and resourcefulness. In the soldier's case the experience that he has had overseas will, in my judgment, in many cases, make him a better man than before he went. I believe that a man who went overseas three or four years ago and who, actively guided by a strong sense of patriotism and a consciousness that he was doing his duty, stood to his post and did his bit as a true soldier has qualifications that you cannot measure by an academic test, and which you cannot judge by his capacity to stand high in an examination in long division or in extracting the cubic root. I would not say that examinations must not be held. I admit that you must test a man's worth in some way and an academic examination is one sort of a test but I would like to see the working out of the Act so changed that when an appointment came up the list that was secured four or five weeks or perhaps seven or eight or perhaps months ago, would not be taken as the list from which the appointment would be made. I believe that some steps should be taken to find out if there were any returned men available who could do this work, even though those men had not made application, and if it was found on inquiry that such a man existed,

an opportunity should be given him to demonstrate his worth and, if he satisfied the commission, not necessarily by an academic examination, of his capacity to undertake the job, he should be given the position regardless of the fact that he did not have an opportunity of writing on an examination which was held in the regular course of events.

I think this demand is going to grow in so far as the Civil Service is concerned —I was going to say worse and worse— but I will change that and say steadily. Men are coming back from the front and their disability claims are rapidly being adjusted by the Pension Commissioners. I suppose we will have, when we have got through, 60,000 disabled men. These are men whose earning capacity is impaired through service and the question is: Where are these men going to get employment and what is going to be the policy of the country, both from the point of view of the Government and from the point of view of the captains of industry, as to what use we are going to make of the residuum of ability that these men have?

The House will remember that pensions are not voted by way of compensation. They are not voted with respect to a man's pre-war earnings; nor are they voted with respect to his impairment in relation to his pre-war occupation. A pension is voted to a man with reference to the amount of work which it may be determined he may be able to do in the ordinary unskilled labour market of the world. The result is that many men of high technical qualifications, education and broad experience are finding themselves impaired in relation to their pre-war occupations and are unable to live adequately on the pensions that have been or will be, granted to them.

As these men, driven from their pre-war occupations, go about this country seeking new occupations, they are confronted, and are apt to be confronted more and more, with this problem that the employer has to solve: Am I justified, in relation to the Workmen's Compensation Act, under which I am now called upon to make compensation, to those of my employees who are hurt, in taking these men back again into my employ? What risk do I incur if I take back into my employment a man who is disabled as a result of service?

The reason I allude to that point is this: The pressure under the Civil Service Act and the pressure from the country for recognition by the employment of returned men is going to depend largely on how far these returned men may or can be absorbed into the industrial, commercial and agricultural life of the community. The principles that underlie the Compensation Act fall into two classes. Some of the compensation acts are worked out on the principle of assessment and others on the principle of individual responsibility. Ontario, British Columbia, Alberta, to an extent Manitoba, Nova Scotia and New Brunswick have worked out their compensation acts on the principle of assessment. The industries of the different districts are divided into thirty-five or forty classes. The hazard of each is determined and a rate struck. That rate is levied on the average wage paid during the year. In some cases it runs as low as ten cents on the $100 and in others it goes as high as $4 or $5 to each $100 of wages paid during the year. The average is about one per cent of the wages paid. In Quebec and in other provinces the assessment system does not prevail. The employer is responsible for the compensation to be paid to the employee. Each factory bears its own losses, and the manufacturer is deprived of the right of setting up the old common law defence of contributory negligence and voluntary incurment of risk. These principles are set to one side and if an accident happens the employer must pay the man who is regarded, so to speak, as a part of the machinery of the factory, and if a part of the machinery is injured the responsibility for compensation is thrown on the owner of the industry. There is no escaping the obligation. That obligation, in those provinces in which individual responsibility prevails, is largely met by the manufacturers carrying insurance in some of the line companies that carry on that class of insurance. You can readily see from this that the problem which confronts the employer coming under either of the two systems is if he takes back the returned man and the compensation for disability is increased. If this happens to be an employment in which many men are engaged, consideration is not so important as in the smaller employments where a few men are engaged. If only two or three are engaged the responsibility will make a tremendous increase in the risk. I am quite willing to admit that the great majority of the employers of this country are patriotic. I am quite willing to admit that the great majority of employers are anxious to take back into their employment men who left them to go overseas. They are anxious in so far as they can, to give

employment to the men who have returned and are looking for work although, when they went overseas they may not have been employed in the particular factory of the employer, who is asked to take them on. But, we must follow that out and find where we are being led. There is no question—it cannot be disputed—that where a man has suffered any disability he will be more awkward and less alert than the man who has not suffered such a disability. Working about rapidly moving machinery which is the very backbone of industry to-day, that man may not find his senses as keen and cannot respond as rapidly to the premonitions of danger as the man who has his full faculties about him. The restrictions under which he works tend to increase accidents. If these accidents do increase, as accidents are bound to increase I think that the dollar and cents argument will be likely to prevail. The economic argument will be felt that each man must endeavour to conduct his factory on a basis to enable him to compete with those who are not as patriotic as himself. As that argument begins to be felt, or as that pressure begins to be felt, there will arise a tendency not to keep the returned man in the employ of this industry or that. Now I had a very striking instance of that a few months ago. There is in my riding a shipbuilding company who are anxious, and have always been glad, to give the returned man recognition. A returned man came into my office and told me he could not get work. I asked the shipbuilding company would they take him on, and they said, "Send him down," and they gave him work. He had not worked there more than a few weeks, when one day, whilst walking across a narrow bridge, he had a fit of dizziness, fell off the bridge and was drowned, with the result that I believe some four or five thousand dollars has been, or will have to be, paid to his dependents. That claim is going to be thrown on the shipbuilding industry. Naturally that industry would likely say, "We do not want to take on any more men like that if we have got to meet the cost incidental to such an accident."

Then there is another class of cases, a very serious class, where a man has had a disability that leaves him a fair residuum of ability to carry on his ordinary work in life. We will take a man who has lost one eye, but whose other eye is perfectly good. One eye is fairly capable of doing the work that the man has to do, working about machinery, or working out of doors; but if he loses the second eye that man becomes stone blind and cannot carry on his work. A man has lost two fingers off his right hand. He is quite capable of doing his work, and doing his work well, but if in addition to the two fingers he loses two more, and loses his thumb, his whole hand is gone. Now what is to be the principle that is to underlie the recognition that is to be given under the Workmen's Compensation Act, where a man suffers an impairment, subsequent to his war disability, on going into industrial employment? Is the workman's compensation to be on the basis of the injury the man suffered through his industrial activity without relation to his war disability, or is the compensation to be determined by the disability the man suffers in relation to his condition on the assumption that he was a whole man when he went into that employment?

Then there is another class of cases. A man comes back from the front. He has been away from the industry two or three years. He is not as skilled a man as he was when he went away. He has lost the skill that comes from long unbroken practice. He has suffered some injury at the front, say a wound that is fully healed, and he comes back into industry. While he is working along, being a bit clumsy, he gets struck right on the old wound, and the old war disability returns, and instead of taking two or three weeks it takes him five or six months to get better. Is his compensation going to be paid in respect of two or three weeks, or in respect of five or six months?

You ask me what are my suggestions for these difficulties and why do I bring them up this afternoon? As I told you I bring them up because I believe they have to be met. Primarily, I bring them up because I believe if they are not met we are going to have so many men looking for Government recognition in this country by virtue of Civil Service appointments that Governments are going to be decidedly uncomfortable. You have a right to say to me "You are criticizing, do some constructing. A man of very moderate ability can be a very bitter critic; it takes a good man to be a passable performer." You have a right to ask me to become a passable performer; and I want to submit to the House a few suggestions which I think it should take into its consideration. The United States, Italy, France and Great Britain have had this matter under review. They have realized that the returned man has a right to his place in the community. He has a right to his citizenship, and I mean by the

expression he has a right to his citizenship, that he has a right if he desires it when he comes back to this country to be given some employment in which he will have a reasonable opportunity of earning his daily bread, and that he should not be made to feel in this country after having given, perhaps I might say, the best of his life, that there is no place in Canada for him, and that all he has ahead of him is to loaf the streets, living on a pittance of a pension; that there is no place in Canada where he can turn the ability he may have left to account and do something to advance the interests of his family. Nothing is worse than that. I do not sympathize with those that believe that work is a burden. I believe that work, honest work, in reason, is the salvation of mankind; and I believe that honest work for the returned soldier is going to be the very best thing that this country can offer him. Of course a pension, with respect to his disability, as well with honest work for the returned soldier is going to be the best thing that this country can offer to him if we are in the years to come to have a contented, thrifty and satisfied class in Canada, among those whom we call the returned men.

Now, the suggestion I make is this, and I divide it into three classes, because I have not had sufficient opportunity to reach a conclusion—I have not been able to get sufficient information to warrant me in finally saying what I think should be done: As I have endeavoured to explain to the House, Sir, the Workmen's Compensation Acts, all proceed on the assumption that the disabled man in industry shall get something in respect of his industrial disability. To give that compensation means that industry, as a class, or individual employers, must meet the cost. Shifting the burden of taxation does not pay the taxes. Shifting the burden incidental to the risk of employment from one industry to a

5 p.m. group of industries does not pay the compensation incidental to the occupation, it simply shifts it, so to speak, in that it equalizes the burden over the entire industry and takes it off a particular shop. I would like to suggest to the Government, therefore, that they should carefully consider this point—that they should insure all returned men as against industrial disability. This would create of the returned men a preferred class, because the manufacturers of this country would be brought to realize that the returned men put no burden on them in respect of workmen's compensation. If they took a man into a particular industry and an accident happened to him, the state would bear the loss, the industry would be spared that loss, and the amount, in my judgment, would not be so excessive. I believe you could do it at a cost of a million dollars a year, and I do not believe it should be done—at least at the beginning it should not be held out that it would be done—for more than five years, and I think the principle should not apply to men who had not been in the army, let us say, six months or a year. Now the reason I say that the man should be in the army at least six months or a year is this: Some men were drafted into the army and were only in it a few weeks. Other men volunteered and were only in a few weeks. Some men are coming back and are going back into civil life exactly as well as when they left it, because they were not in the army long enough to be physically impaired. Others have been as I have endeavoured to show, long enough in the army to be seriously impaired, and these are the men that I think should be protected. I want to be frank with the House: In making this suggestion I am making a suggestion that will, to a certain extent, be beneficial to the employer, and will be beneficial for this reason: In all classes of industry certain men are injured, not through any negligence of the men, not through any negligence—as the law would determine negligence,—of the employer, but by what I would call unavoidable accident. A boiler may explode, a wall may fall, something of that sort may happen, by which returned men would be injured, and yet their injury would in no way be attributable to any disability they might have incurred during the war. Some people may say, "That is too broad a scheme, it is too big a scheme, the Government should not commit itself to it." If they cannot do that, insure all pensionable disabled men—as against industrial disability, who have been recognized by their being pensioned, are suffering from disability due to the fact that they have been impaired, and permanently impaired through service, or during service.

As far as I can estimate it, there will probably be 60,000 of those men, of whom about two-fifths will go into industrial or commercial pursuits. As I said some little time ago Sir, the average protection rate is about one per cent, and it has been computed that it costs on the average about $7 a year to insure a man against industrial disability. Two-fifths of 60,000 will give us

24,000, and at $7 a man that would involve an annual expenditure of $168,000. That is all it would cost this country to insure the pensionable disabled man, and in that way I think we would guarantee them employment in the industries of this country.

But if you are not prepared to do that, then let us at least think of this, which although not nearly enough, is something that the returned man is entitled to be given insurance against, the increased liability to industrial accidents due to his disability. If the loss of one eye is valued at 30 per cent by the Pension Board, and by the Workmen's Compensation Board, then when a man loses one eye during service he will be given a pension of 30 per cent, and if he loses the other eye, becoming totally blind, the industrial compensation being only another 30 per cent, then the man who has become stone blind in industrial service will only get 60 per cent, unless the aggravated disability of 70 per cent is charged against industry by the Compensation Board. Surely that man is entitled to a hundred per cent disability. If the Government is not prepared to adopt either of the first two schemes, surely the suggestion I make in regard to insurance against increased liability for aggravation from industrial accidents is something that this country should and likely will be willing to undertake.

It is a responsibility which should not be shifted on to the employers. I recognize their patriotism, their anxiety to do everything they can to give employment to returned men, but I know how inexorable the laws of supply and demand are, how inexorably the law of costs bears down on industry, and if a manufacturer finds that by reason of keen competition he is making a loss, as sure as the sun rises in the morning, he is going to cut down his costs, and the only way he can do so is by increasing his efficiency, by stripping his factory of every overhead charge that can be eliminated, and I am afraid that in the years to come one of the first to suffer will be the disabled man.

You may say that much of what I have advanced has nothing to do with the Civil Service Commission. I think it has a great deal to do with the Civil Service Commission, because I appreciate the problems with which they have to deal. I appreciate that there is much discontent among our returned men at the present time, and I agree with what the hon. member for Calgary said, that there is one thing that the returned man resents, and that is a young man getting recognition, and I know as I speak on the floor of this House that, unless a change has taken place in the last few weeks, there is one young man in Kingston holding a Government position that should be given to a returned man, and he is holding that position because somebody more powerful than the member wants to keep him there. It is now only a temporary position, but it is a temporary position that has been held for a period of from eighteen months to two years, and just as sure as I stand on this floor to-night I am confident that the reason that young man is being kept in that temporary position is that it is desired that some day his appointment be made permanent. I ask the minister and this House: Is there any reason why an able bodied young man who has not been at the front should not give way, even although he is a temporary employee of this Government, to the returned man who has lost an eye or an arm or a leg in the service of his country, but has all the other qualifications essential to fill that position? I do not think that this country wants the retention of these positions by men who are physically fit, and I want to urge that on the Civil Service Commission. As I said before, I am in favour of the Civil Service Commission, I do not want the worry and anxiety of political patronage, but if the Civil Service Commission is going to continue, both the commission and this Government have got to be alive to the fact that public sentiment from one end of this country to the other demands that full and generous recognition be given to the returned men; and the people of this country are determined that the returned men shall not be deprived of the recognition they are entitled to merely for technical and trivial reasons.

Mr. VIEN: Will the hon. gentleman inform the House whether he drew the attention of the Government to the fact that that young man could be replaced with advantage by a returned soldier?

Mr. NICKLE: I think I drew the attention of the Civil Service Commission to the fact. If I may enlarge on the hon. member's question, what I think should be done is to appoint a returned man as one member on the Civil Service Commission. He might make it his especial duty to watch over the interests of returned men and give careful consideration to all the facts underlying their cases.

Mr. DONALD SUTHERLAND (Oxford South): Mr. Speaker, the resolution before the House touches a real live question, a

question that is uppermost in the minds of the people. I had no intention of saying anything on it this afternoon, but I doubt if there is a representative in this House who cannot recall an instance or more in his own constituency which would justify him in supporting the resolution moved by the hon. member for Colchester. I have listened with a good deal of interest to the addresses of the hon. members for Calgary and Kingston (Mr. Redman and Mr. Nickle). I think the hon. member for Kingston has made it abundantly clear that the returned soldiers are not only not receiving a preference at the hands of the Civil Service Commission, but they are not even receiving what they are entitled to in open competition. Some time ago I placed a question on the Order Paper in regard to this matter, and the information I received was that among the appointments, permanent and temporary, which had been made since the passing of this Act, in 1918, about 12½ per cent of them had gone to returned soldiers, and a great many of them appointments carrying very small salaries, and for that reason so trivial in their character that there was no credit due to anyone for the fact that they had been made.

Now, in view of the fact that I spoke very plainly on this question when the Civil Service Act was before the House last year, if you will pardon me I would like to make some reference to what I said on that occasion, for the reason that I was rather severely criticized for having spoken as plainly as I did at that time. I was then strongly in favour, and I am still strongly in favour, if we are to have the Outside service under the Civil Service Commission, that at least one member of that Commission should be a returned soldier. I think that this should be done in fairness to the men who are coming back to this country after rendering a great public service. I said:

> I do think that the soldiers would have felt that their interests were being safeguarded and looked after much better had a returned soldier been appointed as one of the members of this commission. I submit that among returned soldiers men could have been found possessing the qualifications which I have mentioned; yet for some reason no returned soldier has been selected to fill one of these positions.

Previously, on May 13, I said, when the matter was before the House:

> The fact that the returned soldiers are not represented in the commission justifies the criticism that is offered of this measure and the endeavour to provide all the safeguards that are necessary to ensure that they shall receive the treatment that they are entitled to.

[Mr. Sutherland.]

There is no representation of returned soldiers on the Civil Service Commission. Previous to that I had protested the bringing of the Outside Service under the Civil Service Commission, and I should like to quote a few words I said in reference to that matter:

> I am speaking in this way because I feel this is an inopportune time to introduce a measure of this kind when we have coming back from overseas every day men who are maimed for life, and who will find it difficult to follow their old vocation. These men should surely be given the preference, but I cannot see within the four corners of the Bill anything to safeguard their rights in any degree. It is true that an Order in Council has been passed, but so far as the Bill itself is concerned—I have looked it over very carefully—no safeguards have been provided. On the contrary, the examinations that may be prescribed by the Civil Service Commission will probably debar a great many of these men from entering the civil service, who under present conditions might be appointed. Why is it that to-day practically the only positions you can get for a returned soldier are caretakers of public buildings or some other menial employment of that kind? It may be that in other parts of the country returned soldiers are being given positions.

I said further:

> I say this is not the time to introduce a measure of this sort. It is not right that our returned soldiers should be prevented from occupying positions they are competent to fill simply, it may be, because they cannot spell "Bolsheviki" correctly. I say we could well afford to let this measure stand over until a more opportune time, and the same remark applies to a good deal of the legislation we have had before us this session.

That legislation was put through, and to-day we are in a position to judge what the result has been.

The Civil Service Commission was subjected to very severe criticism on a former occasion in this House during the present session, and the matter will undoubtedly come before the House later. But the fact that in my own constituency as well as in the constituencies of other hon. gentlemen there have been glaring instances where men who have not been casualties at the front, men who have not served at the front at all, are given the preference over men who are returning from overseas in large numbers, is I conceive, nothing short of an outrage. When the matter was before the House last year I pointed out that there was a difference between the Civil Service and the Public Service. These soldiers have been rendering a great public service for many months, some of them for many years. As you go along the streets of our cities and meet numbers of men stumping along minus a leg or an arm or crippled in some other way, you can con-

ceive of no more desirable place to employ these men than in the Civil Service of Canada. There they can render efficient service, because undoubtedly many of them who have been trained in vocational schools are well qualified to fill Civil Service positions. But to my amazement the letter read by the member for Kingston shows conclusively that returned men do not receive consideration until all those who have written at previous examinations have been placed. This is a very serious matter and one that demands the attention of this House and of the Government. Were I not firmly convinced that a great injustice is being done to these men, I would not speak so strongly on this question as I do; but I know from careful investigation that there is no excuse whatever for this condition and the blame for it must be brought home to the Civil Service Commission.

Before the outside service was brought under the Civil Service Commission, members of Parliament, having some knowledge of the conditions in their own constituencies, had some responsibility in the matter of appointments. Under the present arrangement they are not even consulted; a committee is appointed by the Civil Service Commission to find out who is the most suitable man for a given appointment. When the House was discussing the Bill to bring the outside service under the Civil Service Commission, I said:

> By placing the Outside Service in the hands of the Civil Service Commission, we are departing from an established rule that has been in existence in the British Empire for many years; that is, responsible and representative government. I believe a government ought to be responsible to the people for the administration of the affairs of the country. I do not believe you can delegate those responsibilities to any commission and say: The commission have done so and so; the Government cannot interfere in the matter, and we are not responsible for the action of the commission.

We are being held responsible, as we ought to be, for the actions of this Commission. You cannot get away from it; the representatives of the people are rightly being held responsible for what this Commission is doing in their various constituencies, without our knowledge or consent. Under the present arrangement the member of Parliament is in a most humiliating position. One of my constituents comes to me and says: "Why is such and such a man appointed to a position, while men who are returning every day from the front, men who have bled for their country, men who are maimed and crippled, do not receive any consideration from the Civil Service Commission?" All that I can do in that case is shrug my shoulders and say that the matter is entirely in the hands of the Civil Service Commission at Ottawa; that they do not consult me in the matter. Such a condition of affairs should not exist at this particular time; at least until our soldiers are reinstated in civil life, members of Parliament ought to be consulted and ought to have some say in the matter of appointments; as they will be held responsible by their constituents the present humiliating condition should be done away with. I quite agree with the principles expressed in the resolution, the moving of which was much needed in order to awaken the people of the country to the humiliating conditions which exist in this respect.

Mr. H. B. MORPHY (Perth, North): Mr. Speaker, The subject under discussion I conceive to be one of the most important that will be touched upon this session, and the member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) is entitled to credit for bringing the resolution before the House.

While I agree with the resolution and the spirit of it, I cannot believe that it is broad enough to suit the exigencies of the situation in Canada to-day. The resolution reads:

> That, in the opinion of this House, the Civil Service Act should be amended so that, while having full regard to efficiency, a preference in appointments to the public service shall be afforded to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force who have become casualties in a theatre of war.

What I object to is that the resolution is narrowed down and restricted in its phraseology to apply only to casualties. The word 'casualty' is a very broad term, and as the resolution is now worded a man whose only injury was a sprained ankle or some minor flesh wound, who was in the trenches perhaps only one day before the fighting stopped, might get a preference over the man who had fought for his country for three or four years. I do not believe the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) intended so to restrict the meaning of his resolution. In fact, I have spoken to him about it, and he said he had no such intention; that his purpose was to get the matter before the House so that the House could settle on some one resolution.

I was rather surprised to learn to-day from the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) that the Civil Service Commission are not now giving a preference to returned soldiers. In correspondence which I have not here I have had word from the Civil

Service Commission directly to the contrary effect; they say that soldiers who have qualified at the examinations are being put at the top of the list. Now the Civil Service Commission is a creature of the Government, and I think it is about time that this Parliament should put forth an opinion that would have some effect upon the commission. Taking as true what the hon. member for Kingston has told the House to-day, I do not think there is a member of this House who would not condemn such a procedure being followed by the Civil Service Commission. According to the correspondence read, the commission are filling all the positions they can by examination, and now the hopper of applicants is absolutely congested, and the soldier who writes hereafter on an examination may not get a position for many years to come. Mr. Speaker, I do not think that is the spirit that actuates the Canadian people to-day; I do not think it is a practice that they will stand for. It is no use our crying out that we are going to do something for the soldier, and then by some pretence or specious practice have a Civil Service Commission doing everything to prevent the country doing something for the returned soldier. That is the only meaning I can see in the letters written to the hon. member for Kingston. I do not like the word "big stick;" I do not like using a club on anybody, but I think a resolution that would influence the Civil Service Commission and would show the temper of the people of this country as reflected by the Canadian Parliament would be quite in order. And then, if the Government have any influence upon the Civil Service Commission—and I direct the attention of the Acting Prime Minister particularly to this—I would whisper into the ear of the chairman that he had better look alive to the welfare of the returned soldier and not play favourites in any other direction. To put the matter in what I conceive to be its proper position, and in order to make the resolution a little broader, while still preserving the spirit of the resolution of my hon. friend from Colchester, with his approval I am going to move in amendment:

That all the words after the word "that" in the original resolution be struck out and the following substituted therefor:

In the opinion of this House the Civil Service Act should be amended so that priority in appointments to the public service shall after this date for one year be given to members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, Canadians in the Royal Air Force, and Canadians in the Imperial and allied armies who have served at the front; disability, length of service and efficiency to be considered.

[Mr. Morphy.]

Mr. R. W. WIGMORE (St. John City): In seconding this amendment I must say that I consider the resolution deals with one of the most important matters that have been discussed in this House since the opening of the session. I realize, as does every hon. member of this House and every citizen of Canada, that the returned soldiers feel that the Government is not keeping its pledges to the boys, that the promises which they made to the boys when they left for overseas were not sincere. I should just like to give a few concrete cases that have come under my observation in the constituency I represent, and I want first of all to say that the Great War Veterans' Association of the city of St. John are very much displeased indeed with the attitude of the Government. There have been a number of appointments made to positions in the city of St. John which returned soldiers could have filled just as efficiently as those who have been appointed. Not very long ago a letter-carrier was required in the post office department. Several returned soldiers applied, but unfortunately not one of them passed the necessary examination. That was how the Civil Service Commission got around it in that case. The result was that a boy of sixteen who, of course, had never served at the front was appointed to the position, and several returned soldiers were turned down. In another case a vacancy occurred in the Customs House. Several returned soldiers applied for the position, one of whom at least had passed the necessary preliminary examination. Another soldier, who had never been overseas but had been taken ill and placed in hospital at Ste. Agathe, was appointed because he had passed the qualifying examination whereas the other soldier had only passed the preliminary; and this appointment was made in the face of the recommendation of the Great War Veterans' Association and a number of prominent citizens of St. John. Similar cases are occurring every day, and the returned soldier is not at all satisfied with the treatment he is receiving.

In the Marine and Fisheries Department in the city of St. John a number of temporary vacancies occur that do not require examination. A very singular thing happened there not long ago. Dependents of soldiers overseas were dismissed while in some cases at least, men of military age and physically fit were retained.

One man had two sons overseas and another three, one of whom had been killed, and I think that in such cases preference should be given to the dependents of sol-

diers who have been overseas. Construction work is now in progress at Courtney Bay by the St. John Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Construction Company under sub-contract by the Bedford Construction Company. Scores of returned soldiers have applied for positions in connection with this work, but the preference has been nearly always given to civilians. This is a matter that the Government should endeavour to remedy. I am entirely in favour of the amendment because I think the resolution does not go far enough. Preference should be given to the returned soldier in every case, and it should not be necessary in connection with appointments to positions such as that of watchman on a dock or of letter carrier to pass the rigid examinations which are required. I will support the amendment.

Mr. MORPHY: As a matter of privilege I would ask that the words "and allied armies" be added after the words "Imperial army."

Mr. O. TURGEON (Gloucester): I shall be brief in the expression of my opinion on this matter. In my judgment the resolution does not go far enough, and I shall support the amendment because it recognizes the military record and time service of our returned soldiers. Many applications have been made by returned soldiers for positions which I think they were qualified to fill, but their applications, for some reason or another, the Commission did not favourabley consider. Young men who were among the first to respond to the call, enlisting in the first week of the war, and who spent some winters in the trenches very much to the detriment of their health, have come back physically unfit, and when they apply for positions the Civil Service Commission inform them that they must have their discharge before their applications can be considered. Among the returned soldiers, many who have not lost limbs are suffering other disabilities which render them incapable of strenuous work, and it has often happened that men who were longest on active service and were discharged long ago have been put off, some who have not yet been discharged are urged to hurry up and get their discharge papers so that they may be appointed. Many a returned man who has won distinction on the field of battle is overlooked, and as I think that something should be done to remedy this condition of things, I shall support the amendment. I concur in the opinion that all appointments to the outside service for a year at least should be reserved for discharged soldiers, and if in any county or parish there may not happen to be a soldier available to fill any vacant position, one from the adjoining county or parish might be selected..

Mr. W. F. COCKSHUTT (Brantford): Mr. Speaker, I do not desire to delay the House for any length of time, but coming from a constituency that sent a large number of its sons overseas, I feel it incumbent on me to say a few words on this question. We are indebted to the member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) for bringing so important a matter as this before us, and I wish to say, with all the emphasis I can, that the Goverement for some reason or other, are not doing what we expected they would do when the Civil Service Act was passed last year. I think I voice the opinion of members of the House as well as of returned soldiers and citizens generally when I say that too many of the returned men are being turned down in connection with appointments to the public service. This is a very serious matter and one that should be looked into by the proper authorities. There is a very deep-seated opinion current that things are not right and that the returned soldier is not being treated as he ought to be. He needs employment as soon as he is fit after his return, and if the policy that is outlined in the letter which was read this afternoon is one that is being pursued by the Civil Service Commission, I can easily understand why dissatisfaction exists. The policy as laid down in the letter read by the hon. member for Kingston (Mr. Nickle) is exactly contrary to what it should be. It is evidently the intention to exhaust the list of those civilians who have passed examinations before attention is given to the soldier. I would suggest that the proper course would be to consider the case of the returned soldier first, and let the civilians, no matter how high their marks may be, stand until the returned men have received their due.

Mr. NICKLE: I have not the letter before me, but the practice is this: When an examination takes place those who are successful obtain recognition before the returned man who has not had an opportunity of passing the examination.

Mr. COCKSHUTT: That is quite as I understand it, and, as I say, is exactly contrary to what it should be. I think that these technical and academic examinations are entirely unnecessary in the case of soldiers. If a soldier has sound common sense

and can fulfil the duties of the office to which he seeks appointment—and I would always qualify it in that way—he ought to have the first claim regardless of whether he can pass at the top of the list or not. He should be the first man to be considered, because the country owes him a duty which it can ill repay even if it gave him a very good position. In my opinion, therefore, the Civil Service Commission should seriously interest themselves in behalf of the returned soldiers and endeavour to place them in good positions as speedily as possible. It is quite true that members endeavoured to do that when they were dispensing the patronage. I received many circulars on that head and I always endeavoured to see that the returned soldier was the first man considered. In many cases no one else was considered. That is the way it should be before the Civil Service Commission.

I think the amendment of the hon. member for Perth (Mr. Morphy) is a very excellent one. I do not know how the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) may feel towards it. I think that Canadians who have enlisted in the air force, or in the marine, or in any of the Allied armies for that matter and have been wounded in battle or in the service of the country, are entitled to consideration. But whether it is the amendment that is put or whether it is the resolution, I want to go on record as being entirely in accord with the principle that is enunciated in both of them. I want to let it be distinctly understood that from now on the returned soldier gets the best of the deal all along the line and you cannot put that too strongly. He has not had it up to date to the extent that he should have had it. I would hold up both hands for giving all the positions to returned soldiers that they can fill. I would consider them first. Our duty is first to the soldier and after that the civilian list, which is a matter of very small importance, comparatively, may be considered. Before the soldiers are provided for, do not let any of these civilians in at all.

Mr. PIUS MICHAUD: Mr. Speaker, I have listened with great attention to the remarks which have been made in reference to this question. I wish to place before the House the facts of a case that occurred in my own town. A young man came back home in March, 1918, having lost a leg in the war. He made application for a position that became vacant, but to our great sorrow that position was merged in another. The Collector of Customs took the position at a lower salary than that which had been previously paid and prevented the young man from getting it. Now the Collector of Customs at that port occupies the dual position of Collector of Customs and Immigration Agent. This young man made application for the position of Immigration Agent which had become vacant.

Mr. MACLEAN: How much was paid for the office of Immigration Agent?

Mr. MICHAUD: The salary was $800 or $900. The position was given to the collector at a lower rate in order to prevent this young man from getting it.

Mr. MACLEAN (Halifax): In what county is that?

Mr. MICHAUD: In Restigouche and Madawaska. The application was made to the Civil Service Commission. We also made application to the chief commissioner of immigration when we were here but we did not succeed in our enterprise. This case illustrates the fact that a great injustice is being done our young soldiers who return maimed and unable to earn their living. This young man speaks and writes both languages, is well educated and is fully competent to discharge the duties of the position. His name is Dugal and he is a son of the Honourable L. A. Dugal of Edmunston.

Mr. DOUGLAS (Strathcona): There is one phase of this question that I would like to say a few words about and that has reference to the sending out of the advertisements to applicants seeking positions in the public service. In my own experience this advertisement comes along in western Canada too late for the applicant to get his application back to Ottawa in time to receive consideration at the hands of the Civil Service Commission. I do not know whether this is done intentionally or whether it is just carelessness on the part of the Commission. Through that practice alone there has been a tremendous injustice inflicted on all returned soldiers as well as on civilians who are looking for positions in the Civil Service. I am quite in accord with the sentiments expressed both by the mover of the resolution and the amendment. I think the amendment moved by the honourable member for Perth (Mr. Morphy) is preferable to the resolution because it goes farther and I would therefore support it. Too little regard has been paid to the promises which have been made by the Government in regard to what shall be done for the returned soldiers and I hope that in the

future more consideration will be given to the promises and the pledges which were made to the men before they went overseas.

Mr. WILLIAM DUFF (Lunenburg): I am in entire sympathy with the resolution and also with the amendment except that neither goes far enough. In neither is mention made of the Canadian navy or seamen of the mercantile marine. I would like to suggest to the honourable the mover of the amendment (Mr. Morphy) that the members of the Canadian navy and the seamen of the mercantile marine be also included. Whilst perhaps the Canadian navy did not get a chance to do very much during the war, the seamen of the merchant marine, during four years, were in every sea and faced the submarine danger. They are entitled to the sympathy of the Government just as much as the members of the Canadian Expeditionary Force, the members of the Air Force of the Canadians who enlisted in the Imperial army.

Mr. T. M. M. TWEEDIE (Calgary): I would like to ask my hon. friend the mover of the amendment (Mr. Morphy) a question. The amendment says that disability, length of service and efficiency are to be considered. Is the proposal to make the Civil Service of Canada exclusive to returned men for one year, and is this consideration as to length of service, disability and efficiency to apply only among the returned men themselves and without regard to the efficiency of the Civil Service?

Mr. MORPHY: I should say that they should be efficient to perform the duties.

Mr. TWEEDIE: The resolution would not go to the extent of making the service exclusive for returned men without regard to the efficiency of the Civil Service of Canada?

Mr. MORPHY: No, my intention is to put the returned soldier, if he is efficient, ahead of everybody else.

Mr. TWEEDIE: I have no hesitation whatever in supporting the resolution and the amendment as suggested. Campaigns have been carried on throughout the length and breadth of Canada asking employers to reinstate those men who left them when they enlisted for overseas service. Many men have been reinstated, but it has been found that they are unable to perform their duties to the same extent that they did when they went overseas, perhaps by reason of some nervous disability. The result has been that employers have discharged these men. But I think that the Dominion of Canada can take these men into the Civil Service, and that even if they have not one hundred per cent efficiency in the performance of their duty there is no justification for their being discharged from the Civil Service on the same ground that they would be discharged from private employment.

When we take a large manufacturing industry, or some mercantile business, we know that throughout the length and breadth of the country the competition is very keen. An employer may be very good hearted and may desire to retain all these men, but he finds that he is up against the competition of those engaged in the same business, and that he cannot successfully carry on his activities, or successfully compete with his rivals if he yields to good nature.

I think the resolution which has been brought in by the hon. member for Colchester (Mr. McCurdy) covers that class of cases. I also think that provision should be made in the Civil Service of the country for those men who are casualties, or who are suffering from physical or nervous defects which prevent them from carrying on their duties as they did before they went to the front. We owe a duty to these men to see that they are provided for, and that they have the same source of income and maintenance as they did when they were engaged in industrial pursuits. I have very much pleasure in supporting the resolution as introduced by the hon. member for Colchester, and also the amendment, due regard being paid to the necessity of the maintenance of efficiency in the Civil Service. I also wish to support the stand taken by some hon. gentlemen with regard to that service. I think it would be very unfortunate for Canada if, for any reason, we should abandon the reform which we adopted last year and returned to the old system of party patronage which previously prevailed in this country.

Hon. A. K. MACLEAN (Halifax): Both the resolution and the amendment have evidently met with a very substantial and favourable response in the House. I would like, however, to suggest that when it is proposed to make amendments to the Civil Service Act of the nature proposed it would be well if the opportunity were afforded of giving very careful consideration to the details of such amendments. In the course of two or three weeks very important and substantial amendments to the Civil Service Act will be submitted to Parliament, and I would suggest for the consideration of the mover of the resolution, and of

the mover of the amendment as well, the desirability of postponing until then consideration of the proposals set forth to-day. Every opportunity will be afforded the members of the House to submit amendments of this character when the Bill is introduced, and in the meantime I can assure both hon. gentleman that the Government will give every consideration to the proposals which have been presented to-day. I trust that both hon. gentlemen will refrain from asking for a formal adoption of their proposals upon my assuring them that the Government will take careful cognizance of the matters which have been referred to, and that in the course of two or three weeks, or a month at the least, there will be ample opportunity of considering amendments of this nature to the Civil Service Act.

Mr. MORPHY: As mover of the amendment, with the consent of the seconder, I have no objection to the course outlined by the minister. I might request the privilege of adding that he will hasten down to the Civil Service Commission in the morning and put a flea in the ear of the authorities there so that they may keep moving in accordance with the spirit of the House as evidenced by what has taken place here to-day.

Mr. McCURDY: The expressions of opinion by members of the House show unanimity in support of the principle of my motion, not a single voice having been raised in dissent. The whole difficulty in the premises has arisen because the original policy of the Government, with regard to this important matter was not adhered to, or implemented in the Civil Service Act, adopted last year. The language of the first Order in Council, which, by the way, was adopted on the recommendation of the Prime Minister quite soon after casualties began to return to Canada, or, to be exact, on November 26, 1915—

Mr. SPEAKER: The hon. gentleman is proceeding to reply. I understood he rose for the purpose of stating whether he would, or would not, withdraw his resolution.

Mr. McCURDY: I am going to state my reasons for withdrawing the resolution.

Mr. SPEAKER: In that case will the hon. gentleman make them as concise as possible?

Mr. McCURDY: The Order in Council of 1915 to which I have referred, Mr. Speaker, distinctly states that:

[Mr. A. K. Maclean.]

In making appointments to the Civil Service preference shall be given to the returned members of the C.E.F., especially those who through disability, occasioned by active military service, are unable to fill their previous occupations.

That language is followed in successive Orders in Council, but unfortunately reference to those who had suffered disabilities while on active service was omitted from the Civil Service Act of last year.

Mr. Speaker, in view of the statements made by the Secretary of State and the Acting Minister of Marine and Fisheries, that very extensive amendments to the Civil Service Act will be presented to the House before the end of April, and the hope they hold out that these amendments will include the sense of the resolution of this afternoon, I have much pleasure in acceding to their request to withdraw the motion.

Motion of Mr. McCurdy and amendment of Mr. Morphy withdrawn.

At six o'clock the House took recess.

After Recess.

The House resumed at eight o'clock.

MINISTERS OF THE CROWN.

PROPOSAL THAT ALL SHALL BE MEMBERS OF THE COMMONS.

Mr. WILLIAM D. EULER (Waterloo North) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, all Ministers of the Crown should be members of the House of Commons, or become such within a period of three months after their appointment to the Cabinet.

He said: Mr. Speaker, after the strenuous debates of last week, and which developed acute differences of opinion among honourable members, I propose a resolution this evening that I believe should be, in principle, acceptable to a very large majority of the members of the House—that is, providing that the Government do not make it a party question. And I think, Sir, that it is not a party question because the practice of appointing senators to the Cabinet of Canada, as is well known, is one which has been followed by both Liberal and Conservative Governments in the past.

Last week in connection with the debate on daylight saving, I was pleased to note the action of the Government, in that they appeared to give a certain freedom of speech and of action to hon. members on their side of the House. I rather suspect that the reason for that action was because the Government did not care to assume the responsibility of re-enacting that measure;

but be that as it may, I am willing to give the Government the benefit of the doubt, because I believe that it is in the interest of Parliament that there should be permitted to the hon. members on the opposite side of the House a reasonable independence of action, rather than that the majority in this House should resolve itself merely into a rubber stamp to record the wishes of the Cabinet.

I am certain, Mr. Speaker, that the significance of the resolution which I propose is quite evident to every hon. member. If I were speaking in a general way, I should say that it is intended as a step towards a more advanced and complete democracy. And when I use the word "democracy," Mr. Speaker, I realize that in the last few years it has become somewhat hackneyed and that perhaps to most of us it is more a matter of sound than of meaning. The hon. member for South York (Mr. W. F. Maclean), in the debate on daylight saving last week, made a statement that during the course of the war, and especially in the last year or so, the Government had found it necessary to suspend in some degree the principle of responsible government. I do not agree with him when he says that it was necessary even then; but I do agree with him that the time has arrived when responsible government in full measure ought to be restored. If it is indeed true that the war which has just ended was a war "to make the world safe for democracy," then, Sir, I contend we ought to use every opportunity to carry into effect in a concrete way the principles that we were fighting for. We should not be afraid to take our own medicine, but should let democracy, like charity, begin at home.

Frankly, Mr. Speaker, the resolution which I have offered has for its object the debarring from the Cabinet of members of the Senate, for what I consider to be the sufficient reason, that members of the Senate, not being elected, are not representative of, and not responsible to, the people. I am quite prepared to have some hon. gentlemen say that the easiest way to accomplish that which is desired in the resolution would be to abolish the Senate entirely, and if any hon. members choose to offer a Bill in that regard, I for one would support it. I have not risen this evening with any intention of dealing with the Senate as a body, but it does appear to me that in these so-called democratic times a non-elective Senate is something of an anomaly in this country.

We have been told, Sir, that the Senate is established more to protect minorities than perhaps anything else. I do not think that the history of Canada shows that they have had any very great success in that direction. In fact, it seems to me that at the present day the Senate is more in the public eye, because by force of circumstances it has become established as something of a clearing house for the obligations of those who desire to free themselves from the bonds of matrimony —it has become something of a divorce court. But in order to abolish the Senate constitutional action would be necessary; to follow out that which I propose would require no change whatever in the Constitution, the British North America Act, and if this House saw fit to pass this resolution, it could easily be carried into concrete effect simply by the Government adopting the principle upon which the House placed itself on record.

Now, Mr. Speaker, as is well known, senators are not elected. They are merely the partisan appointees of the Prime Minister or of the political party which happens to be in power. That, I submit, Sir, is not by any means an indication that the men so appointed possess the confidence of the country. Indeed it is only too true that exactly the reverse is the case in very many instances, and that men who have been rejected when they have offered themselves for election to the House of Commons are frequently appointed to the Senate merely as a reward for party service.

The responsibility and power of the ministry are very great. During the past two years the power of the Cabinet has been greater even than the power of Parliament itself. That was during the war. As a matter of fact, the War Measures Act is still in force and the Government still retains that power. But even after the War Measures Act becomes null and void the power and influence of the Cabinet will still remain very great. Members of the Cabinet who are of sufficient calibre to deserve a position as responsible as that, wield a tremendous power not only in the formulating of policies, but also in the administration of the departments over which they have control.

The appointment of senators to the Dominion Cabinet is entirely subversive of the principle of responsible government.

I bring this matter before the House at this time because I feel that the abuse—I think it is an abuse—to which I refer appears to be growing. We have in the Cabinet at the present time no fewer than three

members of the Senate; more, I think, than we have ever had since we first enjoyed responsible government. First of all, we have the leader of the Senate (Sir James Lougheed), who is Minister of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. This afternoon we had a very interesting and lengthy debate on the matter of the appointment of soldiers to positions in the Civil Service, and we shall have a great deal of that this year and in the years to come. It seems to me that a minister holding the important portfolio of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment should be present on the floor of this House to give his advice to members and to answer questions that may be put from time to time.

The same is true of the Minister of Labour, Hon. G. D. Robertson, who also is a member of the Senate and has not a seat in this House. One of the most difficult and important questions with which this country will have to deal in the future is the question of labour, therefore this Parliament will necessarily have to concern itself with legislation affecting labour. Old age pensions, pensions to widows, and legislation on matters of labour will have to be considered by this House in the very near future. I do not think that the Government is doing its duty to the people, particularly to the working men, in not having in this House, as head of the Department of Labour, a man who manifestly, by election, enjoys the confidence of the people whom he is supposed to represent.

Then I come to what everybody must consider the most glaring instance of the violation of the principles of responsible government that one could possibly conceive. And, by the way, I make these criticisms not at all in a personal sense, but only in so far as they affect the public service and the public good. We have as Postmaster General Hon. P. E. Blondin, a member of the Senate, a gentleman who in the elections of 1917 offered himself for election in two constituencies and was overwhelmingly defeated in both; in one by a majority of about 1,200 votes and in the other by a majority of no less than 6,500 votes, receiving himself only 500 votes in the constituency of Champlain. This gentleman is in charge of a department which employs about 10,000 persons, which has in its control the expenditure of something like $18,000,000 a year. Yet, in the face of the fact that this gentleman was rejected by his constituents; in face of the very evident fact that he does not possess the confidence of the electors of Canada, the Prime Minister has retained him in an office which, it will not be denied, should not be occupied by any one who is not responsible to the people and who does not occupy a seat in the House of Commons. The Postmaster General is not answerable to Parliament; the same may be said of all members of the Senate who hold portfolios in the Cabinet. They are not on the floor of the House to answer questions or to pass their own estimates through Parliament.

We were told this afternoon in a return that the Postmaster General is represented in this House by the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell). I do not know whether that gentleman has informed himself very particularly as to the details of the Post Office Department; I doubt it very much. At the same time, most of us are willing to admit that the duties of the President of the Privy Council are so light that possibly he feels that the large honorarium that he receives may very well justify his giving some attention to the work of the Postmaster General. But I do contend that the appointment of three members of the Senate to positions in the ministry is the very negation of responsible government. In the case of the office of the Postmaster General it is nothing less than an arrogant defiance of the will of the people which this Parliament, if it dares to call its soul its own, should not tolerate any longer.

If any reply is made to the arguments that I offer, the first may be that Liberal Governments in the past have appointed Senators to the Cabinet. That is true, although I do not think that it is true in such a glaring degree as it is in the case of the office of Postmaster General. But even if it be true, I do not for one moment admit that that affects the argument in the slightest degree. That a Liberal Government did what has been done by a Unionist or Conservative Government makes it neither right nor wrong; the question should be decided entirely upon its merits.

It may also be stated that a similar practice is followed in the British Government; that members of the House of Lords occupy portfolios in the British Cabinet. That also is true, and while I admit that we have taken from the British practice and the British Constitution many desirable things and incorporated them into our own system of government, it does not follow that we must in every respect follow the example of England. Our conditions and political development have been in many respects entirely different from those of Great Britain. The British have travelled a very

long way through all the stages of feudalism, autocracy and rule by the aristocracy, and while they have made great progress on the way to democracy I do not think that the most ardent Britisher would claim that they have yet attained to the very highest ideals of democracy and that no further progress is possible for them. But even if that were contended, again I would say that the mere fact that a thing is good in England does not necessarily make it good in Canada. Moreover, in England when a member of the House of Lords holds a portfolio in the Cabinet, in almost all cases the department over which he presides is represented in the House of Commons by an under-secretary.

The constitution of Canada never contemplated that a member of the Senate should be appointed to the responsible position of Minister of the Crown. That is quite apparent when we consider that when a member of the House of Commons is elevated to the position of Minister of the Crown, notwithstanding the fact that he already possesses the confidence of the people, as shown by his election to the Commons, he is obliged to go back to his constituents for re-election.

That, to me, proves that it was the intention to provide an absolute safeguard; it was intended to ensure that when a man was promoted to the responsible position of Minister of the Crown he should possess the confidence of the electors.

It is no compliment to the hon. members on the other side of the House that three members of the present Cabinet are drawn from the Senate and that the Prime Minister of Canada should, in effect, say to hon. gentlemen opposite that he does not find any of them worthy of occupying the position of Postmaster General, for instance, or that of Minister of Labour, or whatever it may be. For my part, I believe there are a great many members on the other side of the House who could discharge the duties pertaining to those portfolios fully as well as those duties are now discharged, and it would be more in keeping with the principle of responsible government, because the fact that they occupied seats in this House would be an assurance that they possessed the confidence of the people.

In the resolution which I have submitted I provide for a slight qualification, and it is this: that members of the Cabinet shall become members of the House of Commons within a period of three months after their appointment to the Cabinet. I am willing to admit that occasions might arise when it would be desirable, possibly in an emergency or because of some man's special fitness, to appoint to a Cabinet position a man who was not a member of the House of Commons. In such a case the new minister should submit himself, in accordance with the principle of responsible government, to the electors and be returned to the House of Commons within a period of not longer than three months. Failing to be returned, he should make way for some one else who would fill the requirements in that regard.

I shall not elaborate the matter further. It seems to me the argument requires no proof, that the principles are so sound as to be apparent to all; the truth of what I have said, while it has been poorly expressed, must be evident to almost any member of this House. I base my argument on the simple principle that membership in the Cabinet of Canada should be held only by those who are members of the House of Commons and thus responsible to the people. In these supposedly advanced days of the sovereignty of the people let us show our sincerity by putting our own house in order. Let the Government of Canada conform in every respect with the principle of responsible institutions, for which such heavy sacrifices have been made.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): I have listened with close attention to the observations of my hon. friend (Mr. Euler) with respect to the motion now before the House, and if I have any general criticism to make of his remarks, as I understood them, it is his failure to appreciate the constitution as it is to-day, and the status of the Senate as a body of co-ordinate jurisdiction with this House. My hon. friend's argument proceeded along this line: The Senate is not an elective body, but an appointive body. Therefore, no member of the Government should be a member of the Senate. Now it is debatable—the hon. member and other hon. gentlemen have their views—whether the Senate of this Parliament should be an elective or an appointive body; but that is not the question before the House. The question before the House is the motion of the hon. member, and that motion must, I submit, be debated having regard to the constitutional position as it exists to-day. It appears to me that to give effect to the resolution of the hon. member would be to derogate from the status of the Senate as established under the British North America Act. I think it might properly be pointed out that the British North America Act is an act of Union; it is a compact; it represents the agreement which

was made by the different sections of this country at the time of Confederation. It is perfectly clear from the debates which preceded Confederation, and from the Act of Union itself, that great importance was attached to the creation of the Senate as a part of Parliament. My hon. friend has put his resolution in this form:

> That in the opinion of this House all Ministers of the Crown should be members of the House of Commons or become such within a period of three months after their appointment to the Cabinet.

He puts his resolution affirmatively; but, negatively, it might be put in this way—and my hon. friend did put it this way in his remarks:—No member of the Government of Canada shall be a member of the Senate for a longer period than three months. Now in view of the constitutional situation as it exists to-day, namely, that the Senate has under the British North America Act co-ordinate legislative authority with this House, save as to money votes and bills levying taxation upon the people, which must originate with the Commons, it would appear to me that the resolution goes much further than this House or the country would be prepared to go; because it involves a vital change in our constitutional practice of administration and of legislation, and, as I have said, derogates from the status conferred upon the Senate by the British North America Act.

I think I would agree with my hon. friend that the representation of the Government in the Senate should always be limited as compared with that which it should and, I submit, must have in the House of Commons. Ever since Confederation however it has been recognized by all administrations that the Government must be represented in the Senate for the reason that the Senate is a legislative body, that Bills originate with the Senate as well as with the Commons and that the Senate must be a party to all legislation before it can become law. I do not know that any hard-and-fast principle has been adopted, but it has been generally recognized that there are certain portfolios which must belong to the Commons. For example, I cannot conceive of the Minister of Finance being a member of the Senate and not of the House of Commons, because of course, he is dealing almost wholly with financial and fiscal measures which must originate in the House of Commons. With regard to the British Constitutional system, it is to be observed that a member of government need not necessarily, according to the strict law of the constitution, have a seat in the House of Commons or in the Senate. Frequently, and especially upon the formation of new governments, a minister is called into the counsels of the Government by the Prime Minister although he has not a seat in either House. In practice, of course, that situation could not be long maintained, and therefore I may dismiss that feature because, generally speaking, it is necessary that Ministers of the Government should have seats either in the House of Commons or in the Senate for the purpose of dealing with the legislation which is there being discussed, of expounding Government measures, and of informing the two Chambers as to government policy. There are certain departments which I think should be represented in the Commons, although I should not like to lay down a hard-and-fast rule. The Department of Finance is clearly one of them. It has been the practice ever since Confederation, as I have stated, for governments to have representatives in the Senate, and so far as I am aware the leader of the Senate has always been a member of the Government, in order, as is obvious, that he may inform the Senate as to Government policy is regard to legislation before it.

I took the trouble, in connection with this resolution, to look up the practice of the various ministries with regard to Senate representation, and my hon. friend is entirely in error in supposing that this Government is in any singular or anomalous position, much less one open to criticism, by reason of having three members in the Senate. In the Administration of Sir John A. Macdonald, Sir Alexander Campbell was Minister of Justice and leader of the Senate; and when Sir John A. Macdonald died, there were, I think, two members of his Administration without portfolio in the Senate. My hon. friend will find that under the succeeding Prime Ministers, Sir John Abbott, Sir John Thompson, Sir Mackenzie Bowell, and Sir Charles Tupper, there was in the case of each Administration a representation of two or three members of the Government in the Senate; and always, I believe, the leader of the Senate, under the Administrations of which I have spoken, was a member of the Government of the day. Further than that, Sir Mackenzie Bowell when Prime Minister was leader of the Senate. Coming down to the Liberal Administration of the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier—of whom I have always understood my hon. friend was a devoted follower and admirer—we find that instead of the number of members of the

Government having been diminished in his regime it was if anything enlarged. My hon. friend declares that he is taking advanced Liberal ground. Well, he is criticising rather severely in his remarks some men whom the people thought were fairly advanced Liberals.

Mr. EULER: I did not say Liberal; I said democratic.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Well, if my hon. friend desires to dissociate Liberalism from democracy—

Mr. EULER: No, no.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: —I am quite prepared to allow him to do so; but I do not know what the late Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid Laurier would have said to him if he had suggested that he, Sir Wilfrid, was not a democrat, and was not in favour of democratic government. I do not know what the late Hon. Sir Oliver Mowat would have said to my hon. friend if he had made the suggestion that he also, although a Liberal, was not in favour of democratic government. And I would point out, with reference to the last-named statesman, who so long carried the banner of Liberalism in the province of Ontario, and indeed in Dominion affairs as well, that when he joined the Liberal Administration in 1896 he became Minister of Justice and at the same time took a seat in the Senate and became its leader. Then there was another noted statesman of whom I used to hear in the old days, and who I thought was a fairly advanced Liberal. I think he would turn in his grave to-night if any hon. gentleman, especially on the other side, suggested that he was not a Liberal and a believer in democratic government. I refer to that old fighting Liberal, the late Sir Richard Cartwright, who became a member of the Senate and its leader, and who, while he occupied that position in the Senate, held one of the most important portfolios in the Government—the portfolio of Trade and Commerce. Would my hon. friend suggest for one moment that any of the departments mentioned here to-night is of more importance to the business and commercial life of the country than the Department of Trade and Commerce? I do not believe the hon. member would put forward that view for an instant. There was another man whose name was known in every Liberal household throughout Canada,—the Hon. Sir Richard Scott. He was a strong Liberal, and I believe that he would have said, and all of his associates would have said, that he was in favour of democratic government and of the principles of democracy. He was Secretary of State in the Laurier administration and was also a member of the Senate. In addition to those I have mentioned,—Sir Oliver Mowat, Sir Richard Cartwright and Sir Richard Scott—there were, I believe, two other members of the Laurier Administration who had seats in the Senate; one was Hon. Mr. Templeman and the other Mr. Hyman. So that we have an unbroken practice—

Mr. McKENZIE: Who was the last-named gentleman?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Hyman.

Mr. McKENZIE: He was not in the Senate.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Yes, I am mistaken in regard to him. However, since Confederation we have had an unbroken practice of all administrations, Conservative and Liberal, as well as the Unionist Government of to-day, having representatives of the Government in the Senate.

Mr. ROBB: Does my hon. friend say that Mr. Templeman was a member of the Senate?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have a note to that effect.

Mr. ROBB: Not when he was a minister.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: If my hon. friend would like to have the Hon. Mr. Hyman and the Hon. Mr. Templeman eliminated, I shall be content with Sir Oliver Mowat, Sir Richard Cartwright and Sir Richard Scott. I was pointing out that all governments since Confederation have had representation in the Senate. So far from defending that system, I put forward the view that with the constitution as it is to-day no other course is practicable. I put that view forward for the reason that the Senate is a body of co-ordinate legislative jurisdiction with this House with the exception that money votes have to originate here as well as bills providing for taxation. Another name that I had overlooked has been called to my attention by an hon. member—that of the Hon. David Mills. No hon. gentleman on the other side of the House would challenge for one moment the Liberalism or fidelity to democratic principles of the Hon. David Mills. Why, he was one of the Apostles of Liberalism. When my hon. friend finds fault with the Union Government for having representation, as we have it to-day, in the Senate, he is by implication visiting very severe

censure upon the liberalism of those who were highest in the counsels of the Liberal party, its leaders and, as I have said, its apostles. I have no doubt that my hon. friend had his early teaching in Liberal principles from those whom he is impliedly censuring to-night by reason of the fact that they concurred in the principle of representation of the Government in the Senate.

I do not know what view my hon. friend the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) will take in regard to this but we shall hear in due course. I am not censuring those leaders of Liberalism. I repeat that under our system as it exists to-day, no other course is open to a government but to have representation in the Senate. Bills originate in this House involving matters of Government policy. Bills also originate in the Senate involving matters of Government policy. For the despatch of business it is very desirable that the Government should be able to initiate Bills in the Senate as well as in the House of Commons if for no other reason than to save time. But even as to Bills originating in the House of Commons and which go to the Senate, they must be adopted there. The policy of the Government must be explained with respect to those Bills because the Senate must concur in them before they can finally receive the assent of the Governor General and become law.

Fancy the situation that would exist with no member of the Government in the Senate to indicate the policy of the Government in regard to particular measures and to guide its deliberations in respect to Bills of any character, financial, fiscal or otherwise, which had been introduced by the Government and carried through this House. It seems perfectly clear to me that there must be representation of the Government in the Senate. I think the leader of the Senate should be a member of the Government. Although I am rather in favour of limiting the number of members of the Government in the Senate, because this is the popular chamber, I see no objection, as the governments of which I have spoken saw no objection, but on the other hand I see an advantage in having representation of the Government of the day in the Senate. Otherwise, I am satisfied that the business of legislation would not proceed with the despatch that is desirable; nor with the co-ordination of work that should exist as between the two Houses.

My hon. friend has spoken about the fact that the Postmaster General and the Minister of Labour occupy seats in the Senate. In past Administrations the Minister of Justice frequently occupied a seat in the Senate. The Secretary of State in some Administrations occupied a seat in the Senate. The important Department of Trade and Commerce was represented by Sir Richard Cartwright under the Laurier Administration and the important Department of Agriculture has been on more than one occasion represented in the Senate. Where is the difficulty from the standpoint of conveying information to this House as to Estimates or as to the administration of some department which happens to be represented in the Senate. Take the Postmaster General's department, one of his colleagues is here to answer questions which may be asked of the Prime Minister and to deal with his Estimates when they are before the House. Another colleague, the acting Minister of Trade and Commerce, is here to represent the Minister of Labour in this Chamber, to answer questions and to declare the position of the Government in regard to any matter which may come within the jurisdiction of that important department. My hon. friend used a very strong term in regard to the Union Government. He does not seem to like the Union Government—it is hard for me to understand that.

Mr. GAUVREAU: There are lots of reasons.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I know that my hon. friend (Mr. Gauvreau) has a very much more kindly feeling towards the Government and he would not express himself in such strong terms. My hon. friend's resolution has stated that the policy of this Government in having the Postmaster General a member of the Senate and the Minister of Labour a member of the Senate is an arrogant defiance of the will of the people. If that is so, it seems to me that he must apply it to the preceding Administration.

Mr. EULER: That statement was made entirely with regard to the retaining of the Postmaster General after the people had expressly declared that he had not their confidence.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: Was it in arrogant defiance of the will of the people for Sir Richard Cartwright to represent the Liberal government in the Senate? Should he have gone to the country to be elected after having been appointed to the Senate?

Mr. EULER: He was not defeated.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: My hon. friend confines it to one case, but it seems to me that, if it was arrogant defiance of the will of the people to appoint, under the constitution, a citizen to the Senate, and afterwards appoint him to a membership in the Government, or if he chanced to be a member of the Government to retain him, then I say precisely the same remark must apply in the case of any other citizen, or former minister, who was appointed to the Senate and retained a seat in the Senate and his position in the Government without having been endorsed by the people.

I pointed out that we must take the constitution as it is, and as it is the Senate is an appointed body. This Government is only following the practice of all governments since Confederation in having a portion of its membership represented in the Senate of Canada. I have shown, I think, that for convenience of legislation in the two Houses it is absolutely necessary that the Government should be represented there, and in view of all the considerations put forward, it would appear to me that this House would be very slow indeed to adopt a resolution of such far-reaching effect, so far-reaching as to seriously affect the legislative machinery of this country, set up at the time of Confederation, and consisting as it does, not only of the House of Commons, but of the Senate. So long as the Senate is a part of our constitution, until the constitution is changed it appears to me that this Government, or succeeding Governments, will be found to have a representation in the Senate if they are to have proper regard to the efficient despatch of the legislation which comes before Parliament.

It is not necessary that I should refer to the situation which exists in Great Britain. My honourable friend would hardly contend that Great Britain is not a democracy. Great Britain has been fighting the battle of democracy in this war, and has been pretty successful in fighting it. It has been the democratic spirit which has animated Britain which has enabled her to win the war, but what is the practice there? We find that in democratic Britain Lord Kitchener was Minister of War, and occupied a seat in the Lords. Will my honourable friend contend that Lord Kitchener was debarred from occupying the position of Minister of War at the outbreak of hostilities because he occupied a seat in the House of Lords? And what shall we say with regard to Lord Milner and Lord Curzon?

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Is the Acting Prime Minister giving those as examples of British democracy?

Sir THOMAS WHITE: I have no hesitation in giving the Right Honourable Lloyd George as a shining example of British democracy. My honourable friend would not dissent from that surely? And my honourable friend knows how the Right Honourable Lloyd George has constituted his government to-day. So that I think we can put on one side the talk about the violation of democratic principle in this Government having three representatives in the Senate.

Now my honourable friend has put forward his resolution and delivered a very interesting speech in support of it. I have given the reasons which, in my view, should influence the House in rejecting it. I think that while the constitution remains as it is we should not lay down the principle in this House that no Government should have one or more of its members in the Senate, which is a component part of Parliament, and, in my view therefore the resolution should be negatived.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton South and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I do not find it necessary in answering the argument of the honourable leader of the Government, to make any pronouncement as to any views that I may entertain myself in regard to whether or not members of the Senate should be members of this, or any Government. The honourable member for North Waterloo (Mr. Euler) has put his case very clearly and very strongly, and I think that in a democratic country like Canada, and in a democratic House such as this, it is well that questions of this kind should be brought forward and discussed in the open so that people in the country may know what our views are. In my humble judgment, Mr. Speaker, the leader of the Government did not answer the argument of the mover of the resolution at all. The honourable member for North Waterloo admitted that it has been the practice since Confederation for members of the Senate to be members of the various governments. Notwithstanding this admission the leader of the Government, having no other course, built up this man of straw, and when he had that effigy well built and of very good proportions, started in to demolish it. He made a fairly good job of demolishing his straw man. because there was nobody to interfere—the effigy was unprotected from his very vigor-

ous attack. There is no question about any man's ability to put up that kind of man and knock him down. But that is not the question at all. The question is whether or not in this democratic country, in this great Canada of ours, at this particular juncture when we say that old things have passed away, when this democratic Union Government which we now have tells us that everything has become new—there are no Grits, there are not even any Tories according to its dictum. The old landmarks, they tell us, are forever swept away, or put to one side. Such being the doctrine, and gospel of the Union Government, if everything else of old habits must disappear, and forever, this undemocratic idea of members of an irresponsible body being members of a responsible government, should also disappear? That is the spirit, object, and principle of the resolution of the hon. member for North Waterloo. But the leader of the Government says there must be Government representation in the Senate. I agree that it is and has been the custom to have a member of the Government in the Senate as a sort of intermediary between that House and the Government.

9 p.m.

It does not follow that the man who is that intermediary should have any particular responsibility to the people of this country or should be an administrator at all. Up to a short time ago Sir James Lougheed, although the recognized leader of the Government in the Senate, had no portfolio, and with that condition of affairs no person had any fault to find. But the moment that a man who is a senator and not responsible to the people, a man who cannot be called upon to go before the electorate and give an account of his stewardship, becomes the spender of the people's money as the Senate may tell him to expend it, he should be responsible to the people. It is absolutely impossible, Mr. Speaker, to think of responsible Government if that is not done, because the true essence and meaning of responsible Government is that the Government collectively and individually is responsible to the people and must submit its actions to their final judgment. If that Administration is to a large extent governed by a body that is not obliged to go to the electorate for a verdict in favour of or against its Administration, it is no longer responsible. It is along those lines that my hon. friend moving this resolution is asking the opinion of this House.

[Mr. McKenzie.]

Now, let me say to the hon. leader of the Government that only a few days ago—last Friday, was it not?—he took a spasmodic fit in favour of wide-open democracy in the shape of the Daylight Saving Bill; but I think, as was hinted on this side of the House, that was something that he was quite willing to get clear of, he was willing to be generous in disposing of that he hated to have anything to do with, and he let us have our full fling.

Sir THOMAS WHITE: A final fling.

Mr. McKENZIE: He said in effect, "They think they are having something they are really not getting, and I am delighted to be clear of it and to let them get into all the hot water they please over it." But now when it comes down to a question that is more democratic, that goes to the very heart of democracy—and we have some very good democrats in this House—he cracks the whip at his followers and says, "This must not be accepted," and whether our friends, the supporters of the Government, think this is a democratic idea or not, the ground is cut from under their feet and they must not think at all for themselves, but simply as the Government thinks.

The leader of the Government put forward a few arguments as to why we should have representation in the Senate. If we turn to the Government of the United States, Mr. Speaker, we find that it is governing a hundred million people and has not a representative in either the Senate or the House of Representatives. Still it gets along splendidly, and if the United States Government gets along with the governing of a hundred million people without a representative in Congress, surely this Canada of ours with only eight million people, having full representation of the Government through elected members of this House, can get along without a representative in the Senate.

My hon. friend is a good lawyer, and I presume above everything else he is a good constitutional lawyer. I am sure he is not trying to tell us that the Senate is in all respects the same as this House as far as the representation of the people is concerned. He tells us that it is important that the Senate should know what the Government policy is. They have nothing to do, Sir, with Government policy; they are supposed to be paid by the people as an independent body, as a check upon the legislation of this House, absolutely free from party bias one way or the other. That is their function, and that is their position.

It is not necessary therefore, if they are properly discharging that function, to tell them how the wind blows as far as Government policy is concerned; although I do not object to somebody being in the Government without portfolio who can tell the Senate what the policy of the Government is, but they are not so very busy but they might read Hansard and see what is going on in this House. Perhaps it is necessary to chew the food for them and put it in their mouths, but I do not think that is the type of men they are. I think they are willing to read the Bills we send down for their consideration without somebody going over them and telling them what is in them. I do not think it is at all necessary that on the grounds set forth by the hon. gentleman we should have members of the Senate in the Government.

Now about the question of Labour. The hon. minister knows that that is a department of comparatively recent origin. It has been created for the purpose of giving labour a special voice in this House through a minister, and if there is any department of our Government that requires to be in immediate touch with the legislative body, that department is the Department of Labour, because every hour something arises in this House, some questions to be asked by the men who are here fresh from the people and who are in touch with labour feelings and labour wants. There should be a man sitting in this House, and I submit to the Acting Prime Minister that it was always the intention from the inception of this Department of Labour that the minister presiding over it would be in this House. I submit to you, Mr. Speaker, and to the Government that they have no business to take the Minister of Labour, I care not how excellent a man he may be, and place him in the seclusion of the Senate where we who represent labour have never an opportunity of presenting our views to him. He should be sitting in this House and hearing what we say.

I have no advice to give my hon. friend who moved this resolution. I do not wish to establish a precedent that my hon. friend who leads the Government might think would be detrimental to the established principles that we have been following in this country, but I think the purpose of the resolution would be served just as well if it were not pressed to a vote.

Mr. EULER: The leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) has so well answered the arguments of the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White) that very little is left for me to say. The Acting Prime Minister, being a lawyer, apparently has more respect for precedent than I have. I admitted that the practice we have discussed to-night has been followed in the past, but I am not prepared to admit that because of that it was a correct practice to follow. After all, the Acting Prime Minister was quoting persons in the way of precedents, whereas I was trying to impress principles. He has not answered the argument that ministers in charge of important portfolios involving the expenditure of large sums of money should be responsible to the people through the Parliament of Canada. And the vital principle involved in this case of the Postmaster General he has avoided with great skill.

The Acting Prime Minister paid considerable attention to what may be called the constitutional phase of the question. He said that it was in accordance with the constitution that we should have members of the Cabinet in the Senate. I do not think it is mandatory or obligatory that members of the Senate should be in the Cabinet; the matter is entirely subject to the discretion of the Prime Minister or of the Cabinet itself. I am inclined to think, from the tenor of his remarks, that the Acting Prime Minister is, after all, pretty much in sympathy with what I have stated. In fact, he gave expression to the opinion that he would not like to see—he did not use the word "abuse," but I will do so—the abuse carried much further. In view of that assertion, and having regard to the probability that as a result of this we may expect an abatement of an unsound practice, and because of the fact that the Acting Prime Minister has cracked the party whip, I shall not press the motion to a division.

Motion negatived.

VOCATIONAL TRAINING.

PROPOSAL TO INCLUDE BOYS ENLISTED UNDER AGE.

Mr. H. H. STEVENS (Vancouver) moved:

That, in the opinion of this House, boys who enlisted under age and who under the regulations are not at present included in the present vocational system, shall be given vocational training in such lines as may be considered to their best interest and so as to enable them to complete their educational course interfered with by enlistment.

He said: Mr. Speaker, in bringing this resolution before the House I feel that the principle which it embodies will receive a very large measure of sympathy and support from the members of the House, and,

I am quite sure, from the Government. I have purposely limited the resolution so that it applies only to boys enlisted under age. My reason for doing so was this. Many difficulties are involved in the question of vocational training in its wide, broad sense, and I recognize the perplexities with which the Government was faced in deciding just how far to go. I did feel that there could be no opposition to dealing with the class referred to in this resolution, and I made this limitation specifically to enable the Government to get the views of the House with regard to the matter. I feel sure that they will remedy this very serious defect in the system of vocational training. The great dominion of Australia has adopted this system. I state that simply as a suggestion, not particularly as an argument.

The lads who enlisted at the age of fifteen, sixteen, seventeen and eighteen, will be citizens of Canada for a long time. They are young men, starting at the very threshold of life, and for the full term of their manhood will be citizens of the country. Parliament, therefore, would assume a very serious responsibility if it interfered in any way with the prospects in life of a young man just at the beginning of his career. That is a very strong point that I wish to emphasize at the outset.

The State owes the boyhood of Canada a fair chance. The citizen owes allegiance, support and loyalty to the State; but the State has its duty to the citizen. These lads demonstrated their loyalty to the State by volunteering their services,—many of them gave up their lives at the front,—and to young fellows of that type the State owes everything they can do for them. If an error was made in allowing these young men to enlist and go overseas, the error was on the part of the State, not on the part of the boy. The boy simply showed a splendid spirit, the spirit which actuated the manhood of Canada generally; they went overseas typifying the sacrifice, and the grit, and the pluck, of the people of Canada. I wish to give one or two illustrations to bear out my arguments. A young lad enlisted at sixteen years of age and went overseas with the 65th Battalion. He received his certificate for entering High School before he enlisted. He was wounded at Regina Trench. Certain great battles or events of the war stand out from others; one of these is Regina Trench. Any boy who went through that fight and who suffered wounds there is certainly entitled to consideration. This lad has since recovered and returned to Canada after several years' service. He finds himself faced with a regulation which provides that as he is not incapacitated to carry on his previous work he is not entitled to vocational training. What was his previous work? He was a schoolboy. Mark you, this boy goes overseas, performs all the work of a man, heroically faces the enemy, suffers wounds, comes back a full-grown man—because no person could question his manhood after that—and he is asked to go back to school again where he left off, two, three, or four years before, as the case may be. The perpetuation of such a regulation is too absurd to be seriously considered by the House.

Another is the case of two brothers who went overseas. The younger enlisted at the age of fifteen. He was a big, husky boy, but the authorities knew he was under age and they kept him in Canada for six or seven months. The boy however was keen to get across and he got an opportunity to go over with one of the battalions. He was engaged in a number of battles and was wounded twice. His elder brother was also wounded, returned, and got vocational training, but this younger boy comes back to Canada and gets no vocational training at all, because when asked his vocation on enlisting he said he was a photographer. As a matter of fact he was a messenger to a photographer in Montreal. They gave him a physical examination when he returned, felt him all over and finding him physically sound, told him: "You can carry on as a photographer which was what you were engaged at before enlisting." That is another illustration, and I could give very many more.

I have here a document drawn up by students of Queen's University giving another viewpoint. Briefly, it is this: Some 110, or something like sixty per cent, of the second-year medical students at Queen's —I think the figures are limited to Queen's —went overseas and gave their trained services as orderlies in hospitals; they were not qualified to go as medical men, but gave their two years' training in the university for the benefit of the hospitals, as orderlies. They come back after a couple of years' service without any funds, for they could save very little out of an orderly's pay, and now they need assistance to complete their third year. Most of them are young fellows; some of them, though perhaps not all, under age. That is but another illustration of the imperative necessity of this House and Government recognizing the need of helping the boys to carry on their educational courses and

fitting them for their vocation in life, whatever that may be.

I wish to proceed to another argument, and what I shall say is not in the way of criticism, because all this work is new to the Government and to the country, but simply in the way of suggestion to the Government. My opinion is that our present method of vocational training is too diversified; it is not under one head. It may be answered that, technically speaking, there is a head in Ottawa, but I am speaking not of the ministerial, but of the technical or professional head. As a matter of fact the training is not under one head so far as administration is concerned. In that respect each unit—and there are something like a dozen different units in Canada—carries on almost independently. Let me give an illustration of one unit with which I have some acquaintance—"J" unit, which is the unit of the province of British Columbia. On the staff of "J" unit are 57 returned men, 9 civilians, and 25 female assistants, mostly stenographers. That makes a staff of 91, which is divided as follows: 38 instructors, 8 ward aids,—that is women who assist in the wards with the cases confined to bed—and 45 administrators. There we have only 46 instructors out of a staff of 91, and I do submit that the proportion may fairly be considered as almost top heavy. The reason I draw attention to this matter is that I believe the work could be done far better if it were under a head with some special qualifications—a man, for instance, who had been a sub-head of one of our leading educational institutions or universities. A man trained in technical educational work should have supreme control of vocational training in Canada, and each unit should carry on under this central head.

Another point I wish to make in that connection is this: Instead of giving training in electrical engineering, we will say, in each of these different units, it might be very much more to the advantage of the student, and would certainly be to the advantage of the country from a financial standpoint, if the training in these various vocations could be centralized to a greater degree than at present. I will illustrate what I mean by again referring to "J" unit. In "J" unit there are certain centres where vocational training is given. At Fairmont hospital in Vancouver, I find, there are six teachers and five pupils. It is difficult to understand just what the six teachers are doing with only five pupils,—perhaps one of the pupils is particularly unruly. At another place, I find two teachers and twenty-four pupils; at another, three teachers and seventy-four pupils; at another, fourteen teachers and one hundred and fifty-nine pupils. The latter three cases are quite reasonable. At Esquimalt there are four teachers and fifteen pupils. The reason I draw the attention of the Government to this is because I believe the cost of administration, which is always advanced as an argument against expenditure on vocational training, could be very materially reduced and the efficiency of the training very much increased; and if a reorganization were effected, not one iota would be added to the cost of extending this education to the young men with whom particularly my resolution deals. Some time ago I asked some questions which have not yet been answered, and which were asked to stand as an order for a return, which has not yet been received, so I am not in a position to give exact data upon this point, but I am informed that there have been between six and seven hundred applications for vocational training from young boys who enlisted under age which have been turned down; I do not know how many more there are. Let us compare this number who would be affected by my resolution with the number of applications received,—and I do this to show that it is not such a very important matter from the standpoint of finances as we might be led to believe. I am told that the total applications for vocational training are somewhere around 12,000—from 11,900 to 12,000. That is quite a large number and will give the House an idea of the magnitude of the task which the Government have in hand. Now the point I make is this: That the administration cost for additional pupils would be comparatively slight compared with the administration cost of the training now given, and particularly so if a better organization of the system of training were effected.

I wish at this point to ask a question which I think is of vital importance. If we refuse these boys this technical or vocational training, what is to become of them? They left the country as boys out of High school or college, or from the shop; they were merely lads playing around their homes. They leave, and in a couple of years are transformed into men—a transformation that, had they remained in civil life, it would have taken probably ten or fifteen years to effect. It is unreasonable to expect that these lads in any large num-

ber will go quietly back to school to resume their education at the point at which they left off. If they will not do that—as I am sure they will not—what is their future to be? There is only one thing open to them, that is, the common labour market; I say emphatically that it would be wrong to take keen-spirited lads like these—because they were the keenest-spirited of all who enlisted—and, after they have been to the front and have rendered such admirable service, many of them returning seriously wounded, simply turn them loose and say, "Now you can go to the pick and shovel." This Parliament and this country owe to every one of them at the very least a technical education. We owe them the chance of making good in this life, and it is our bounden duty to see that they get that chance. I accordingly urge this resolution, and would bespeak for it the most serious and careful attention of the Government.

At this point I would offer another suggestion, and that is in reference to the establishment of technical schools in Canada. I believe, Sir, that this is an excellent opportunity for the Government to take advantage of the suggestions put forward in a very long report on technical education made some years ago under the authority, I think of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier's Government. I remember having seen the report, although I had not the time to give it any careful perusal. It strongly advocated the establishment of technical schools in Canada, and if ever there was a necessity for such institutions it surely exists to-day, not only for these lads but also for other men who have been wholly or partially incapacitated. Technical schools are urgently needed, and this would be an eminently opportune time to establish them and make them a permanent institution. I do not think that there is an hon. member in the House, or an intelligent citizen in the country who will question the advisability of establishing such schools. Taking that for granted, when could a better opportunity present itself for the undertaking than at this moment? For these reasons I would impress upon the Government, and particularly upon the minister in charge of this department, the importance of technical schools for the instruction of the youths who enlisted under age as well as other men seeking technical education or vocational training. I do not desire to labour the question, but the problem facing us is one which not only merits our attention, but imposes a serious duty upon us, and I trust the Government will not pass it off with the comment that the matter is a complicated one which may open the door to serious and expensive demands from all quarters, but will realize, in its fullest significance, the fact that there are some six or seven hundred lads who enlisted under age and did their bit and who have now come back with the simple request that they be given a decent technical education to fit them for their future life work. The very least that a grateful government and people can do is to give these lads the opportunity they deserve and badly need, and for these reasons I move the resolution.

Mr. HUGH CLARK (North Bruce): Mr. Speaker, when this question first came up Canada did what I think every other country at war did. It regarded disability as the line of division between men who should be re-trained and men who should not. This was the only line that could be taken by which we could avoid what might be considered as class legislation. It may probably be argued that we have strayed from that in connection with our Soldiers' Settlement Act when we re-train men to enter into agriculture. But as against this argument it must be remembered that our object was to encourage the returned soldiers to take up agriculture, and the object of the re-training was to ascertain whether or not the applicants were fit and proper persons to whom certain loans should be given to enable them to go into farming. Outside of that I think we can say that we have so far avoided anything that might be called class legislation. I admire my hon. friend from Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) in the sympathetic attitude he takes towards the men who enlisted under age, because I am firmly convinced they were impelled by a splendid spirit of patriotism, a spirit perhaps not shown by others of maturer years; I believe, as he does, that the Government should have some regard for these young men who have devoted two, three or four of the most precious years of their lives to the service of their country—years in which their characters were forming, and in which they and their parents hoped they would be able to qualify in some profession or occupation by which to earn their livelihood.

My hon. friend suggests that he does not want to hear any reasons why this project should not be undertaken, but I must tell him that when it was first proposed it opened the door to other propositions as

well. The proposal was made to us by the universities, to which it was represented by the returned men that those who wished to have an education should be given it. We had the further demand that other people who were not students should be compensated for losses in business, or should be given loans to set them up in business, and the subject assumed such large proportions that the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment decided to go no further with it. This, however, was owing to no lack of sympathy with the proposal my hon. friend has just advanced. The entire subject of university training has engaged the attention of the Repatriation Committee of the Government, a member of which committee will no doubt speak after I have concluded. The university students whose courses were interrupted, and who, perhaps, are in as bad a position as young men who enlisted under age, must also be considered, and that is a matter that will have to come before the Government. I can well understand the arguments of my hon. friend with respect to all these classes of men. He has anticipated the contention that might be made as regards increased cost, by giving us the cost of organization and of maintenance, and he has suggested that there should be more centralization. Had I expected these arguments I might be in a better position to meet them. However, I wish to say that the young men in whom my hon. friend has shown such sympathetic interest have the same interest and sympathy from myself.

Mr. F. L. DAVIS (Neepawa): Mr. Speaker, I regret that so small a House is present to consider the question which the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) has brought to the fore. I also regret that I have made no preparation to address the House on this subject, but it is one that I have been interested in and I would like therefore to have a word upon it. If the wealth of the country is its manhood, as we all believe, this question is one that very greatly concerns the future of our Canadian soldiers, and more especially is it necessary that we should deal with the very young men of the class which the hon. member for Vancouver has dealt with. The very young man has not fixed his course in life; he has not as yet set before him what his life aim shall be, as the university student or the man who has chosen a professional course has. There will be a very serious void in this young man's life unless an unusual effort is made to engage his interest in its future development. I believe that Parliament is interested in getting this young man started upon a course of vocational training, the machinery for which has been largely provided. It is not a matter of extending it to the young men who can be brought into the schools and technical colleges which the Government will operate apart in any event from the question of training injured soldiers. I therefore would give my support to the proposition and earnestly commend it to the House.

Mr. A. R. McMASTER (Brome): Mr. Speaker, I did not expect to take part in this debate, but I think something should be said in support of the proposition brought forward by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre. In my humble opinion, the State owes a very special debt to those boys of fifteen or sixteen who went to the front, because they never should have been allowed to go. If the State allowed them to go to the front, then the State is under an obligation to see that they are equipped to lead useful lives when they come back. I was somewhat astonished to hear the remarks made by the hon. Acting Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment (Mr. Hugh Clark). What I gathered from his remarks was that a claim was made to this Government on behalf of those boys that they should be entitled to vocational training, and that apparently this was a just claim; that again a demand was made for special training by people who had lost money, and that that was not such a just claim as the other; that these matters constituted a proposition of such tremendous importance and difficulty to the Government that the only thing they could offer to the boys at the present time was warm and sincere sympathy. I think that the young men who are in a position that the hon. member for Vancouver Centre has brought before the House are entitled to something more.

Mr. HUGH CLARK (North Bruce): Mr. Speaker, I made mention of those cases because each grew out of the other and what I did say was that all these questions were matters that were engaging the attention of the Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment Department.

Mr. McMASTER: No doubt they are engaging the attention of the Government, but that the war was going to come to an end was an idea that we had been cherishing for years. Incidents of this class ought to have been considered months ago rather than, as the Government tell us, after the boys come home and are discharged from

the army. It is during the first few months after they are discharged that they must be interested in some line or they will drift into those blind alleys of employment that the member for Vancouver Centre indicated. I endorse most heartily what has been said by hon. members on the other side of the House, and urge that this matter is of paramount and immediate importance. It seems to me that the Government has only to amend its regulations so as to say that all the school boys who left Canada and who served in the army should, on their return, have the right to vocational training even if they do not come within the four corners of the present regulations. These regulations could very easily be amended. It is far better that the Government should offer training to a few who perhaps do not deserve it than that they should not give any of this class of boys the training to which they are entitled.

Hon. N. W. ROWELL (President of the Council): Mr. Speaker, the question brought to the attention of the House by the hon. member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) is one of very great importance and I am sure all the members of the House are deeply interested in it. I believe the number under the age of eighteen years who enlisted, is substantially larger than my hon. friend mentions. I have not the final figures but the estimate which I have received, and which is based on the information the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment has secured is between 5,000 and 7,000. The hon. member for Brome (Mr. McMaster) suggested that the enlistment of these boys should not have been permitted. I imagine that very few were knowingly permitted. I imagine that the boys gave their ages as 18 years or more in order to get overseas. I believe there were many instances of that kind. I remember on one occasion being at a camp in France where I saw a boy who was obviously under 18 years of age. I also saw a man who was obviously over military age. I said to the man who was over military age: How did this boy get over here? He turned to the boy and said: How do you come to be here? The boy replied: I got here in the same way as you did—by lying about my age. Many of the boys in their anxiety to get over, gave an age above what it actually was. I am only saying that in answer to what my hon. friend said that the Government should not have permitted them to enlist. But that they constituted an exceedingly fine body of young men no one will question. I remember many of them were brought back from France when it was found that they were under age. Last summer we saw at Bramshott a full battalion of young boys under the command of Colonel McKay of Winnipeg.

Some of those boys had one or two wound stripes on their arm, and I must say I never saw a finer battalion than that battalion composed of boys all under eighteen years of age. The majority of them had served at the front. Others had gone as far as England and were weeded out of other battalions and incorporated in this boys' battalion under the command of an able and sympathetic commanding officer, who was giving them training in England.

Now, as my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. Clark) has pointed out, the basis upon which the work of the vocational branch of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment is carried on is to provide an education for disabled soldiers, a disability of the soldier which prevents him from resuming his former occupation, and the training courses are established and carried on to fit him for a new pursuit. May I turn to the section of the Order in Council which defines the conditions upon which a man becomes entitled to vocational training under the regulations as they now exist:

> Any former member of the forces suffering from a disability which in the opinion of a naval or military medical board, or of a medical officer of the department, is due to or was aggravated by service, and which in the opinion of the Directors of Vocational Training of the Department prevents such former member of the forces from returning to his previous trade or principal occupation, shall be entitled to re-training for a new occupation in accordance with the regulations of the department, and to such allowances as are provided herein for former members of the forces undergoing re-training.

A great many men come within that class, and vocational training is now being carried on throughout the country at the various centres as established by the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment. That training may be described under three heads.

There is the training which is being given in certain universities and schools to those who desire to enter upon a course, or a vocation, which justifies the sending of them to these schools. In other cases, where special training is required, it has beeen found necessary to establish classes conducted entirely by the department. The third method is the utilization in industries of the apprentice system, where these men are given training in shops or factories in

the particular occupation which they desire to pursue, and their income is supplemented as provided in the Order in Council.

From all who have come within the classes I have referred to, special provision is made by way of pay and allowances. The allowance payable by the department to a former member of the forces who is without dependents will be $60 per month. He receives $60 a month during the whole period he is undergoing this training, as well as free instruction in the school. The allowances payable while undergoing training by the department, for a former member of the forces, who has a wife, or a wife and child, or a wife and children, is as follows:

For such former member of the Forces	$85.00 a month
For one child	10.00 a month
For two children	18.00 a month
For three children	25.00 a month
For more than three children	25.00 a month

Plus $6 a month for each child in excess of three.

The House will thus see and realize the amount that is being contributed by the Government in the case of each of these disabled men, or for a disabled man who has a wife and children. Then, corresponding allowances are made where he is a widower with dependent children. Corresponding allowances are also made where the man, though not married, has others dependent upon him, as in the case with the soldier serving at the front. In other words his position is kept as nearly as possible as it was while he was serving in the army, and he draws pay and allowances during the period he is undergoing training.

It is quite true, as has been pointed out, that this provision does not apply to those who are not disabled, and this raises a very important question. It applies with particular force to those under eighteen years of age. But, as my hon. friend from North Bruce (Mr. Hugh Clark) has mentioned, it has been pressed upon the Government that the relief should not be limited to those under eighteen years, but that provision should be made for all whose education has been interrupted. It is only necessary to point out that the average cost per man of vocational training is about $1,000, to indicate the amount of the charge which would be placed upon the country if many thousands more were brought within the provisions of the existing regulations.

Mr. STEVENS: Does the $1,000 include the cost of administration and plant? Does it represent the whole cost?

Mr. ROWELL: Approximately the whole cost.

Mr. STEVENS: The minister will realize that the larger the number the smaller the individual cost.

Mr. ROWELL: Quite so, that would reduce the administration charge undoubtedly. The number undoubtedly will steadily and rapidly increase as the troops come back, and as the disabled men return from the hospitals in England. Therefore it is anticipated that there will be a large increase in the number that even under the existing regulations will require treatment in the vocational institutions provided. While that is all true, everything that has been said about these boys is also perfectly true. Undoubtedly it is a matter of serious moment to Canada, and to all the nations at war, that so large a percentage of young men, just at the age when character is being formed, and when they must get their education, if they are to get it under the most advantageous conditions, were called upon to serve their country at the front and have been deprived of these educational opportunities. Unless these young men do receive an education now we will undoubtedly suffer in the future in the educational leadership of our country. I am sure all will recognize that at no period of our history was it more important that we should have our citizens, and particularly those who will be the leaders of our people, thoroughly trained and given the best education that is available in order that they may render to the State the service which that education should qualify them to render. As my hon. friend (Mr. Hugh Clark) has said, this whole problem is receiving the earnest consideration of the Government. The Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment is looking into the number who will be affected by a provision for those under eighteen years. We are also looking into the question of the boys whose university course has been interrupted, to see what financial obligation would be involved if anything is attempted in that direction. This question has been considered by the Repatriation Committee of the Cabinet, and a report has been prepared upon the matter, which will come before the Government for consideration probably within a few days. In view of that fact I must ask my hon. friend, who has very properly brought this matter to the attention of the House, if, having done so, he could see his way clear to withdraw the motion. It is a matter involving

10 p.m.

governmental policy which is receiving the earnest attention of the Government at the present time, and upon which an announcement may be expected in the near future.

One other matter I might mention. My honourable friend referred to technical education and the opportunity this would offer the Government for dealing with the suggestions contained in the report on technical education which was made some few years ago by the Commission appointed by the Government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier. Might I draw my honourable friend's attention to the fact that in the Speech from the Throne there is an announcement that a Bill will be brought down this session providing for vocational training. A Bill will be introduced into the House this session dealing with the question and providing substantial assistance for the work of technical education in the different provinces of the Dominion. There can be no doubt of the importance of technical education, of the great practical benefits which would result to the industrial life of the country if we had a larger trained body, such as we might secure by the enlargement of existing institutions or the establishment of others where technical education might be given.

Mr. WILLIAM F. NICKLE (Kingston): Mr. Speaker, before this resolution is withdrawn by its mover I would like to say a word or two on behalf of the principle enunciated during the debate. As the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell) has said, to avoid legislation being thought to be class legislation, those responsible for the promulgation of the regulations affecting vocational training established the principle that vocational training should only be given to those who through disability had been impaired in their trade or occupation as practised before the war. That admits that the soldier prior to enlistment—not the schoolboy, but the soldier who had a trade or occupation—was in a position then to earn his living, and that if his disability was of such a character that on his return he could not earn his living, then the State recognized its responsibility to give him such a training as would enable him to earn a living in another sphere of activity. But when you come to apply that principle to the position of the schoolboy, you find yourself confronted with this difficulty. The schoolboy at the time of his enlistment—and I am speaking now particularly of the boy in our high schools and our secondary schools—was not in a position to earn a living; he was building the foundation on which he hoped later on to earn a living. He went over as a boy of sixteen or seventeen, the companion of girls at school with short skirts and flowing curls and of boys in knickerbockers—children so to speak living at home, kept in the parental establishment at the minimum of cost. He spent two, three or four years at the front. He returned, not a boy of seventeen, but a man of twenty-one, and not only a man of twenty-one in years, but a man of probably twenty-five in experience, in aspirations and in instincts. He cannot return to the secondary school which he left three or four years ago, he must go into the university, where his class fees are greater, and his maintenance higher, and where the general average of living costs are much more than when he was a schoolboy.

What is going to become of the young man? He cannot go back to school, because there is no place there for him. If means are not provided for him and—I speak of him who has not been born with a silver spoon in his mouth—if he has not the means to contiue his education he must give it up. If he had not a trade or occupation prior to going to the war, what is he to do? Because he was willing to sacrifice his future when seventeeen years of age is he to go back to the very roughest of trades, to become a manual labourer? I do not believe that that is the desire or the intention of the Government, and I am impressed to-night by what the President of the Privy Council said, that this Government appreciates the necessities of the situation and is endeavouring to find a solution for them. And the President of the Privy Council is quite correct when he says that the problem does not stop with the boy who went to the front when he was seventeeen years of age. I am confronted in my own riding, more particularly in the university with which I happen to have the honour to be connected, with the troubles of the medical students and students of the School of Science. The universities did magnificently in the war. I have not the figures as fully as I would have had them had I any expectation of this debate, but I know the Royal Military College lost in the neighbourhood of 150 of its graduates and undergraduates; that Toronto University lost somewhere in the neighbourhood of 550; that McGill—I regret I have not the figures—

An hon. MEMBER: A very large contribution.

Mr. NICKLE: —but I know McGill gave a magnificent contribution to the war, and Queen's University sacrificed 150 of its graduates and under-graduates. But not only did we sacrifice many men through death, many of our best—and they were the leaders in university life—were impelled by the call of duty when war broke out to go to the front in the most, I was going to say menial, capacity. Medical students of three and four years' standing went as hospital orderlies earning only enough to keep them at the front. Then when they return to Canada after giving two or three years from the creative period of their life they find that the six months' course has been extended to eight months, and when they look about to seek employment to put them through they find in these disturbed times that there is no employment to be had, and they are obliged either to seek financial assistance or abandon their course. Last Saturday when in Kingston I was waited upon by a delegation of medical students who explained to me, speaking for their class, that unless they were granted assistance by way of donation, or unless some other financial arrangements were made, it was impossible for many of them to see how their academic course could be completed.

The universities are impressed with the necessity of making up to these young men the years they have lost in the war, and some of them this year are running summer sessions so that a man who is anxious because of the lack of the wherewithal for the more extended course may in two years take the four years' course, that is, in one-half the ordinary academic course he can fit himself for his chosen profession.

I sincerely trust that the Government will give this matter most careful and immediate consideration, because I am impressed with this fact, that if there is one class more than another that has paid a terriffic penalty in this war it is that class which is composed of the leading spirits in our university and educational life, and in the years to come it is absolutely essential that as promptly as possible these men who went down to death be replaced by other men of the same high spirit, vigour of thought and intellectual quality, if Canada is not to feel more severely than she should the sacrifices she has been called upon to make in this war.

Mr. D. D. McKENZIE (Cape Breton North and Victoria): Mr. Speaker, I have not anything particular to add to what has been so well said by the mover of the resolution and by the other hon. gentlemen who have spoken, but silence on my part, on account of the position which I hold, might be construed as indicating that I have no special interest in this resolution, when the contrary is the fact. I agree entirely with what has been said by the mover of the resolution as to the very great importance of allowing those young men to get within the scope of the vocational training which is now being given, Nothing should be allowed to stand in the way. I suggest to the President of the Privy Council (Mr. Rowell), who seems to speak with authority for the Government on this question, that no time be lost in enabling these young men to get the advantages which others are receiving from this branch of education. The country generally has reason to find fault with the Government for being slow in connection with these matters.

The member for Vancouver Centre (Mr. Stevens) mentioned technical education. That is a matter that has been receiving the attention of this House for many years. Ever since 1910, when a commission was appointed by the Government of the late Sir Wilfrid Laurier to inquire into the matter, it has received the attention of the country in concrete form. The Government of Sir Robert Borden, early in its lifetime, found in its archives the report of this Commission. I have distinct recollection of this matter coming up in the House every year and of promises repeatedly made that some action would be taken. But eight years have gone by and nothing has been done either by this Government or by the Government preceding it—which was, to my mind, just the same Government under a somewhat different name. And to-night when a supporter of the Government asks what is to be done about technical education, he is told that somewhere, sometime, something may come forth into actuality. Technical education is at all times important; to-day it is more important than ever. If the Government wish to give the industries of this country a good start and a good standing, let them stop high protection and devote their attention to technical education. The industries will then be put upon a good footing, efficiency will be brought about in our producing centres, and our manufacturing industries will have such a superior standing in the world that protection will no longer be required. I make this argument not in a broad sense of talking politics or tariffs, but simply to illustrate the great necessity of putting

the young men and young women who are to be the producers of our country on an equal footing with those of any other part of the world by giving them technical training.

In the province from which I come we have an excellent technical college; I am proud to say that Nova Scotia was the first province, with its small means, to build up a first class institution of that kind. That technical college is affiliated with the universities in our own province; students holding two-years' certificates from any recognized college in Canada may finish the other two years in our technical college and get their degree. I do not know how many of the other provinces have similar institutions, but I am sure that institutions of that kind can be made sufficiently strong and sufficiently important to be self-sustaining and to be of great benefit not only to the provinces in which they are established, but to the whole country as well. After we get well on our feet in establishing these institutions throughout the provinces, we could have a great central institution for the whole of Canada. But, to begin with, we should have institutions in the various provinces, supported by such sums of money out of the Treasury of the country as will enable them to be put upon a first class and efficient footing and carry on such technical education as is recommended by the Robertson Commission Report now in the hands of the Government.

I fully agree with the arguments put forth by the mover of this resolution, and I hope that what he has in mind will be carried out at once by those who have charge of vocational training; and, further, that the matter of technical education and the carrying out of the terms of the report to which I have referred will be taken up by the Government as soon as possible. I hope that the Government will move; I hope they will start up and do some work. We on this side of the House are ready to meet them and help them along. From day to day, when items of Government work on the Order Paper are reached, the response is given: "Stand"—"Stand"—"Stand"—nobody ready to do anything. When we come to have a long dreary session in the hot summer, we shall be blamed on this side for blocking the business of the House, whereas we are doing nothing of the kind. We invite the Government to get along with their work, and we will help them; we will help them particularly with this technical education and in the carrying out of the ideas suggested by the resolution of the member for Vancouver Centre.

Mr. STEVENS: The Acting Parliamentary Secretary of the Department of Soldiers' Civil Re-Establishment (Mr. Hugh Clark), said that the basis upon which vocational training was granted to returned soldiers was that of disability. I appreciate, as I stated a moment ago, the perplexities with which those administering this department have been faced; but I think they have had sufficient experience now to have the matter well in hand. I should like to emphasize the fact that I have limited the application of the resolution to boys who enlisted under age. This, I think, is a fair answer to the suggestion that it opens the door to many other claims. The President of the Privy Council (Hon. Mr. Rowell) stated that my figures were very much out when I gave 700 as the number of applicants of boys under age for vocational training. He gives the alarming figure of 5,000.

Hon. Mr. ROWELL: My hon. friend will pardon me; I gave 5,000 not as the number of applicants, but as the number under age who enlisted.

Mr. STEVENS: I say that this figure is an alarming one; it emphasizes the gravity of the problem with which we are faced. The further argument is made that the boys who enlisted under age are personally to blame because they described themselves as being older than they were. Surely the medical examiners would not pass 5,000 boys who were under age—that is a very large number. If true, it certainly does not reflect much credit on the medical examiners. I can easily understand that a great many would get through. I know boys personally who enlisted when under age and who were quite well known to be under age by the military authorities who accepted them. The cost of training 5,000 boys at $1,000 each would be $5,000,000, and what the House and the Government must consider is this: Is it worth $5,000,000 to take 5,000 boys out of the cesspool of ignorance and put them on the highway to decency and capability? In justification I may say it is not my fault I did not get the right figures. I think if the minister had given me about two hours in his office I could have got the figures exactly. I am sure they must be easily available on short notice, and I cannot understand why the figures have not been given in answer to the question I asked over two weeks ago. At all events, the Bill is in preparation and

I am willing at the request of the Government to withdraw this resolution at present. But in all courtesy and in a perfectly kind spirit, I am going to advise the Government that if the principle of this resolution is not included in the Bill when brought down I shall exercise my freedom as a citizen of Canada and as a member of this House to fight the Bill to a finish, because I feel this is too important a matter to be lightly dealt with. I do not say that with any desire to harass the Government, but I think the expression of opinion here to-night should be quite sufficient for the Government to include such a provision in the Bill as is sought by this resolution. I wish to thank the Government for saying they are going to bring down the Bill.

Motion withdrawn.

ST. CHARLES RIVER IMPROVEMENTS —THE KING V. BELANGER.

Hon. RODOLPHE LEMIEUX moved:

For a copy of all papers, records, and other documents, in the case of His Majesty the King, Appellant, and Pierre Edouard Emile Belanger, Respondent, now pending in the Supreme Court of Canada.

He said: Mr. Speaker, last year on two occasions I brought this matter before the House, and I wish now just to point out very briefly the facts of this case. As you are aware, some years ago the Government decided to build a dam on the River St. Charles at Quebec. A gentleman by the name of Belanger was the proprietor of two beach lots on the River St. Charles, and when the time came to build the dam in question expropriation proceedings were taken, and a petition was entered before the Exchequer Court, where the respondent Belanger, who was the plaintiff in the court below, claimed from the Government the sum of $800,000 in round figures; this seemingly representing 50 cents per square foot for one of the two lots and 35 cents per square foot for the other. His Majesty the King was represented in this case by a very eminent counsel from Levis, Mr. Bernier, who has been the batonnier of the bar in that district and, if I mistake not, for the whole province of Quebec. Mr. Bernier denied that Belanger had any valid title to these two lots, denied also that the portion of these lots situate between high and low water marks were always water lots situate in the estuary of the River St. Charles and covered with the waters thereof, and affirmed that said lots always formed part of the Crown lands and were never legally granted to anybody. That was one of the pleas filed by the Crown as represented by its counsel. Then it was averred that even if the respondent proved his title, a reasonable sum ascertained under the provisions of the Expropriation Act should be paid him for the value of such lands and the damages resulting therefrom. The enquete took place. Mr. Justice Audette of the Exchequer Court, went to Quebec and quite an array of witnesses was summoned before him. Finally, on the 28th of June, 1917, judgment was rendered. The Court held that the respondent had proven his title and was entitled to recover the value of the lands. The amount awarded by Mr. Justice Audette for the two lots totalled $215,925.10, with interest. To that amount the judge added the 10 per cent which is allowed in some cases owing to peculiar circumstances. This 10 per cents, at the rate of 10 cents a square foot, represented the sum of $21,592.51. The case was appealed by His Majesty the King and came up before the Supreme Court last year when this Parliament was in session. In his factum the counsel for the Crown stated that the Crown accepted the judgment of the Exchequer Court as regards the larger amount, but appealed as regards the smaller sum of $21,592.51. When the case came up before the Supreme Court one of the judges appeared to be surprised at the way in which it had been conducted, and inquired of counsel if the Crown were really appealing only as regards the smaller award, or as regards the larger sum as well. On counsel insisting that the appeal was in respect of the smaller sum only, the court of its own initiative stopped the case and decided to ask that new instructions be given to counsel. This attracted my attention as it appeared in the press, and I was curious enough to look at the record of the case. To my amazement I found some startling developments in it. I discovered that Mr. Justice Audette had reluctantly made the award after witnesses had been heard in the city of Quebec. He said:

The lands in question were acquired by the suppliant for the sum of $18,165.32, and were practically yielding no revenue save the renting of one house on lot 513, and pasture on lot 560. These lots lie in the estuary of the river St. Charles, and are nothing but a stretch of muddy soil upon which in the case of 560 some marine grass grows upon which cattle may feed; but the land is entirely covered by water at high tide, and the lot has been practically idle and no use has been made of it for years and years. Wharves may be built upon the same, as wharves may be built in fields, but it has no access to deep water, except to the height of the water brought in by the tide. Lot No. 513

is impracticable for building purposes. It is a beach lot. Some of the witnesses were candid enough to say, they thought the property had very little value, but it might have value for public purposes and assessed it on that basis. In other words, that the property was of very little value to the owner, but might be of some good value to a party expropriating for public purposes, or for a scheme like the present works. However, it is now settled law that in assessing compensation for property taken under compulsory powers, it is not proper to consider as part of the market value to the owner such value as the land taken may have to the party expropriating when viewed as an integral part of the proposed work or undertaking.

The Court must guard against fostering speculating in expropriation matters, and must not encourage the making of extravagant claims, and more especially must guard against being carried away by the subtle arguments of real estate speculators or expert witnesses and thus render the execution of public works impossible or prohibitive. While the owner must be amply compensated in that he shall be no poorer after the expropriation, it is no reason to charge the public exchequer with exorbitant compensation built upon an imaginary or speculative basis. These remarks I must confess are provoked by the extravagant amount of the claim of the suppliant, namely the sum of $800,085.65 for a property which cost him, a few years before, the sum of $18,165.37 as above set forth, and more especially when the property has been idle for years and years and the public work in question herein is the only thing which will give it any value. I feel I am perhaps allowing too high an amount for a property composed of waste flats and beach entirely covered with water at high tides, which a few years ago cost in round figures $18,000 and which had been for years practically unproductive and has been a charge upon the owner, the taxes being larger than the revenues, and but for the public work in question would have very likely remained idle for years to come.

However, the judge rendered his judgment, and to the sum of $215,925.10 he added 10 per cent for compulsory taking—because the land had been taken against the owner's will—the total sum being $237,517.61. Now I confess that when I read this judgment, and the appeal therefrom, I was startled to find that for a property consisting of two beach lots on the St. Charles river which had cost the owner originally $18,000, and which did not produce enough revenue for years and years to pay the taxes, His Majesty the King should pay over $237,000. This was acquired for a public work which, I am informed, has been abandoned.

Mr. MORPHY: Has the hon. gentleman discovered in the record the evidence upon which the judge based his finding allowing $215,000?

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have not the evidence before me, but I had it last year. The evidence, with the plans, is filed in the Supreme Court. The evidence is very lengthy. I found that last year no expert appraiser had been called as a witness. Several neighbours and friends had been called. When the man from whom this property was purchased died his estate had been obliged to pay the inheritance tax to the provincial government and a declaration was filed which, had it been filed in this case, would have proven that the estate attached no value whatsoever to these lots. Yet, that evidence was not adduced before the judge. The judge reluctantly granted that enormous amount of $237,000 for a property which was bought for $18,000 and which for years had not produced enough to pay the taxes.

The judges of the Supreme Court were startled, stopped the case and told the counsel for the Government that he should receive new instructions from the Department of Justice. What I want to know from the Minister of Justice, or his representative, is whether or not new instructions have been issued, whether new evidence has been adduced and just what the Government intends to do in this matter.

With the present financial condition of the country it would be nothing short of scandalous that this enormous amount of money should be paid to land speculators especially when the object for which the construction was made—a dam—is being abandoned by the Government. I think the House is entitled to get some explanation from the Government because, as will be shown by the record, this land was bought evidently with the view of carrying on a speculation at the expense of the taxpayers. The Government has been warned. On two occasions last year I called the attention of the House to this case and I am informed that the case was lately given a re-hearing by the Supreme Court. No new instructions were issued. Possibly the judgment may be that the award of the Exchequer Court be confirmed. No doubt it will be confirmed because the Counsel for the Department of Justice accepts the award and contests it only for the smaller amount. It is something remarkable. Here is an award of $237,000 given reluctantly by the judge, as the judge so admitted. Counsel goes before the court, files his factum, introduces his case and says: Oh, well, as regards the large amount of $225,000, the Crown accepts that award, but as regards the $25,000, we intend to fight. It is a very strange circumstance indeed. The damming of the river St. Charles has been stopped, so I

am informed, and yet this case goes one. Some time next fall somebody will startle the country by stating that the amount has been paid. I do not care one whit where it is that the expropriation has taken place. It would be far better for me probably not to say a word. I would be very popular in the neighbourhood if I would remain silent on this question. But I am a taxpayer, I am one of the legislators of Canada, and it is my duty as a legislator and a member of Parliament to protest against such a scandalous transaction. The Government, I repeat, has been warned, but instead of heeding the warning the Government is proceeding with the case and no action has been taken. Well, I give a last warning to the Government and I say: Retrace your steps, and stop this proceeding because it is nothing short of a scandal.

Hon. J. D. REID (Minister of Railways and Canals): Mr. Speaker, if the hon. gentleman had spent five minutes telephoning to the Department of Public Works and making inquiry there he would have understood the situation in regard to this matter and he never would have made the speech that he has made this evening. The only reason that I am saying anything in answer to what the hon. gentleman has said is that my hon. friend the Minister of Public Works (Mr. Carvell) and my hon. friend the Acting Minister of Justice (Mr. Meighen) are absent. I am not seized of all the facts but let me say that I was in Quebec and looked over this property when I was Acting Minister of Public Works. It is true the property was expropriated, but I do not think any Minister of Public Works would have ever considered the purchase of that property even at $18,000. Certainly, I would not myself have taken it at that sum. However, the property was expropriated and the case was sent to the Exchequer Court, which is the customary procedure in expropriation proceedings. The decision of the Exchequer Court is supposed to be satisfactory to all, but what astonishes me, as well as the hon. gentleman who has just taken his seat, was that the Exchequer Court gave judgment for $215,000. That fact not only surprised me, but it surprised the Government as a whole. I am free to admit that the case was badly handled in the Exchequer Court. I believe that if the Government had been represented by better counsel that judgment would never have been given. An appeal to the Supreme Court followed, and argument was heard in that court. However, the Department of Justice was following the case, and when it heard in court the position taken by counsel, as stated by the hon. member, a stay of proceedings was applied for and granted. The Department of Justice engaged other counsel and took the case in hand itself. If the hon. gentleman has made inquiries he must know that the department asked for a new trial, and that a new trial was granted. He must also know if he is acquainted with the facts, that the Department of Public Works has filed a plan abandoning three-quarters of the property for the reason that it does not require it. What will now happen is this: one-fourth of the property has been built on and therefore must be retained, but there will be a valuation of it. Unless we get a fair valuation there will be a further hearing in the Exchequer Court, and the Government will be represented by the best counsel it can get. When the case is tried, and judgment rendered, it will be fair and just. With the full information in his possession, which the hon. gentleman could have got by merely telephoning for it as I did, it would not have been necessary to have taken up the time of the House for one hour to-night trying to make it appear that there has been an awful scandal, whereas the facts are that three-quarters of the property that was sought to be foisted on the Government have been abandoned, that only twenty-five per cent of the property is being retained, for which a fair value will be paid, and that instead of $215,000 having been paid out not one dollar has been expended.

Mr. THOMAS VIEN (Lotbiniere): I know something of the circumstances of this case, and I know the counsel who was employed by the Government. That counsel has been the Batonnier of the Bar of Quebec, Batonnier Général of the province of Quebec, mayor of the city of Levis, member in the Quebec Legislature for the County of Levis, and is one of the most respected lawyers at the Bar of Quebec. Last year when this question came up, the Minister of Justice made this reply to an interpelation by the member for Maisonneuve (Mr. Lemieux):

> There is not any doubt that the Crown was represented by counsel. The facts in regard to the direct action of the Crown are that the instructions were of the clearest possible kind, that an appeal should be made from the entire award, and the appeal which was lodged under the immediate direction of the Deputy Minister of Justice, as the departmental records will certainly show, was an appeal from the entire award.

The documents which will be filed will show that the appeal was not for the entire

award, but for the ten per cent specially provided in the award by the judge of the Exchequer Court.

Mr. J. D. REID: It may be true that the appeal to the Supreme Court was made in the way that the hon. gentleman states, but it was the lawyer from Levis who made it, not the Justice Department.

Mr. LEMIEUX: Under whose instructions?

Mr. VIEN: I will come to that point, because I have something more in store for the hon. minister. The Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) now acknowledges that the appeal was only for the ten per cent, and yet the Minister of Justice (Mr. Doherty), when giving information to this House last year, said that the appeal had been made under the direction of the Deputy Minister of Justice and for the full award. We now have the evidence that the appeal was not made for the full award, but only for the ten per cent. There is something further. The hon. gentleman says the appeal was made only for the ten per cent, but it was made thorugh counsel who did not obey his instructions. Well, Sir, a few days after the session
11 p.m. closed—and the statement to which I have referred was given to the House by the Minister of Justice on the 23rd of May, 1918, the very day of prorogation—I returned to Quebec and had an interview with Mr. Bernier himself. He then told me definitely that he had written instructions to appeal only for the ten per cent. There is something very mysterious about this case. I have not the slightest doubt that the counsel engaged by the Crown to act in these proceedings tells the truth when he says he had written instructions, and it simply envelops the whole affair in greater mystery. This is particularly true when we remember that the Minister of Justice made the statement last year that the appeal was for the full award, whereas to-day we have the evidence that it was not for the full award but only for the ten per cent.

I say, Sir, that this case is really tantamount to a big scandal. It is a scandal to see the Minister of Justice give wrong information to the House on a matter of such importance. Before giving the information he should have taken steps to verify it. I am not going so far as to say that he deliberately gave wrong information, but surely when a minister of the Crown is giving an answer to a question put to him in this House his answer should be based on first-hand knowledge. It is also mysterious and almost tantamount to a scandal for a minister of the Crown to say that he gave instructions and that the appeal was for the full award, when the counsel who was retained by the Government to deal with this matter—and who is a reliable member of the Quebec Bar, one who has occupied the highest position in its gift—definitely states that he acted on the written instructions of the department. I submit that it is time we saw the bottom, and the under bottom, of the whole affair, and it seems to me that the Government should lay on the Table all the documents bearing on this case, so that we can investigate the matter fully and call to account during this session the people responsible, and not wait, as they did last year, until the last day of the session before producing the evidence.

Mr. D. D. MCKENZIE: I do not think that the Government should get off lightly on this transaction. I have facing me on the front benches of the Government four distinguished members of the Bar, and this is a legal question. I am surprised that when proceedings in the Exchequer Court and in the Supreme Court of Canada are under fire my good friend the Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) is put forth as the chief bluffer. I do not always agree with the judgment of the leader of the Government, but on this occasion, in putting forth the Minister of Railways in a case of this character his judgment was of the very first order. The Minister of Railways started out bold and aggressive as usual, which is the first essential of a bluffer, but it fell through, Mr. Speaker, it was not half as effective as I thought it was going to be. We are now down to the rock bottom of this business, and the Government must give an account to this House and to the country as to how it is that some $250,000 of public money was almost paid, the judgment of one court delivered and almost the judgment of another, until the court itself stopped making it obligatory on the people to pay out this sum of money.

What should the Government have done about this case? I was never a minister, and possibly I never shall be, but I know what the procedure is in matters of this kind. When the Government wants land it is supposed to send a competent Government surveyor to inspect the site, make a plan of the land required and report on its value. In this case we find that after the matter has gone through the courts and we have almost paid $250,000, it is dis-

covered that it is only a quarter of the land that they want. Is that good business, is that the kind of procedure that this Government will countenance? They never even procured an estimate of the value of the land. Having obtained a report and valuation the department should have tendered the money to the owner of the land. Was that done in this case? The Minister of Railways said to-night that he went on the ground as a casual observer, that he was merely acting on behalf of some other minister, that he considered it was ridiculous to pay the sum of money that had been suggested. The department should have obtained a valuation of the land, tendered the owner the amount of the valuation, and if he refused to take the amount he could go to the Exchequer Court at his own risk, for if the Exchequer Court found the property was not worth any more than the amount tendered, he would have to pay the cost of the proceedings. That is the way this business should have been carried through.

I submit, that there was the greatest possible bungling and negligence in this transaction, from start to finish that ever came before this House, and that this attempt to bluff it off is something not worthy of consideration. I think it is hardly fair to the lawyer who acted in the case, who was not instructed fully as to the facts, and who was evidently made a scapegoat to allow this business to go through to answer some sinister motive that evidently some speculator in touch with partisan authority had in mind in the whole transaction. There is not a word of evidence here from the Government that the lawyer concerned ever had the proper data put in his hands, and I submit that it is hardly fair to him to hold him responsible for the whole business, when the Government itself and those responsible were derelict.

It seems to me, Sir, that we are very much indebted to the honourable member who has brought this matter to the notice of the House, and I do hope that even at this late day the Government knows how much of this land it wants, and that it will have a proper appraisement made of its worth, and will tender the money to the owner and let him take the responsibility of disputing the value in the Exchequer Court. The whole transaction is something that the responsible department should apologize for.

Sir THOMAS WHITE (Acting Prime Minister): Mr. Speaker, I am sorry that the Acting Minister of Justice is not in his seat to-night. He was not aware that this Order would be called this evening and he went home some little time ago. I asked the Minister of Railways,—who, as he stated, was at times Acting Minister of Public Works,—to make inquiry of the Deputy Minister of that department with a view to having some information laid before the House to answer the question of my honourable friend.

Personally I know nothing of the transaction. So far as the Government is concerned we are willing that the correspondence called for shall be brought down. Until the documents are brought down it is rather futile to discuss the matter in the House, because we should have assertion on one hand and counter-assertion on the other, and we should make no progress toward elucidation of the facts. From the discussion to-night, however, two or three matters seem to me to stand out.

It is stated by the mover of the resolution (Mr. Lemieux), and by the hon. member (Mr. Vien) who has spoken in support of it, that the counsel engaged by the Department of Justice to represent the Crown in the expropriation proceedings before the Exchequer Court is a man of eminent legal ability. That in itself would appear to be conclusive proof that the Government was not, as stated by the leader of the Opposition (Mr. McKenzie) negligent with respect to the proceeding. In a proceeding of importance involving the expropriation of property of considerable value the most important matter is the selection of counsel, and by the admission of those who are making these charges—for they are charges in effect—against the Government here to-night, the counsel selected was a man of high standing at the bar. Before the court of first instance, the trial court, the presentation of matters of fact is of supreme importance because it is upon the evidence adduced there that the court reaches its conclusion, after hearing the witnesses and observing their demeanour, as to the value of the property expropriated. The principal thing in litigation affecting property by expropriation is the decision of the first court, because a court of appeal will not lightly set aside the decision of the court which has heard the evidence, seen the witnesses and reached a conclusion on the facts adduced before it. Nothing is put forward here to suggest that the counsel selected was not a man of standing before the courts of Quebec; on the contrary, he has been vouched for by the two hon. gentlemen opposite who have spoken.

The Minister of Railways (Mr. J. D. Reid) has said that he saw the property in question before or about the time that the expropriation proceedings were had. He was of the view that it was not worth more than $18,000. He could not well know what the court would determine it was worth; therefore his view of the transaction at that time would be in accordance with his judgment as to what the value of the property was. The St. Charles works were projected in 1912 upon a larger scale than that upon which they have been or will be carried on. One can conceive of a piece of property, not regarded as of great value, being expropriated in connection with a larger project and the conclusion being reached, upon that project being reduced, that a part of the property might be abandoned, as the Minister of Railways said to-night. It has been suggested by the member for Lotbiniere (Mr. Vien) that the Minister of Justice misled the House. I am sure he would not say that the Minister of Justice intentionally misled the House. The Minister of Justice made a statement which I am certain he made in all good faith, and if it is in fact an error—I do not pronounce upon that, as I do not know the facts—I am sure that it was made by inadvertence. He was speaking of an appeal from the Exchequer Court judgment to the Supreme Court. Now it has been stated that a new trial has been granted at the instance of the Department of Justice. That new trial was sought, no doubt, on the ground of the judgment that was rendered by the Exchequer Court and which was on appeal before the Supreme Court. If a new trial has been granted, as stated, and if three quarters of the property has been abandoned, it seems to me, looking at the entire transaction in the light of what I have said, that there is nothing to call for any particular censure of the Government. Eminent counsel selected; judgment given; appeal had to the Supreme Court; new trial asked and granted; the project as originally conceived reduced; three-quarters of the property taken abandoned, one-quarter only retained; issue now as to the value of that one-quarter. That seems to be the position of the transaction at present. As I stated at the outset, the Government will be very glad to bring down the papers, and until they are brought down I do not think the House can reach any just conclusion with regard to the transaction or as to allegations made by hon. gentlemen opposite with regard to it.

[Sir Thomas White.]

Mr. LEMIEUX: If the facts were as argued by the Acting Prime Minister (Sir Thomas White), the case would not be very good, though it would still have a leg to stand upon. But I am afraid that the case is not exactly as he would like it to be. As it stands, the case is as follows: The Government of Canada decides to build a dam on the river St. Charles, and has to expropriate some land in order to do so. I am credibly informed that the two lots in question are below the dam, not above the dam; therefore they are not at all affected by the dam. That is the first information I get. Moreover, many speculators are involved in this case; there is an Ethiopian in the pile. I am informed that this man Belanger is only a prête-nom —a name borrowed by others. First of all, there is a petition of right, and action is taken before the Exchequer Court, and expropriation proceedings are had. Does it not strike you that there is something radically wrong with this business? For a property for which the owner is supposed to have paid $18,000, the judge, according to his own words, reluctantly grants $237,000. No expert appraisers are called; the judge is helpless; he looks around; who is going to enlighten him? The Department of Justice should have seen to that. Think of the enormity of the case! Here is a man claiming $800,000 for a property that cost him $18,000, and which had not produced enough revenue to pay the taxes during a period of twenty years. There is something strikingly strange about that. The judge after having heard the witnesses, with the acquiescence of the counsel representing the Government, renders judgment. An appeal is taken by the Department of Justice. The interests of the Crown are again confided to this same counsel. Now I hope that when the papers are filed, the letter of protest written by Mr. Bernier, K.C., will be filed with them because he declares most emphatically that he received his instructions from the Department of Justice to appeal only from the smaller amount, the 10 per cent, and not from the larger amount, $225,000. At all events no case is filed in the Supreme Court in which His Majesty the King is involved without the Minister or Deputy Minister of Justice surveying the whole case. How does it happen that this factum was filed with this declaration on behalf of the Crown?

By the judgment of the Exchequer Court rendered on the 28th day of June, 1917, the Court held that the respondent had proven his title and was entitled to recover the value of the land expropriated from him by the appellant.

From this part of the judgment of the Exchequer Court the appellant does not appeal.

The appellant is His Majesty the King, represented by the Minister of Justice or by the Deputy Minister of Justice. I had the honour of being Solicitor General of Canada for two years and I know, and everybody knows, that no document issues from the Department of Justice for any of the courts, whether it be the Exchequer Court, the Supreme Court, or any other, without first being surveyed and passed on by the Minister of Justice or at least by the very able Deputy Minister of Justice, Mr. Newcombe.

My hon. friend says that the honour of the counsel is not questioned. It is not. It has never been questioned by me or by anybody else; but I say to the Government that there is something very mysterious in the whole proceeding; there is something very mysterious which must be clarified by the Government. The Minister of Railways and Canals says that a new trial has been ordered. How does he know?

Mr. J. D. REID: I inquired over the telephone from the Deputy Minister of Public Works—the Minister of Public Works was away—and the information I have given to the House is what I got from him over the telephone just a few moments ago.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I am sorry, but I think my hon. friend has been misinformed, not intentionally so, by the Deputy Minister of Public Works. My hon. friend should have inquired from the Deputy Minister of Justice, because the case is conducted by the Department of Justice, and not by the Department of Public Works. I am informed by some one who was present at the Supreme Court a few weeks ago when this same case was argued—argued, if I mistake not, by Mr. Chrysler, K.C., the very eminent counsel from Ottawa—that Mr. Chrysler took no different stand from that taken by Mr. Bernier; he argued from the same evidence, from the same factum, and there was no change in the procedure. The case is now en délibéré by the Supreme Court and I am very much surprised at the information the minister has just given.

Mr. J. D. REID: The Deputy Minister of Public Works tells me the Supreme Court has granted a new trial.

Mr. LEMIEUX: I have followed the proceedings of the Supreme Court for the last few days and have read some of the judgments, but I am not aware that the Supreme Court has granted judgment in this case. But if it has, well and good. If a new trial has been granted, well and good. A new trial will be highly gratifying to me, and I am pleased to learn that the Government has at last awakened to the enormity of this claim. I am glad the Government has reduced by 75 per cent the acreage required for the damming of the river St. Charles, and I can assure my hon. friend that when this case comes up, if a new trial has been granted, the Government's counsel may obtain from the provincial revenue officers in Quebec the clearest possible evidence that this property is worth just a few hundred dollars. My hon. friend seemed a little excited when he spoke a few moments ago, but he should not have been excited. He should have thanked me for bringing this matter before the House. I brought it up last year on two occasions without any result. I could get no information then; but to-night I learn that a new trial has been asked for by the Department of Public Works and has been granted by the Court, and that the department will not require more than 25 per cent of the two lots. Well, I think that is a success, and under the circumstances my motion should pass unanimously and with cheers.

Motion agreed to.

On motion of Sir Thomas White the House adjourned at 11.40 p.m..

INDEX

SECOND SESSION — THIRTEENTH PARLIAMENT, 1919

Abbreviations.—1r., 2r., 3r. = first, second, or third reading. Amdt. = Amendment. Com. = Committee. Con. = Consideration. Div. = Division. M. = Motion. Ques. = Question. Ref. = Reference. Rep. = Report. Res. = Resolution. Sec. = Section.

Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 13, 41, 73, 116, 141, 185, 230, 272, 318, 358, 399, 424, 463, 514, 551
No quorum, order lapses, 397; reinstated, 398

Adjournment. *See* House of Commons

Admiralty Court, Montreal, ques. 1440

Advertising. *See* Government advertising

Aeronautics, 1264, ques. 1340. *See also* Air Board
Air Service, 4689
Canada's hinterland, development by, 302
European-Asiatic route via Canada, 305
Mail service, by, 2036
Naval air bases, ques. 1532
Permanent Force in Canada, 2867
Transatlantic flight by Hawker, 2564

Age of Consent. *See* Criminal Code

Agricultural Education. *See* Technical Education

Agricultural Implements, 4008
Duties on, 3690
Freight rates on, 3926

Agriculture
Bulls, Ayrshire and Holstein, ques. 601
Department of
Orders in Council respecting, tabled, 270
Report of, tabled, 111
Staff and salaries, 2959
Experimental farms, prices, markets, pests, cold storage, etc., 2959-2976
Live stock
Bulls, Ayrshire and Holstein, ques. 601

Agriculture and Colonization, Committee, 113, 2652, 4376

Air Board Bill. 1r., 1865; 2r., com., 2050; 3r., 2143
Provincial jurisdiction, 2052, 2060

Alcohol. *See* Proprietary; Prohibition

Aliens, 222, 375, 497. *See also* Asiatics; Immigration Act Amdt.; Naturalization
Enemies
Deportation of, 1946

Aliens—*Con.*
Interned, 1712, 1947; ques. 1611
Naturalization of. *See* British nationality
Discrimination—charged, 376
Non-alien territory, in, 1947
Policy respecting, 753
Prohibition of certain classes, Motion, Mr. Stevens, 769
Property and trade amongst, ques. 844
Property of, custodian, ques. 1535
West in, conduct of, 2320

Allan, Mr. G. W. (South Winnipeg)
Board of Commerce, 4511
Industrial unrest, Winnipeg strike, returned soldiers, etc., 3061
Militia, Permanent Force, 3979
Titles, 1474

Alpine Club, 4046

Ames, Sir Herbert B. (St. Antoine)
Baker, the late Lieut.-Col. Geo. Harold, M.P., 4456
Board of Commerce, 4527-8
Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill, 3738
Divorce, 3778
Housing scheme, 2536, 2542, 2546
Immigration Act Amdt., 1950
Income Tax, ques. 2049, 3722, 3729-35
Peace Treaty, copy of terms, 4239
Pensions, 4182-9, 4196-7, 4277, 4298
"Unmarried wife," 4277
Purchasing Department, Commissioners' Salaries, 3815
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2768-9
Soldiers' Land Settlement — improving farms, 3882
Unsalaried war workers, 3815
Victory Bonds, ques. 2047

Amherst
Amherst Mineral Water Company, ques. 3997
Carriage Factory building, ques. 3997
Dr. Goodwin and Dr. Bliss, ques. 3377, ques. 4070
Internment Camp, 3848, ques. 4070
Morris, Col., ques. 2565

Amos Station, 2460

Anderson, Mr. R. K. (Halton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 495. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —Canada at the Peace Conference, 495; Union Government—conscription, 496; disfranchisement of defaulters—aliens—franchise—pensions, 497; returned soldiers and tuberculosis—patronage in Civil Service, 498; Civil Service Commission—public health—Canada's soldiers, 499; national unity, 500
Pensions, ques. 1076
Proprietary Medicines, 2481
Public Health, 1198

Andrews, Mr. George W. (Centre Winnipeg)
Daylight Saving, 896
Hutterites, 1920
Immigration, exclusion of certain classes, 1920
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1328
Postal workers—Civil Service Re-classification, 2342
Prohibition, 2356
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3872
Sympathetic strikes—collective bargaining —Winnipeg strike, etc., 2851, 3019
Yukon placer mining, 632

Anti-loafing, ques. 883

Appropriation Acts
1. Bill No. 32 (for 1919-20, for $52,310,-026.12). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 842
2. Bill No. 113 (for 1818-19, for $18,827,-098.72). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 2462; 3r., 2463
3. Bill No. 123 (for 1919-20, for $148,211,-640.39). Res., 2952; 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 2953
4. Bill No. 181 (for 1919-20, for $162,527,-610.91). Res., 1r., 2r., com., 3r., 4689

Archambault, Dr. J. U., ques. 1306

Archambault, Mr. Joseph (Chambly and Verchères)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 435. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French language and seconding of the Address, 436; peace and victory—Kinmel Camp riots—prohibition, 437; high cost of living, 438; prices, profits, food control—titles, 439; industrial unrest—Hon. Mr. Calder and Liberalism, 440; Government measures and Liberalism, 441; Mr. Richardson, M.P., in Europe—Quebec and enlistment—Soldiers' votes, 443; National unity, 445

Archambault, Mr. Joseph—*Con.*
Bankruptcy Bill, 1987
Non-traders, 2476
Provinces and, 1998
Trustees, 2006
Board of Commerce, 4530, 4560-4
Printing of Bill in French, 4530
Budget, The, date of, 2752
Canadian Expeditionary Force, enlistments in, ques. 2904
Canadian National Railway, 1857
Canadian soldiers, prisoners of war, ques. 1077
Censorship of soldiers' letters, 1663
Chambly Canal and Highway, ques. 2045
Clemens, Judge, investigation relating to, ques. 3066
Cold storage companies, taxation of, ques. 2904
Complaints of Canadian soldiers, alleged suppression of, 1618
Dafoe, Mr. John W., ques. 974, ques. 1789
Enlisted and conscripted men, lists, motion for, 1908
Fishermen, tax on, ques. 2144
Food Controller McFall, report of, ques. 4464
Franking of pamphlets, ques. 1791
Georgian Bay Canal, 2855
Gibson, Major, ques. 884, ques. 1440
Immigration, 2598-9
Industrial unrest, 1858
Hull industrial disputes, ques. 2905
Industrial Relations Commission, 1260
Labour Disputes Board, ques. 1535
Labour unions of the West, 1343
Winnipeg strike, nationality of leaders, 2598
Labour, Minister of, ques. 884
Letter carriers' bonuses, ques. 848
McLennan, Judge F. S., ques. 1075, ques. 1106, ques. 1906, ques. 2905
Montreal Admiralty Court, ques. 1440
National Service Registration, ques. 2145
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4003-5
Pensions, 4031
Pension Commissioners, ques. 1790
Postmaster General, representation of in House of Commons, ques. 974
Public Health, "Social Welfare," 1188
Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904
Siberian Expedition, 4001
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, ques. 974
Soldiers, in Hull, Pontiac and Wright, ques. 602, ques. 603
Toronto meeting — "Fellow Bolsheviki," 1997
Victory Loan, Montreal brokers, ques. 1612
War Service gratuities, ques. 4241
Washington, representation at, 2077-8

Argue, Mr. Ira E. (Swift Current)
Agricultural fairs, 2996-7
Arid Belt, so called, irrigation station, 2974
Budget, 3577; Liberal Unionists, 3577; Treatment of immigrants — wheat prices, 3578; Tariff Commission, 3579
Highways and railways, 742
Judges in Saskatchewan, 2311
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2765-6

Argue, Lieut.-Col. J. F., ques. 3068

Argyll House. *See* War, Military Management

Arisaig Wharf, 2780

Armstrong, Mr. Joseph E. (East Lambton)
Athabasca and Grande Prairie Railway Company, 2778-9
Canadian Pacific Railway, 3215
Inter-Imperial trade—ocean transport rates —Board of Investigation, 3240, 3327
Pelee Island, 4041
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2625
Railway Committee, 1864, 1886
Steamship Services, 3829-30
Railway Act Amendment Bill (Coastwise and Inland water traffic), 71
United States, management of ships in, 2210
Upper Lakes, Government ships on, 2255
Water-borne traffic and rates, control of, 2068, 2929-40
Water-powers, Dominion control, 2530

Armistice. *See* Peace; League of Nations

Army, Canadian permanent. *See* Militia Act Amendment

Arthurs, Mr. James (Parry Sound)
Budget, 3672. Labour unrest—returned soldiers, 3673; tariff and cost of living, 3674; Tariff Board, 3675
Divorce Court Bill, 3784, 3786
French River waterway, 1087
Mail contractors, 2089
Naturalization, powers of Secretary of State, 4112
Pensions, 4173
Purchasing Commission, 3813
Sailors' wages, 2600
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3865, 3870

Arthurs, Colonel James, M.P.
Service pay and expenses, ques. 2653

Asiatics in Canada, 433, 1048, 1976
Naturalization and voting, 3822

Asphalt, oil for manufacture of, 4003

Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 605

Auditor General, death of, 115

Auditor General's report, 138, 312, 514, 744

Australia, markets and shipbuilding, 2207, 2222

Automobiles, Government-owned in Ottawa, ques. 880

Baker, the late Col. Geo. Harold, 549, 2224, 4456
Pension to unmarried sisters, 3004

Baldwin, Mr. Willis K. (Stanstead)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 332; Demobilization—development of natural resources, 332; housing —capital and labour, 333; franchise—Siberian expedition — inland revenue stamp taxes, 334; farmers and production—Department of Trade and Commerce, 335; infant mortality, 336
Budget, 3276. Reciprocity—titles, 3276; public debt—commissions, 3277; shipbuilding—produce and save, 3278; Franchise Act—good roads, 3279; Quebec, 3280
Emigration to United States, ques. 2046
Good roads, 4390
Weights and measures, 2156-8

Ball, Mr. Robt. J. (Southeast Grey)
Fire prevention, 1579
Telephone companies, 2650

Ballantyne, Hon. Charles C. (Minister of Marine and Fisheries and Minister of the Naval Service)
Biological Board, 2568
Budget, 3270. Liberal Party and Free Trade, 3270; Manufacturers and the tariff, 3271; War Profits Tax, 3272; United States competition — foreign trade, 3273; shipping and shipbuilding, 3275; moderate protection, 3275
Buoys, etc., 2608
Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bill, 2802-8, 3755, 3928-38
Cold storage, Montreal warehouse, 1619
Crerar, Hon. T. A., resignation of, 3270
Dominion steamers, 2600
Fisheries Act. Amdt. Bill (British Columbia), 2097, 3758-61
Fisheries patrol service, oyster culture, lobsters, hatcheries, etc., 2887-2903
Halifax Harbour Master, 2693-5, 2800-02
Industrial unrest—Speech at Verdun, 3241
Life-saving stations, 2850
Lighthouses and keepers, 2608-9, 2613
Livestock shipments, inspection, 2602
Marine and Fisheries Department, salaries, etc., 2600
Marine hospitals, 2613

Ballantyne, Hon. Charles C.—*Con.*
Masters and mates, 2600
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners (rate of interest), 3757
Meteorological service, 2613
Naval Service
Halifax, discharge of men at, 1959, 1996, 2226
Ministerial statement, answer to charges, 2811, 2839-47
Northern waters patrol, 2849
Pilotage, 2610, 2612, 3157-62
Radio-telegraph service, 2848
Royal Naval College, 2850
Schools of navigation, 2601
Shipping, registration of, 2602
St. John Harbour Commission, 4299, 4306, 4337-9
St. Lawrence Ship Channel, 2608
Shipbuilding, programme, vote, ministerial statement, 2202-16, 2251-3, 2261-3, 4682-6
Steamboat inspection, 2614
Steamers
"Brant," 2607
"Champlain," 2606-7
"Montcalm," 2607
Vancouver Harbour Bill, 3742-54, 4017-21
Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070
Verdun, speech at, 3241
Wharves, generally, 2611
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 2603-4
Wrecks, investigations into, 2601

Bankruptcy Bill. 1r., 229; 2r., 931; com., 1981, 1998, 2263, 2467; 3r., 2510; Senate amdts. concurred in, 4132

Banks. *See also* Finance
Excess circulation, 1103
Mergers, 1088

Bateman, Lieut. R., ques. 3067

Bate, McMahon & Co., 1277

Betiscan protective works, ques. 645

Bear River, N.S. Harbour and shipping master, 3242

Beaverbrook, Lord, 2872

Béland, Hon. Henri Severin (Beauce)
Air Board Bill, 2061
Aliens, interned, 1712
Belgium, reconstruction, 3294
Budget, 3293
Child welfare, 1200
Civil Service examination, 4496
France, steamship line to, 1291
Franchise, 3298
Jellicoe, Admiral Sir John, ques. 751
Laurier, the late Sir Wilfrid, 3293
Military Service Act, 1163

Béland, Hon. Henri Severin—*Con.*
Navy, the British, 3301
National unity, 3302
Pensions, 2692, 3001
Prohibition, 2348, 2358
Proprietary medicines, 2484, 2487, 2653
Public health, 1202, 1375
Soothing syrups, amdt., 2488, 2491-3
Three Rivers harbour master, 2694
Trade Commissioners, 4493-4
War Measures Act, 1163
Welcome to on release from German prison, 3
Acknowledgments, 3293

Belanger vs. **The King,** 1021, 1279

Belgium, restoration of, 3294
Cablegram from Belgian Senate, 1955

Bell, Col. F. McKelvey, resignation of, 3240, 3422, 3472, 3926, 4674

Bench, freedom of, 350. *See also* Judges Act Amdt

Bernier, Mr. K.C., 1021, 1027

Berubé, Esdras, case of, 2250

Best, Mr. John (Dufferin)
Agriculture—seed, 2971
Civil Service
Efficiency, 1558
Re-classification, 1960
Salaries of $2,500 and over, 1439, 4481
Daylight saving, 889
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 852
Good roads, 4425, 4428
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1245
Purchasing Commission, 3812

Biological Board Act Amendment Bill. 1r., 2396; 2r., com., 2568; 3r., 2617

Blair, Mr. H. C., superannuation, ques. 2398

Blake, Mr. Matthew R. (North Winnipeg)
Budka, Bishop, ques. 646
Eight-hour day and Peace Treaty, 1996
Industrial unrest, labour unions, Bolshevism, strikes, etc., 3004
Partisanship in appointments, 2095
Postmen's 1918 strikes, 2037
Prohibition, 2358, 2665
Soldiers' land settlement; inclusion of Royal Air Force, 1437, 3873

Bliss, Dr. P., payments to, ques. 3377

Blondin, Lieut.-Col. P. E., ques. 1790, 2042, 2084

Board of Commerce Bill. 1r., 4198; 2r., 4497; com., 4527, 4549; 3r., 4567
Protest of Montreal Board of Trade, 4466, 4553
See also Combines

Board of Railway Commissioners. *See* Railway Commission

Boisdale Wharf, 2780

Bolshevism, 35, 42, 105, 111, 127, 141, 143, 145, 160, 247, 354, 368, 371, 435, 479, 1062-8, 2284, 2285, 4691
Calgary labour meeting, 1343
"Fellow Bolsheviki," 1997
Siberian Expedition and, 319
Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880
See also Criminal Code; Immigration; Industrial unrest

Boivin, Mr. George Henry (Shefford). *See* Deputy Speaker

Bonnell, Mr. Saul (East Kootenay)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 445

Boots and Shoes from United States, ques. 978

Boots, purchase of, 3202

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert (Prime Minister)
Bell, Lt.-Col. McKelvey, 3240, 3473
Birthday congratulations, 4133
Board of Commerce, 4466, 4474, 4554
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Acts Consolidation Bill, 3585
Bruce Report, 4001
Canada Shipping amdt., 3936-7
Canadian Pacific Railway Bill, 3214
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4696
Civil Service. *See under this head* Industrial unrest
Collective bargaining. *See under this head* Industrial unrest
Crerar, Hon. T. A., resignation of, 3193
Divorce Court Bill, 3777, 3789, 3791
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 4621-5, 4644-9
Franchise Bill, 2906
Georgian Bay Canal, 2855
Good Roads, 4426-30
Suggested amdt., 4430-2
Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3211
Horse racing, 4466
House of Commons, Saturday and morning sittings, 3420
Business of the House—legislation pending, 3999
Postponement of legislation, 4690
Inter-Imperial trade, Board of Investigation, ocean transport and rates, 3240, 3327
Industrial Relations Commission, 4621
Industrial unrest, 3056

Borden, Right Hon. Sir Robert—*Con.*
Collective bargaining, 2908
Conference, 2908, 3195
Peace Conference labour principles, 2852
Postal employees, Calgary, 3194
Post office appointments after, 4347-8
Strikes, 3056
Ottawa Street Railway, 4535
Toronto, 2851, 2953
Winnipeg, 2953, 3069-70, 3472, 3587, 3927
Trial of arrested parties, 3740
Intoxicating Liquors Bill—Senate Amdt., 4071-2, 4133
Free conference, 4497
Intoxicating liquors, interprovincial trade in, opinion of Minister and Deputy Minister of Justice, 4133
Letter postage rate, 4621
Members, absence of from Chamber, 3195
Peace celebration, 4238
Peace Conference, presence at. *See* Peace Conference
Peace Treaty, copy of terms, 4239
Ratification of, 3937
Signing of, 3473
Labour provisions, 4239, 4692
Poland and Ukranians, etc., 3472, 4534, 4620, 4690
Privilege, Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
Proportional representation, 3069, 4620
Purchasing Commission, 3209, 3215, 4453-5
Railway Act Consolidation
Control of rates, 4144
Rates, three-year limit, amdt., 4147, 4152; res. moved, 4169; agreed to, 4170
Senate amdts., 3473-4
Telephones, 4167
Red Cross Society, 3162-4
Return from Europe, reception by the House, 2800
Senators, responsibility for opinions of, 4152
Shipping for St. Lawrence coal trade, 4335
Soldiers' votes, statement of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, 4135
Wheat, prices, 4466
Canada's contract with Greece, 2907
Ypres, war memorial, 4465

Boughton Island, P.E.I., 2784

Bourdreault, Benjamin, Judge of Exemption, ques. 1439

Bourassa, Mr. Joseph B. (Lévis)
Lévis aqueduct, ques. 1789
Separation allowance, ques. 1908
Transcontinental Railway, accidents, ques. 1211

Bowman, Mr. James (North Huron)
Daylight saving, 927
Bow River, election petition, 4
Boy Scouts and Girl Guides, 4486
Boyce, Mr. George (Carleton)
Connaught rifle range, 1896-7
Daylight saving, 904
Farming, conditions and prospects, 2964
Good roads, 4390
Highways and railways, 743
Income tax, farmers and, 3734
Land grants to religious denominations, ques. 2462
Livestock Amdt. Bill, 2066-7
Mail contractors, 2085
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1249
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4384
Boyer, Gustave (Vaudreuil-Soulanges)
Coteau Landing roadway, ques. 2045
Highways Aid Bill, 732
Isle Perrot bridges, 733
Maple syrup and sugar, ques. 645
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, soldiers' hospital, ques. 1212
St. Zotique—River Beaudette roadway, ques. 2144
Vaudreuil-Soulanges rural mail, ques. 2566
Boys, Mr. William A. (South Simcoe)
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1246
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2622-8
Senate amdts., 4157
Transmission lines on highway, consent of municipalities, 3126
Bradbury, Lieut.-Col. G. H., ques. 1107
Bran and shorts, 4007
Brien, Mr. John Wesley (South Essex)
Pelee Island, 4033
Briquetting coal. *See* Coal
Bristol, Mr. Edmund (Centre Toronto)
Railway Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highway, consent of municipalities, 3098, 3102, 3112, 3124
Shipbuilding, transportation, trade, 2230
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2949
British Columbia Courts. *See* Interpretation Act
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Act Consolidation Bill. 1r., 3585; 2r., 3816; com., 3820, 4110, 4257, 4339; 3r., 4344
Secretary of State, powers of, 4110
Married women, 4127
Naturalization, Canadian autonomy, 4119
British Navy, 3301
British North America Act, method of amdt., 415
Broderick, Mr. Michael E., ques. 729
Brouillard, Mr. Joseph O. (Drummond and Athabaska)
High Commissionership, ques. 3242
Purchasing Commission, ques. 3470
Social Hygiene Conference, ques. 3068
Bruce Report, the, 1483, 2885, 4001, 4071
Buchanan, Mr. William A. (Lethbridge)
Budget, 3455. Tariff, 3455; cost of living, 3456; production and wealth, 3457; Western farmers, 3458
Canadian National Railway, 1855
Government contracts, personal position, 2033, 2036
Immigration Act Amdt., 1912
Industrial unrest, eight-hour day, profiteering, etc., 3021
Irrigation, 4601
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1913
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2033
Taber irrigation district, 4211
Budget, The, 3145. *See also* Ways and Means Amdt., Mr. McMaster, 3260; neg. on div., 3678; debate, 3242, 3293, 3378, 3422, 3474, 3587
Inquiry as to date of, 1343, 1712, 2752
Budka, Bishop, ques. 646, 1917-38. *See* Poles, Ukrainians, Ruthenians
Buoys, Atlantic coast, 1866, 1910
Bureau, Mr. Jacques (Three Rivers and St. Maurice)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1984
Board of Commerce, 4472, 4497, 4549, 4599-4600
Board of Internal Economy, ques. 605
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3817-23, 4110-33, 4257, 4272
Revocation of certificate, 4119
Secretary of State, powers of, 4111, 4124, 4266
Canada Evidence Act, amdt., 1389-92
Canadian National Railway Company, 1395, 1403, 1414, 1420-21
Capital stock, 1777
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1717-26, 1751, 1765, 1787
Directors
Appointment, 1625, 1631, 1636
No personal responsibility, 1783
Payment of, 1653
Electric and power companies, 4573
Executive committee, 1667-74
Expropriation, 1695
First meeting, 1664-6
Fiscal year, 1705
Head office, 1651-3
Parliamentary control, 1691

Bureau, Mr. Jacques—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway Co.—*Con.*
Public ownership, 1748
Securities
Advances and, 1777-8
Issue of, 1780
Other companies, of, 1781
Steamships, 1682, 1689
Town sites, 1769
Work for the general advantage of Canada, 1706
Civil Service re-classification, 3927
Conference with Senate, no suspension of sitting of House, 3948-9
Criminal Code, aliens and British subjects, 4358-61
Dominion lands, pulp, etc., 4251-4
Dominion water-powers, 2512-32
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572-81
Amdt., 4580; neg., 4588
Good roads, 3909, 3911-2, 4395, 4423, 4426-7
Housing scheme, 2557-61
Income War Tax Amdt.
Members of Parliament, sessional expenses, 3991-2
Iron, galvanized, 3689
Judges' salaries, 4218, 4235, 4368, 4435-7
Jacobs, Mr., personal explanation, 4234
National harbours, advantages of Three Rivers, 3754
Negroes, rioting in England by, 3741
Newsprint control, 4540-1
Orders in Council, government by, 2557
Peace, celebration, 4238
Pensions, 4193-5, 4197
"Unmarried wife," 4208-10
Purchasing Commission, 3195, 3810-15, 4439-45, 4453-4
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2619-39
Telephone companies, 2647
Steamship services, 1289
Technical Education Bill, 3791-3808
Decennial payment to provinces, 3892
Toronto Suburban Railway Company, ques. 1611
Tuberculosis, Indians, 4062
Welland Canal contracts, 1594-6

Bureau of Statistics, 3838

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden (West Peterborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 108. Liberal party—reconstruction, 108; wages and cost of living, 110; Bolshevism, 111
Budget, 3599. Minister of Finance—Dominions' interchange of Governors General—Protection or free trade, 3599, 3601; Union Government, 3600; land held vacant for speculation, 3601
Canadian National Railway, 1801

Burnham, Mr. John Hampden—*Con.*
"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic," 1385
Civil Service, Outside, delay in appointments, ques. 3680
Combines and trusts in Great Britain, 3741
Cost of production, cost of consumption, 2854
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2466
Foreign credits and home supplies, 3836
Harbours, national, control of, 3746-8
High cost of living and minimum wage, 2908
Income tax, allowance for children, 3724
Industrial unrest, cost of living, wages, etc., 3015
Judges' salaries, 2958
National economic interests, 2253
Public ownership, 1801
Purchasing Commission, 3203
Titles, 1457, 2712, 2715, 2731
Transmission lines on highways, municipal powers, 3088-9, 3110
Trent Canal
Rates of wages, ques. 3586
Remuneration to returned soldiers, ques. 3470
War trophies, 2043

Burrell, Hon. Martin (Secretary of State and Minister of Mines)
Bolshevism, 2285
Briquetting lignite, 3472, 4488
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3819
Daylight saving, 914
Geological Survey and mines development, 4491-2
Government advertising, 2023
Government Printing Bureau
Civil Service Commission and, 1812
Strike, 230, 312, 399, 513
Immigration Act Amdt.—advocates of violence, 2285
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1320
Mines Branch, 4489-91
Naturalization, 4264-5
Non-ferrous metals, 3682
Peat experiments, 4489
Public Printing and Stationery Dept. reorganization, 4687
Purchasing Commission, 3220-2
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 833
Technical education, 3801
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 986

Business Profits Tax. *See also* Budget; Revenue Bills
Proceeds, ques. 1791

Butter, price of, 1618

Butts, Mr. Robert H. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3821
Budget, 3643. Resignations from Government—Opposition leadership, 3643; all protectionists, 3644; shipping, coal and steel, 3644
Civil Service, sessional employees, 1558
Expropriation, Dominion water-powers, 2518
Housing scheme, 2548
Militia, Permanent Force, 3981
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1250
Naturalization, 4271
Nova Scotia Highways Board, 4435
Patronage, 1272
Pensions, 4280
War expenditure ($350,000,000), shipping and trade, 2234

Cables, 1052, 2794
State control of, 1827

Cadet Corps. *See* Militia

Cahill, Mr. Frank S. (Pontiac)
Air Board Bill, 2051-3
Bank mergers, 1095
Banks, excess circulation, 635
Canadian Government Railways, 2458, 2460
Canadian National Railway Company Bill, 1405, 1414, 1421
Annual meeting, 1799
Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
Capital stock, 1777
Directors, 1627, 1639, 1799
Extension of time for construction of lines, 1717, 1770-6
First meeting, 1659, 1664-5
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
Parliamentary control, 2119
Political influence, 1633
Profit sharing with employees, 1622
Publicity, 1644
Public ownership, 1770, 2219
Civil Service, 2913
Cold storage, 2984-5
Combines, 4568
Cost of living, 4332
Dominion water-powers, 2513, 2516
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4587
Experimental farms, 2976-8
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1574, 1585
Fisheries Act Amdt. (Salmon), 3759
Fisheries Department, salaries, etc., 2889, 2893
Foreign trade, credits to other countries, 2167, 2834-6
Gold, prohibition of export of, 1102-3

Cahill, Mr. Frank S.—*Con.*
Good roads, 3907, 3912, 4411, 4429
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 399, 666, 1127, 1130-1, 1157
Hanna, Alta., removal of engine crew to, 671, 1407
Housing scheme, 2538-40, 2561, 2564
Immigration and Colonization Department, work of, 2570, 2593-4
Advertising, 2597-9
Exodus of settlers, 2579
Free land as attraction for settlers, 2572-4
Hutterites and Mennonites, 2570
Land speculation and, 2574
North Ontario as field for, 2574
Income tax
Farmers and, 3735
Publicity, 3718
Timber limits, 3721
Industrial unrest, 2908, 2953
Winnipeg strike, 2508, 2753
Lobster packing, 2989
Ottawa-Pembroke postal service, 2034
Packing companies, taxation, 4478
Parliament Building, 2336, 2340-1
Pensions, 4292
Railways, nationalization of, politics and, etc., 667-671
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2799-2800
Seed grain, 628, 1030
Shipbuilding, 4684
Steamship subsidies, 1293
Surveys, 4049-55
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 831
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3099-3104, 3115
Welland Canal contract, 1594-7

Calder, Hon. J. A. (Minister of Immigration and Colonization)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 62. Victory—after-war problems, 63; demobilization, 64; employment—soldier settlement, 65; reconstruction and repatriation, 67; progressive legislation—returned soldiers, 68; United Canada party, 69; tariff, 70
Aliens. *See, under this head,* Immigration
Budget, the, 3337. Union Government—tariff, 3338; elections, 3339; tariff revision, 3340; gravity of pending questions, 3341
Canadian National Railway
Branch lines in Saskatchewan, 1766-7
Connor, Mr., Immigration agent, 2591-3
Dominion Elections Act, 4651, 4656-7
Exhibitions, 2600, 4682
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 767
Good roads, 787, 3917

Calder, Hon. J. A.—*Con.*
Immigration. *See also, under this head,* Immigration Act Amdt.; Immigration and Colonization Department
Belgians, 2587
Canada's attractions, 2573
Chinese, of, 1975, 2599
Dangerous and undesirable aliens, 759
Great Britain, from, 2594
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1875, 2570-1
Northern Ontario and Quebec, 2573-4
Nova Scotia and New Brunswick, to, 2573, 2582
Policy
All Canada, for, 2585
Need for, 2577
United States, from, 2598
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill, 1206, 1866-83, 3175, 3211-3
Acts of violence, 2283
Conspiracy, ques. 1949
Deportees, 1978
Domicile, 1971, 2286
Enemy aliens, 1945
Espionage, 1948
Illiterates, 1954, 1960, 1964
Non-enemy aliens in enemy territory, 1947
Officers, 1972
Psycopathic inferiority, 1945
Immigration and Colonization Department
Advertising, 2597-8
Agencies, 2569, 2586-94
Colonization work, 2570
Connor, Mr., agent, 2591-3
Deputy Minister
Extra work, payment for, 2441, 2442
Purposes and methods of, 1972, 2568, 2572, 2594, 2598
Land grants to Canadian Northern, 1873
Land prices in the West, 2579
Patriotic Fund, 3240, 3738
Public Health, 1199
Director General of, 2572
Quarantine, 4682
Retaining settlers, 2579, 2590
Technical education, res., vote $10,000,000, 3164-74
Technical Education Bill, 3791-3808
Distribution of grants, 4136
Town planning, 767
United States head tax, 1111, 1942

Campbell, Mr. J. A. (Nelson)
Budget, 3556. Public debt and natural resources, 3556; Manitoba's forests, fisheries and mines, 3558; Great War Veterans' scheme of mineral prospecting, 3560; development of resources by Government, 3561; Stefansson's proposition for development of the North, 3561; Mr. McMaster's amdt., 3564
Canadian National Railway, 1837
Lines, description of, 1838
Dominion Elections Act, 4647-8
Experimental farm, 2979
Good roads, 4409
Hudson Bay Railway, 4688
Judges' salaries, 2958
Land for soldiers—forest reserves, 3070-3
Naturalization, 4126
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, statistics, 2651-2
Titles, 2744

Campbell, Mr. J. A.—*Con.*

Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 928; 2r., 1383, 1388; com., 1388; 3r 1619

Canada Food Board
Expenses, ques. 602, ques. 613
Fish, 121; ques. 2750
Licenses, ques. 602
Reports of Controller McFall, 4070, ques. 4464
Revenues, ques. 602

Canada Grain Act, administration, 3837

Canada Grain Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 3940, 3949; 1r., 3966; 2r., com., 4073, 4380; 3r., 4380; Senate amdts., 4662
Appeal Board, 4099
Surplus, 4073, 4380

Canada Medical Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3240

Canada Registration Act
Cost and result, ques. 728
Lamontagne, Miss., ques. 1957, ques. 2145
Operation, ques. 844
Pictou, registrar at, ques. 2144

Canada Shipping Act Amdt. Bills
1. Pilotage and harbour masters. Res., 2802; 1r., 2808; 2r., com., 3157; 3r., 3162
2. Transfer of ships. Res., 3754; 1r., 3757; 2r., com., 3928; 3r., 4002

Canada Trade Commission, 4493

Canada Year Book, 3839

Canadian Council of Agriculture. *See* Council

Canadian Expeditionary Force. *See* War

Canadian Government Merchant Marine. *See also* Shipping
Rates of freight charged by, ques. 4241
Vessel for, ques. 3998

Canadian Mining Institute, 4492

Canadian Mission in London, ques. 1905

Canadian National Railway Company Bill. Res., 1380, 1394; 1r., 1422; 2r., 1620; com., 1623, 1663, 1713, 1734, 1797; 3r., 2143. Amdt. (Mr. Fielding—Revenue and Audit Act to apply), 2102; neg. on div., 2130; amdt. (Mr. Copp—Intercolonial Railway), 2133, neg. 2137; amdt. (Mr. Lapointe, Kamouraska—labour representation), 2138, neg. on div., 2141
- Clauses and discussions
  - Abandoned lines, 1708
  - Advances and securities, 1777
  - Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
  - Capital stock, 1647, 1776
  - Charters, schedule of, 1766
  - Closure, discussion under, 1797-1864
  - Constituent companies, 1694, 1784
  - Construction, extension of time for, 1709
    - Authority of Parliament necessary, 1779
  - Directors
    - Nomination of, 1623
    - Nomination of returned soldier, 1638
    - No personal responsibility, 1783
    - Payment of, 1623, 1653
    - Responsibility of, 1671
    - Term of office, 1646
  - Estimated expenditure, 4688
  - Executive Com., 1667
  - Finance, expenses to be paid out of revenue, 1699, 2102
  - First meeting, 1657-64
  - Fiscal year, 1705
  - Freight rates, 2457
  - Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
  - Head office, 1648
  - Inquiries—Minister may provide for, 1782
  - Lines to be included, 1677, 1784
    - United States, in, 1693
  - Municipalities, consent of, 1782
  - Name, 1779
  - Orders in Council, powers under to construct, 1767
  - Railway and Expropriation Acts to apply, 1694
  - Securities
    - Issue of, 1779
    - Other companies, of, 1781, 1861
  - Steamships, 1681-2
  - Work for general advantage of Canada, 1706

Canadian National Railway
- Cap Rouge, repairs, 2460
- Cars and rails, contracts for, ques. 1907
- Coal, ques. 611, ques. 1211, ques. 1906, res. for papers 2906, ques. 4377
- Construction and betterments, 30, 4614
- Directors, ques. 612
- Employees (Canadian Northern) for, ques. 846
- Government Railways
  - Construction and betterments, 3190
  - Expenditure proposed in year 1920-21, 3190
  - Locomotives, 1212
- Halifax terminals, ques. 2398
- Intercolonial. *See that title*
- Labour troubles, reported, 1617
- Lands at Fort William, Canadian Northern, ques. 883
- Legal expenses paid
  - Bureau and Bigué, to, ques. 2047
  - Tachereau, Roy, Cannon & Parent, to, ques. 2047
- Locomotives, ques. 1212
- Managers, ques. 748
- Mileage, rolling stock and equipment, finance, value, etc.—answers to questions by Leader of Opposition, 1610
- Montreal terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
- National Transcontinental. *See also* Canadian National Railway Bill
  - Accidents, ques. 1211
  - Business during 1918, ques. 3065
  - Damage claims, ques. 616
  - Government use of line, Winnipeg, Quebec, Halifax and St. John, ques. 2398
  - Station operations and receipts, ques. 1211
- Officials, transfer from Moncton, ques. 748
- Patronage, abolition of, 1624
- Prince Edward Island Railway
  - Coal purchase, ques. 4377
  - Gauge, broadening of, 460
- Quebec and Cochrane line, 2456
- Quebec bridge, ques. 977
- Toronto building occupied by, ques. 612
- West, in, 424

Canadian Northern Railway
- Arbitration, ques. 2045, ques. 2145
- Bonds, ques. 4241
- Common stock, ques. 1214
- Date of Government taking possession, ques. 1212
- Equipment Trust, ques. 4240
- Liabilities, ques. 1212
- Net earnings, 1918, ques. 2462
- New Westminster, 423
- Port Mann, ques. 979
- Securities, ques. 1214

Canadian Official Record. *See* Public Information

Canadian Patriotic Fund, 1164

Canadian Patriotic Fund Bill. 1r., 3240; 2r., com., 3738; 3r., 3740

Canadian Press News Service, 4482

Canadian Red Cross Society, 2874

Canadian Red Cross Society Incorporation Bill. 1r., 3004; 2r., com., 3162; 3r., 3164

Canals
Appointments on, 3175
Chambly, ques. 2045
Trent, returned soldiers, ques. 3470
Wages, ques. 3586
Welland, lock tenders, ques. 604
Construction, 1592

Canned Goods. *See* Weights and Measures; Meat and Canned Foods

Cannon, Mr. Lucien (Dorchester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 264. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—military service defaulters, 264; Canada's war record, comparison of provinces—national unity—Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister, 265; German fleet—Canadian Navy—Canada a nation, 266; the Press—reconstruction, 267; party government—Union Government, 268; legislation by Order in Council—provincial rights, 269; franchise, 270
Bankruptcy Bill—Provinces and, 2008
Blondin, Hon. P. E., Postmaster General, 2042
Budget, the, 3413. Hon. Mr. Calder and Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3414; Peace Conference, 3415; public finance, 3416; industrial unrest, 3417; development of the Cabinet as an institution, 3419
Canadian National Railway
Lines in United States, 1693
Lines to be included, 1686
National Transcontinental, damage claims, ques. 616
Parliamentary control, 1670-1
Pesident's salary, 1659
Canadian soldiers in Ireland, ques. 849
Divorce Court Bill, 3789
Dominion parks, 2302
Expropriation for, 2304
Dorchester county
Level crossing accident, ques. 972
Mail service, ques. 729
Telephone lines, ques. 849
German merchant fleet, 1289
Good roads, 4418
Immigration
Deported conspirators, 1950
Illiterates, 1954
Non-enemy aliens in enemy territory, 1947
Kent House site, ques. 976
Laflamme, Mr., expenses of, 2042
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1323

Cannon, Mr. Lucien—*Con.*
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1323
Pensions, 2692
Pomeroy, Major A. L., ques. 2657
Proprietary medicines, 2487
Public health, jurisdiction, 1199
Quebec Harbour Commission, ques. 601
Railway Act—"avocats," 2632
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2695
Technical education, 3795, 3805-7
Titles, 2727
War Expenditure Bill, "any measure deemed necessary or advisable," 2244

Canso
Censorship, ques. 847
Distressed seamen, 2614
Harbour Master, 3158

Capilano Bridge, 2790

Capital and Labour. *See* Industrial Unrest

Capital Punishment, 1957

Carleton, Que., mail service, ques. 727

Carter, Mr. T. J., Solicitor, Public Works Department, 1270, 1274

Carvell, Hon. F. B. (Minister of Public Works)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 41. Reconstruction, 41; Bolshevism—Government expenditure, 42; shipping—unemployment — highways, 43; Department of Public Works, 44; housing, 45; branch railways—demands upon the Government, 46; local public works, 47; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment—income and other taxes, 48; wanted, $100,000,000 a year, 49; immigration—duty of private employers, 50
Aerial service and works, 1265
Cables, 2794
Canadian National Railway, position of Intercolonial, 2135
Daylight Saving, 91
Dominion Elections Act Amdt., 4647-59
Dry docks, 2360, 4307
French River waterway, 1080
Harbours and rivers, 4613
Highways Aid Bill, 740-3, 4405
Hospitals, 1264
Hydroplane stations, 1263, 1274
La Prairie dyke road, 4059
Militia pensions, 2756
Ottawa City, arrangement with, 2495-2500, 4380-5
Ottawa highways, 2791-2
Parliament buildings, 2331-41, 4621
Provincial voters' lists, 2446
Public buildings, 4610-2
Public works, explanations in Committee, 2359-94, 2780-97

Carvell, Hon. F. B.—*Con.*
Public Works—*Con.*
Demands on Government for, 46, 2792
Department—staff, salaries, etc., 1262, 1266-70
Railway Act Consolidation—transmission lines on highways, hydro-electric, 3097, 3106-8, 3112, 3117, 3120
St. John Harbour, 2359, 4301-6, 4337-8
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2800
St. Charles River works, 1297
Seignorial rights, 2787
Slides and booms, 4607
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 828
Telegraphs and telephones, 2793-6, 4608
Tender and contract, 1263
Titles, 2737
War structures and works, 1263
Wireless, 2794-5

Casgrain, Mr. P. F. (Charlevoix-Montmorency)
Budget, 3427. Complaint of governmental delay, 3427; prices, 3429; patronage, 3430; wealthy ministers, 3431; extravagant expenditure, 3432; taxes, 3433; Government and the Press, 3434; "Produce and save," 3435
Canadian National Railway, 1835
Branch lines, 1693
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675
Intercolonial, ques. 750
Quebec and Saguenay Railway
Baie St. Paul, branch, 2449
Flag stations, 1690
Transcontinental, accidents, ques. 1211
Capital punishment, commutation, 753
Compassionate allowance, case for, 3175
Debates, printing of, 424
Desjardins, Mr. Charles ("Ti-noir"), ques. 750
Dominion Bills, issues of, ques. 616
Experimental farms, ques. 1077
Gobeil-Simard investigation, ques. 619
Government printing, ques. 844
Isle aux Coudres, 2609
Laflamme, Mr. J. K. L., ques. 750
Lighthouses and keepers, 2608
Newsprint inquiry, ques. 752
Pilots, 2613
Prohibition, 2358
Steamers
Cold storage on, ques. 882
"Champlain," ques. 616, 2606, 2614
War, correspondence concerning, motion dropped, 753
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2946
Winnipeg strike, 2508

Casselman, Mr. Orren D. (Dundas)
Highways, 787, 789, 790
Weights and measures, 2153

"Catholic" or "Roman Catholic," 1383-8

Cavell, Edith, monument to, 2447

Censorship, 226, 295, 1110
Cable, ques. 847
Hazel Hill and Canso, ques. 847
Literature, forbidden, case of J. H. Lewis, 270
Removal of, 135

Chambly Canal highway, ques. 2045

Champlain Market wharves, ques. 1438

Chaplin, Mr. James D. (Lincoln)
Prohibition, 2349

Charges of Management, 4475

Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296, 4464

Charlton, Mr. William A. (Norfolk)
Daylight Saving, 913

Chartered Banks, Excess Circulation Bill. *See* Finance Act

Charters, Mr. Samuel (Peel)
Prohibition, 2663

Child Welfare. *See* Public health

Children, medicines for. *See* Proprietary

Chinese in Canada. *See* Asiatics; Immigration

Chisholm, Mr. Alexander W. (Inverness)
Amherst internment camp, 4070
Buoy picked up, 2607
Cheticamp and Grand Etang, port physician, 2614
Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379
Inverness Railway, 4614
Mail contracts, 2082
Port Hood wharf, 2782
Steamship services
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1302, 3828
Hendrie & Co., 3830
Sick Mariners' Fund and fishermen, 2615

Circulation and Reserve, ques. 614, 637. *See also* Finance Act

Civil Service. *See also* Civil Service Act Amdt. *For Departments, see their titles*
Appointments, ques. 2049
Temporary, 279
Commission, 85, 293, 404, 1498
Appointments by, 161-6, 260, 963, 3230
Charges against
Chief clerk of files, 163, 286
Fruit inspector, 161, 282
Immigration and Colonization publicity agent, 279
Schools, preparatory for Civil Service, 164, 288

Civil Service—*Con.*
Charges against—*Con.*
Superintendent of penitentiaries, 162, 283
Theft of examination papers, 164, 289
Toronto Customs hardware appraiser, 161, 278
Toronto deputy postmaster, 161, 276
Examinations and examination papers, 162, 164, 282-4, 287, ques. 750
Printing Bureau appointments placed under, 1812
Returned soldier suggested as member of, 996
Salaries, 4495
Secretary, 165, 289, 292
Disadvantages of, 962, 4477
Double salaries, 1902
Examination, 985, 987, 990, 998. *See also this title under* Commission, *above*
Income tax, 3497. *See also* Ottawa Improvement
Pensions, on, 3713
Inside, efficiency of—Special Committee of Inquiry into
Appointment, 1554, 1709
Reports, 2652, 3004, 3376, 3420, 4133, 4534
Insurance, report tabled, 138
List, tabled, 398
Murray, Sir George, report of, 2113, 2920
No minister of, 1559-60
Outside
Delay in appointments, ques. 3680
Dissatisfaction amongst, 404
Salary increases, 945-6
Overmanning of, 4605, 4670
Overseas men
Civil and military pay, 2925
Promotions, ques. 729
Patronage in, 58, 498, 1267, 1271, 3234
Postal employees' salaries, 1794
Postmasters at sub-stations, 404
Post Office appointments after strike, 4345
Promotions, 983
Reclassification, ques. 610, 956, 1267, 2292, 3827. *See* Civil Service Act Amdt.
Arthur Young & Co., 2911
Coms. of Civil Service Commission engaged in, ques. 617
Postal workers, correspondence, 2342
Report asked for, 1960
Report of, 3519
Returned soldiers, and, 291, 962
Wounded men and; motion Mr. McCurdy, 981; amdt., Mr. Morphy, 997; withdrawn, 1002
Salaries, 86, 1559
$2,500 and over, ques. 1439
Specialists, appointment of, 983, 989, 1182
Strikes

Civil Service—*Con.*
Appointments after, confirmation of, 3809
Superannuation, 1266-9, 4476
Report tabled, 138
Special com. report, 4133
Transferring officials, 278
Vacancies, advertising of, 2049
War bonus, 1, 955, 4687
Mail carriers, ques. 848
Vote of $2,500,000, 2824
Women in, ques. 2751

Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2909; 1r., 3293

Clark, Mr. Hugh (Parliamentary Secretary for the Department of Militia and Defence)
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2764
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1014

Clark, Mr. Michael (Red Deer)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 231. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 231; victory and peace, 232; conscription—Liberal party, 233; tariff, reciprocity, free trade, 235; reconstruction, 236; markets and their effect on trade, 238; taxation, cost of living—farmers' movement, 239; income tax—British Corn Laws, 240; free wheat—competition, 241
Board of Commerce, 4467
Budget, the, 3378. Political independence, 3378; bureaucracy, 3380; lowering tariff—Messrs. Calder and Crerar, 3381; reconstruction, 3382; tariff proposals, 3383; prices and tariff, 3384; Britain under free trade, 3386; revenue raising methods—tax-free bonds, 3387; industrial unrest, 3388; Canada a bond of nations, 3390
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3932-4
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1729
Finance, Parliamentary control, 2118
Public ownership, 2118
Civil Service, deputy ministers, payments to, 1591, 2442
Daylight Saving
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342
Railroad time, 1453
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 872
Grain trade, operation of elevators, 4089
Highways, 787, 3914, 3919, 3924, 4387, 4401, 4411, 4416
Provincial jurisdiction, 3901
Housing scheme, 2541, 2548

Clark, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Immigration
Great Britain, from, 2596
Prohibition of certain classes, 1918
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1317, 1339
Militia, permanent force, 3974
Naturalization, 4122-3
National harbours, control of, 3745
Pensions, 5203-4
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4288
Ploughs, duty on, 3690-6, 3701, 3704
Post Office appointments after strike, 4348
Prohibition, 2657, 2664, 2679
Proportional representation, 3069, 4620
Public health, social welfare, 1138-40
Purchasing Commission, 3203, 3815, 4454, 4620
Scientific research, 4462
Shipbuilding, 2217-9, 2253-4, 2257
Soldiers' land settlement, 3866
Tariff
Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 813
Explanation of vote, 3749
Titles, 1467, 2712, 2746

Clemens, Judge, investigation relating to, ques. 3066

Clements, Mr. Herbert S. (Comox-Alberni)
Alien enemies and treatment of soldiers, motion, 753
Mounted Police, 761
National non-sectarian schools, 756
Naturalization papers, 754
Technical education, 756

Closure
Canadian National Railway. Notice, 1789; discussion, 1797
Interpretation of rule, 1796, 1799

Coal
Canadian National Railway, ques. 1906
Lignite, briquetting of, 3472
Railway contracts for, 1909
Railway rates, and. *See* Budget
St. Lawrence route, ques. 3471, 4335
Supply, 174

Coal Tar derivatives. *See* Proprietary

Coasting Trade
Railway Commission control. *See also* Railway Act Consolidation Bill
Bill to provide, 71
United States, with, 1110, 1209, 1260

Cochrane, Hon. Francis, Senate request his attendance at Hudson Bay Com., 2511

Cockshutt, Mr. W. F. (Brantford)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 124. Peace and victory, 125; Bolshevism—capital and labour, 127, 130; His Majesty the King, 128; income tax, 130; tariff, 131; Peace Conference, presence of the Prime Minister, 132
Agricultural implements, duties, etc., 3072, 3099
Ploughs, 3691
Bankruptcy Bill, 1990, 1994, 1999, 2003, 2475
Budget, the, 3349. Industrial unrest—Peace Treaty, 3349; Russia, 3351; trade conditions and tariff, 3353; tariff investigation commission, 3359; coal duties and freight rates, 3361; dumping, 3362
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1850
Freight rates and tariff duties, 3700
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership—nationalization; railways extending into United States, etc., 687
Illiterates, immigration of, 1965
Income tax, 3737
Materials for manufacture, purchase of in Canada, 3699, 3702
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart and others, 1531
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1329
Militia, permanent force, 1899, 3973
Passports, 1052
Pensions, 4031
Railway Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highways, Hydro-Electric, 3087
Railway rates, Commission control, 4146
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 999
Shipbuilding, 2257
Titles, 1469, 2723, 2739, 2746-8

Cold Storage, 2062
Taxation of companies, ques. 2904
Transportation, 2980
Warehouses, 2982
Food in, destruction of, ques. 2906
Montreal, proposed building, 1619, 2062

Collective Bargaining, 3908. *See also* Industrial unrest

Collins, Mr., case under Military Service Act, 1326

Combines and Fair Prices Bill. 1r., 4198; 2r., com., 4567, 4588; 3r., 4601. *See also* Board of Commerce

Commercial Cable Company, property at Hazel Hill, N.S., ques. 2046

Commissions, return of number of, ques. 646

Connaught Rifle Range, 1894-8

Conner, Mr., Immigration agent, 2590

Conscientious Objectors. *See* Military Service

Conscription, 233, 346, 489, 496, 510. *See also* Military Service Act

Conservation, Commission of, report tabled, 312

Consular Officers, payment to, 1900

Contract by Tender vs. Force contracts, 1606

Cooper, Mr. Richard C. (Vancouver South)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 336. General Currie — St. Julien, 337; Cambrai, Mons, 337; Canada's war record, decorations won—proposed grant to Sir Arthur Currie, 339; Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 339, 340; scholarships as war memorials, 340; national defence service—women in Government service—aliens and fishing licenses—public works to give employment, 341; immigration—war service gratuity and clothing allowance, 342; war service button—land settlement — pensions — prohibition — taxes —vocational training, 343; party government, 344
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3822
Daylight Saving, 887
Militia pensions, 2755-60
Pensions, 4175, 4201
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3868-9
Women in Civil Service, 2751

Copp, Mr. Arthur B. (Westmorland)
Air Board Bill, 2051-6
Bankruptcy Bill, 2004, 2007
Canada Food Board, ques. 613
Canadian National Railway
Coal purchases, ques. 1906
Directors, ques. 612
Appointment—politics and patronage, 1639
Intercolonial Railway
Lines to be included, 1677
Managers, ques. 948
Moncton, transfer of officials from, ques. 948
Operation, 4615-8
Position of in C.N.R., amdt., 2131-7
Pugwash spur, 3067
Steamships, P.E.I., ferry, 1690
Toronto, buildings in, occupied by, 612
Demobilization, men in garrison at St. John, 3236-7
Divorce Court Bill, 3784
Economy in expenditure, 4053
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2464
Fisheries
Lobsters, 714-24, 2902
Oysters, 2897
Petitcodiac River, fishway in, 2898

Copp, Mr. Arthur B.—*Con.*
Forestry and timber limits, 4053-4
Franchise, 4635
Government employees' compensation, 705-6
Housing scheme, 2560-1
Immigration agents, 2588
Indians, 4061
Judges' salaries, 4371
Lighthouse keepers, 2609
Migratory birds, 4604
Napadogan, ice at, ques. 972
Naval Service, 2241
Newcastle wireless station, 2849
Parliament buildings, 2338
Pensions, 4299
Commissioners' salaries, 2452
Proprietary medicines, 2486-7
Public Health, Director General, 2572
Purchasing Commission, 3237
Sackville public building, 4612
St. John harbour, 4300, 4305
Steamship services, freight rates, 1285
Steamships, management of, 4685-6
Technical education, 4136
Payment to provinces by population, 3893
Tinplate, 4447

Cost of Living. *See* High Cost

Costa Rica, message in celebration of peace, 2

Coté, Eugenie, alias "Venus," 2808

Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566

Coteau Landing, highway, ques. 2045

Cottonseed Meal, 2446

Council of Agriculture, 578
Platform, 531
Policy and representatives, 556
Wood, Mr. H. W., 556, 566, 586

Courts Martial. *See* War, Naval Service, Military Service Act

Cousineau, Mr. L., ques. 1306

Cowan, Mr. Walter D. (Regina)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 168. Liberal Party, 168; Peace Conference, presence of Prime Minister, 168; Union Government—co-operation in the work of government, 170; medical men and patronage—housing, 171; tariff, 172; railways—Mounted Police, 173; coal supply—Health Department, 174; industrial unrest, 175
Budget, 3474. Tariff and reciprocity, 3474; Western problems, 3478; Hon. Mr. Crerar and wheat prices, 3479; tariff and prices, 3480; manufacturers' action under protection, 3481; implement prices, 3483; Western Provinces and natural resources, 3484

Cowan, Mr. Walter D.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway, 1840
Cold storage warehouses, 2983-4
Daylight Saving, 898
Housing scheme, 2538-40
Immigration, 2576
Package goods, net weight, 2153
Postmasters and inspectors, 2031-3
Proprietary medicines, 2482-3
Public health, 1197
Red Cross Society, 3168
Rentals paid by Government, 2505
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2319
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2774-5
Water-powers, 4049
Wheat, drought resisting, 2972

Credits, foreign. *See* Trade

***Crerar, Hon. T. A.** (Minister of Agriculture)
British embargo on Canadian cattle, 2963
Budget, the, 3328. Resignation from the Government, 3329; tariff and national development, 3330; prices, 3332; tax proposals, 3336
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3953, 3961-4
Cattle, number in Canada, 2997
Co-operation, federal and provincial Departments of Agriculture, 2966
Cold storage
Transportation, 2981
Warehouses, 2982-8
Dairy products and the war, 2967
Daylight saving, 926
Experimental farms, 2965, 2976-80
Fairs, 2996-7
Flax, 1550
Grain trade—elevators, 4073, 4082
Health of animals, 2988
International Institute, 2992
Livestock Act Amdt. Bill, 1570, 2061-7
Livestock, pure bred, 2992
Meat and Canned Goods Act, 2989
Militia, permanent force, 3972
Oleomargarine, 2982
Pests, 2979-80
Publications, 2990
Resignation from Government, 3193, 3329
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 820
Wheat
Drought resisting, 2972
Local mills and, 2974
Market for, 2999-3000
Wheeler, Mr. S., experiments of, 2972-3
Yukon, wheat growing in, 2974

Criminal Code Amendment Bills
1. Fire prevention. 1r., 1382; 2r., 1573; com., 1574; 3r., 1619
2. Sexual offences. 1r., 1710; 2r., com., 2159; 3r., 2305; Senate amdt., 4634, 4689

Criminal Code Amdt. Bill—*Con.*
3. Excessive punishment. 1r., 2851
4. Unlawful associations, etc. 1r., 4134; 2r., com., 4355; 3r., 4380; Senate amdts., 4660
Unlawful associations, 4355; concealed weapons, 4356; bribing peace officers, 4361; venereal disease, 4362; indictable offences, corporations, 4363; election by prisoners, 4363; challenging jurors, 4363

Cronyn, Mr. Hume (London)
Immigration Act. Amdt., 1876
Alien enemies, 1948
Illiterates, 1953, 1961, 1968
Prohibited classes, amdt., 1969, 2280; withdrawn, 2283
Imperial Conference, 1919, 1948
Imperial Court of Appeal, ques. 1075
Peace Treaty, ratification, 2200
Pensions, 4296
Prohibition, 2349, 2655; amdt., 2656-7, 2688
Research, scientific, 4457
National Research Institute, 1565
Seed grain, 1031

Crothers, Hon. T. W. (West Elgin)
Militia pensions, 2755
Resignation as Minister of Labour, 129

Crowe, Mr. S. J. (Burrard)
Capilano Bridge, 2790
Chinese and Japanese immigration, 1976
Daylight Saving, 920

Cruelty to Animals, 2603

Currency Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 637; 1r., 639; 2r., com., 1044; 3r, 1111

Currie, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Arthur, 336, 370, 500
Currie, Col. John A. and, 545, 547
Proclamations by, ques. 607
Proposed grant and testimonial, 339, 548

Currie, Mr. John A. (North Simcoe)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 545, 551. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — personal reference, war record, second battle of Ypres, 545; Canada's soldiers deserving of the nation's thanks — returned soldiers, 548; tribute to dead soldiers—Col. Baker, Col. Sharpe, 549; Rhyl riots, 550; tariff—economic war, 551; free wheat, 552; manufacturers and exports, 553; demobilization — soldiers' land settlement, 554; manufacturers' earnings—class hatred, 555; Canadian Council of Agriculture, 556; income tax—industries and resources of the several provinces, 559; proposals of action—elevators, ships, factories, 564;

*Resigned as Minister of Agriculture June 4; p. 3194

Currie, Mr. John A.—*Con.*
Conservative party, 566; Mr. Wood, President, United Farmers of Alberta, 556, 566
Franchise, 4642-3
Pensions, 4197
Railway Commission and freight rates, 4145
Shipbuilding, 2219
Siberian Expedition, ques. 1440

Customs and Inland Revenue
Department
Commissionership of, 3927, 4380
Messrs. H. C. Blair, Bryson Macdougald, John Ridley, ques. 2398
Preventive service, 965
Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216
Salaries, 954
Duty, rebates of, ques. 646

Customs Tariff Act Amdt. *See* Revenue Bills

Dafoe, Mr. John W., ques. 974, 1789

Dairying Industry, development of, 2980

Dams, Government, 2796

d'Anjou, Mr. Joseph Emile Stanislas Emmanuel (Rimouski)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 224. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 224; bi-lingualism, 225; women's franchise—censorship—Orders in Council, 226; Siberian expedition—Military Service Act defaulters, 227; franchise, War-time Elections Act—Union Government—national unity, 228
Bradbury, Lieut.-Col. G. H., ques. 1107
Budget, 3450. War and conscription, 3450; election law, 3451; Siberian expedition—French-Canadians in the war, 3452; Guelph Novitiate, 3453; Hon. Mr. Crerar and Hon. Mr. Calder, 3454; tariff, 3455
Enlistments, May-December, 1917, ques. 609
"Hochelaga," steamer, ques. 609
Intercolonial, express parcels, ques. 2047
Keddy, Dr. O. B., ques. 2797
Laferriere, Capt. Alban, ques. 3135
Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612
Mahon, Mr. C. E., ques. 1612, ques. 1790, ques. 2295
Military Service Act, ques. 1306, 1332
Militia, permanent force, 3977
Naval Service recruiting, ques. 747
Parent, Dr. Rufus H., ques. 1213
Thompson, Lieut.-Col. Alfred, M.P., ques. 747

Dansereau, Mr. Lionel, 357

Davidson, Mr. Avard Longley (Digby and Annapolis)
Canadian National Railway, legal expenses, ques. 2047
Good roads, 3913-25, 4387, 4390, 4394, 4430, 4433
Point of order: discussion of motion standing on Order Paper not permissible—upheld, 190

Davis, Mr. Fred Langdon (Neepawa)
Board of Commerce, 4518
Budget, 3631. Greater revenues needed, 3631; excise and land taxes, 3632; tariff revision, 3633; farm labour shortage, 3634
Civil Service, com. on efficiency, 1517
Fire prevention, 1577-8
Immigration, restriction of, 1938
Livestock, pure bred, 2993
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1260
Naturalization, 4130
Ruthenians, 1938

Daylight Saving, 456, 505, 1074, 1208, 1383, ques. 3242
Ethier, Mr., vote of, 1482
Government's policy, 647, 970
Health and, 912, 915
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342, 1422
Point of order (Mr. Denis) as to hour of sitting, 1432
Railway time, 929, 1433
Special motion to take up order, 886
Res. (Mr. Cooper), 887; amdt. (Mr. McCoig), 892; point of order (Mr. Guthrie), 903; amdt. to amdt. (Mr. Mackie, Edmonton), 910; div. 928

Debates. *See* House of Commons

Déchène, Mr. Aimé Miville (Montmagny)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 87. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 87; soldiers' settlement, 88; immigration—commissions, 90; foreign trade, 91; war indemnity—pensions, 92; taxation — thrift, 92; tariff — public health, 94; returned soldiers, 95
Canadian National Railway, 2129
Dominion Police, ques. 2047, ques. 2144
St. Barnabé Island, ques. 4464
Spirituous liquors, entered at Quebec, 1533

Deep Brook post office, ques. 751

Defaulters. *See* Military Service Act

Delisle, Mr. Michel Siméon (Portneuf)
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 1534
Destroyers, purchase of, ques. 1534
"Hochelaga," steamship, ques. 606
Life-saving stations, ques. 606

Delisle, Mr. Michel Siméon—*Con.*
Newfoundland R.N.R. ratings, ques. 1611
Seymour Narrows batteries, ques. 975
"Stadacona," steamer, ques. 880
Trawlers, ques. 746

Demobilization. *See* War

Demers, Mr. Marie Joseph (St. Johns and Iberville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 344. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —reconstruction—franchise, War-time Elections Act, 344; aliens—independence of judges, 341; conscription—defaulters, 346; Canadian autonomy, 347
Conscriptions, number of, ques. 972

Denis, Mr. Jean J. (Joliette)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 446. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —French Canadians and national unity, 447; Quebec province and the "Black Robes," 448; the Orange Sentinel and national unity, 449; war indemnity, 450; Canada's sacrifice in war—Military Service Act, defaulters, 451; tariff and the Liberal party, 452; Liberals and Unionists, 453
Business of the House, pending legislation, 3420
Canada Evidence Act Amdt., 1390
Daylight saving, point of order as to time of meeting of House, 1432
Franchise, 3420
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 692
Parliament Buildings fire, 725
Pensions, 4181, 4185

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees (Mr. George H. Boivin)
Rulings and statements of
Bills
Amendments
Changing character of Bill, 1745
Procedure in, 1198, 1204
Committee, in
Reading of clauses by Chairman, 2001
Motion to refer back, 4064
Preamble read and postponed, 1623
Principle not to be discussed in Committee, 1929, 2053
Reconsideration of clause only by unanimous consent, 2929
Schedule, order of, 1725
Taxation measures originating in Senate, 2490
Chair to be addressd, 2538
Closing of debate, 3207
Closure, 1799

Deputy Speaker and Chairman of Committees—*Con.*
Rulings and statements of—*Con.*
Committee, limitations of debate in, 1034-5, 2508
Committees appointable by the House, not by Committee, 1639
Conversations in Chamber, 4200
Interruptions, 1174, 2869
Language
Not disorderly except as applied to members, 1930
Objected to
Bolshevists—"Your friends," 1068
"Wilfully leading the House into error," 1854
Leader of the House, announcements by, 1566
Motion and amdt. debatable together, 2725, 2728
Motions not debatable
That Committee rise, 1583, 3816
To report a Bill, 4017
No motion before the House, 1566
Opportunity for discussion under the rules, 2760
Order and "Privilege," 2840
Past debate, 1608, 2885, 4588
Quorum, 397, 2361
Relevancy, 1175, 1273, 1631, 1746, 2068, 2480, 2661, 2977, 3734, 3813, 3984, 3986, 4480
Nickel, 3684, 3689
Orders in Council, 4487
Ottawa agreement, 4384-5
Pensions, 4257
Vancouver harbour, 3752-3
Repetitions, 3978
Resolution standing on Order Paper, debate not permissible, 190
Senate debates, reference to, 3278
Statement of member to be accepted, 1607
Taxes cannot be increased by Committee, 2487

Desaulniers, Mr. Arthur L. (Champlain)
Batiscan, works, ques. 645
Blondin, Lieut.-Col. P. E., ques, 1790
Enlistment of certain soldiers, ques. 3067

Desjardins, Mr. Charles ("Ti-Noir"), ques. 750

Deslauriers, Mr. Hermas (St. Mary)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 353. Profiteers—returned soldiers, 353; immigration—Bolshevism—Siberian expedition, 354
Budget, 3531. Social unrest, 3532, 3535; unsatisfactory answers to question,

Deslaurier, Mr. Hermas—*Con.*
3533; cost of living, 3534; soldiers and liquor, 3536; Military Service Act, defaulters, 3537
"Canada," C.G.S., ques. 745
Canadian National Railway, locomotives, ques. 1212
Daylight Saving, 3242
Halifax disaster, ques. 879
Hull armoury, ques. 1215
Labour Union convention, Calgary, ques. 2143
Lamontagne, Miss Yvette, ques. 1957, ques. 2145
Luxuries, taxes on, ques. 749
Montreal, port of, labour, ques. 3997
Montreal strike, 1482, 1615
National Service Registration, accounts, ques. 2296, ques. 2565
Ontario and Quebec, Northern, colonization, ques. 748
Ste. Marie wharf, ques. 1958
Salvarsan, ques. 2144
Strikes in Canada, ques. 1792, ques. 2143
Transcontinental Railway
Business during 1918, ques. 3064
Stations, ques. 1211
Weights and measures, inspectors, ques. 2296

Destroyers, purchase of, ques. 1534

Destructive Insects and Pests, 111, 2979

Devlin, Mr. Emmanuel B. (Wright)
Budget, 3343. Pending questions and government, 3343; Canada's tariff history, 3344; waste, 3345; increased production, 3347
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1722-4
Directors
Salaries, 1623
Term of office, 1797
Head office, 1665
Patronage, 1625
Civil Service war bonus, 2919
Arthur Young & Co., 2920
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2163
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 877
French River waterway, 1086
Influenza, cure of, 1175
Judges' salaries, 2957
Loans, public, 4198
Military Service Act, administration in Wright county, 2399-2402
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1254
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Tariff, 824
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-4

Dickson, Mr., contractor, 1376

Divisions
Budget, 3678
Canadian National Railway
Finance, 2130
Labour representation, 2141
Third reading, 2142
Cost of Living, 4334
Daylight Saving, 928
Divorce Court Bill, 3781
Fire prevention, 1619
Intoxicating liquors, 4072
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4336
Permanent force, 4002
Purchasing Commission, 3226
Railway Act
Power clause, 4165
Telephone clause, 4169
Tariff, 841
Titles, 1481, 2748

Divorce
Fees, remission of, number of divorces, 2779
Jurisdiction of Provincial Courts, 1438, 2779, 4535

Divorce Court Bill. 1r., 1662; 2r., 3761; motion (Mr. Fripp), six-months hoist, 3777; neg. on div., 3781; com., 3783

Dogfish, ques. 979

Dominion Bills, issues, ques. 616. *See* Currency

Dominion Coal Company, demand for ships, 2406

Dominion Elections Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 4533; res., 4534, 4621; 2r., 4622, 4635; com., 4646; 3r., 4659

Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt. Bills
1. Bill No. 79. 1r., 1789; 2r., com., 2297; 3r., 3344
2. Bill No. 125 (Land for soldiers). 1r., 2953; 2r., com., 3070; 3r., 3073

Dominion Iron and Steel and Nova Scotia Steel and Coal companies
No amalgamation, 2342
Steel rails, 2251

Dominion Lands
Orders in Council tabled, 185
Provincial taxation of, 709

Dominion Lands Act Amdt. Bill (Rates of interest). Res., 1111, 1112; 1r., 4063; 2r., com., 4251; 3r., 4254

Dominion Lands Surveys Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 72; 2r., com., 930; 3r., 1029

Dominion Parks, expenditure, 4046

Dominion Police, 2925, 4670
Bourdon, Henri, ques. 1440
Men employed, ques. 2047
Special force, ques. 2144
Suspensions, ques. 1440

Dominion Power Board, 4028

Dominion Revenue and Expenditure, ques. 1217

Dominion Steamers, 2600. *See* Vessels

Dominion Water Powers Bill. 1r., 2291; 2r., com., 2512; 3r., 2576
Application, 2512
Bond issues, 2526
Director of water-power, 2523
Private lands, expropriation, etc., 2517, 2524
Surveys, 2522
Title in Crown, 2516

Dorchester
Customs receipts, ques. 882
Level crossing accident, ques. 972
Post offices and mail service, ques. 729
Telephone lines, ques. 849

Dorval, buildings, ques. 610

Douglas, Mr. James McCrie (Strathcona)
Board of Commerce, 4505
Canadian National Railway, branch lines in the West, 1771-3
Postal employees' war bonus, 2928
Returned soldiers
Civil re-establishment, 2764-7
Civil Service positions for, 1000
Telegraphs, North country, 2795

Douglas, Mr. John C. (Cape Breton South and Richmond)
Petit de Grat—Mulgrave service, 1303

Doukhobors, 2043

Draftees. *See* Military Service Act

Drainage. *See* Reclamation

Draper, Mr. P. M., ques. 3999

Drugs. *See* Proprietary

Drummond, Sir George, sale of paintings, 2447

Drummond, Mr. Huntley, Commissionership of Canada, ques. 3242

Dryden, Mr. Michael, appointment, 287

Dry Docks, 2360

Dry Dock Subsidies Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 4306; 1r., 2r., com., 4307; 3r., 4337

Duchemin, Mr. H. P., ques. 1536, ques. 1791

Duff, Mr. William (Lunenburg)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 116. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French Canadian Liberals—peace and victory, 116; United States' part in the war, 117; demobilization—franchise, 118; resignation of Mr. McCurdy, 119; reconstruction, 120; fish prices, 121; Canada Registration Act—Peace Conference, 122; shipbuilding—coal miners, 123; ideals in public life, 124
Aliens, naturalization, ques. 616
Amherst Carriage Factory building, ques. 3997
Blair, Mr. H. C. and MacDougald, Mr. Bryson, ques. 2398
Buoys, Magdalen Islands, 1866
Canada Registration Act, ques. 978
Canada Shipping Act. Amdt., 3929-34
"Canada," steamer, coal, ques. 1340
Customs and Inland Revenue salaries, 961
Dennis building, Halifax, ques. 972
Dogfish reduction works, ques. 979
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2286-9
Fish, Canadian, alleged accumulation in Great Britain, 3328
Fish, compulsory inspection, 949-951
Fisheries, British Columbia, 935, 3759
Fort George postmistress, ques. 602
Halifax harbour master, 2694
"Hochelaga," steamer, dismissals from, ques. 1340
Immigration Department, appointments, 2592-4
Immigration, discharged seamen, 1980
Liquor on patrol vessels, ques. 1340
"Lottie Russell," steamer, ques. 746
Lunenburg harbour, 2607
Marine hospitals, salaries, 2613-4
Messeroy, Mr. John A., ques. 1610
Military Service Act, ques. 749
Naval Service
Administration of, 2176
Boys in, ques. 607
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 606
Canadian vessels in action, ques. 607
Courts-martial, ques. 607, ques. 1534
Efficiency—conduct in war, 2821, 2840
Pay, increase of, ques. 607, ques. 746
"Princess," steamer, ques. 615
Prize money, ques. 607
Starrar, Mr. Hall, ques. 616
Trawler "T-30"
Men sentenced, 3472
Repairs, ques. 2397
Newfoundland steamship service, 3829
Nova Scotia Carriages, Limited, ques. 3066
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Pilotage, 2806
Proprietary medicines, 2483
Public Information Department, ques. 750
Pugwash brickyard railway spur, ques. 4239

Duff, Mr. William—*Con.*
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1001
Shipbuilding, 2252, 2262
Steamship services
Britain, 1282
Clipper ships, 1288
Jamaica, 1284
Steel plate, price of, 2252, 2262
"Tuna," H.M.C.S., ques. 1534, ques. 1905
Victory Loan, cost of, ques. 1918, 2798
Wireless operators, separation allowance, ques. 1905
Woodbury, Harry, and Military Service Act, ques. 2048
Wrecking plants, 2605

Duff, Mr. Justice, allowance for Imperial Privy Council, 4687

Dunkirk, base commandant at, report of, ques. 1216

Du Tremblay, Mr. Pamphile Réal (Laurier-Outremont)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 149. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Canada's war record, 149; French Canadian Brigade—industrial unrest—public expenditure, 150; business situation—tariff, 151; development, use of natural resources, 152; soldiers' settlement—labour problems—trade relations with the United States, 153; Victory Loan—war indemnity and public debt, 154; national unity, 155
Daylight Saving, 910
Public health, provincial rights, 1367
Seed grain, 1032, 1041
War indemnity, Canada's claim, 773

Ecum Secum wharf, 2780

Edmonton Bridge, 2790

Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208

Education. *See also* Schools; Technical; Vocational
Land for school purposes, ques. 848
Mennonite schools, 2571
National non-sectarian schools, 756
Quebec, schools in, 2914

Edward VII, His late Majesty, monument to, 2797

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley (Frontenac)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 254. New Opposition leader, 254; Liberal party, record of leading Liberals, 255; franchise—Peace Conference, attendance of the Prime Minister, 256; repatriation in Quebec—war activities of various parts of Canada, 257; enlistment figures by provinces, 258; tariff, free trade record of Mr. Clark (Red Deer) and others, 259; Civil Service appointments by the Commission, 260; Union Government—tariff—defaulters and slackers, 263
Agricultural implements, duties, 3704-5
Bank mergers, 1097
Barriefield, militia buildings, 3985
Board of Commerce, 4552, 4555
Budget, 3435. Reply to Mr. Casgrain, 3435; reply to Mr. McMaster, reciprocity, 3437; Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3438; protection and agricultural prosperity—profits and prices, 3440; Hon. Mr. Crerar and prices, 3442, 3638; tariff, 3444; Union Government, 3449
Calvin residence, Kingston, ques. 3377
Civil Service
Commission, 260, 2916
Examinations, 4490
Salaries, increases, 2915, 4480
Conscientious objectors, 1929
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2161
Daylight Saving, 913
Education
Bi-lingualism in schools, 241
National non-sectarian schools, 2403
Technical, 2897-9
Eight-hour day, 914
Empire Parliamentary Association, ques. 2749
Feldspar, 3693
Finance Department, vacancies, ques. 847
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payment of, 850, 877, 1102
Good roads, 792, 3903, 3917-9, 3924, 4398, 4430
Immigration
Illiterates, 1965
Prohibition of certain classes, 1929
Income tax, judges, 3714
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1250
Militia
Pensions, 2759
Permanent force, 1898, 3985
Policy and system, 1888
Parliament buildings, 2338
Pensions, 4298
Post Office
Mail contractors, 2085
Postmasters, 2085, 2927
Surplus, 2090
Privilege: statement of Ottawa "Journal," 1997
Prohibition, 2684
Return of Canadian soldiers, strikes delaying, 3741
Ross, Mr. P. D., 1997, 2915-7

Edwards, Mr. John Wesley—*Con.*
Royal Military College, clerk of works, ques. 4377
Titles, 2736
Correction, 3753

Electrical Measure. *See* Units

Electrical Development. *See* Canadian National Railway; Water power

Electric and Power Companies Bill. 1r., 4377; 2r., com., 4572; 3r., 4588

Elevators. *See* Grain

Electrocution Bill. 1r., 1957

Elkin, Mr. Stanley Edward (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Agricultural implement duties—rebates, 3702-3
Fire prevention, 1576
Gold taken into United States, 637

Embezzlement, Quebec officer charged with, 2294

Emigration
Belgium, from, ques. 1874
United States, to, ques. 2046

Empire Parliamentary Association, ques. 2749

Employment Bureaux. *See* Unemployment

Employment Offices Co-ordination Act, 2450

Employment Works, 1597

Ethier, Mr. Joseph Arthur Calixte (Laval-Two Mountains)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 133, 141. Peace—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — reconstruction, 133; Military Service Act, defaulters, 134; censorship—public works—highways—returned soldiers, 135; Public Health Department—unemployment—Georgian Bay canal, 136; prohibition, 137, 138, 141; General Pau's visit, 137, 141; Bolsheviki, 141, 143; duties on implements and raw materials—Prime Minister at Peace Conference, 142; financial situation—Siberian expedition, 143
Vote on Daylight Saving, recording of, 1482

Euler, Mr. William D. (North Waterloo)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 370. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—German - Canadian soldiers, 370; Canada's national status—Union Government and Bolshevism—Liberals and Unionists, 371; censorship—conscientious objectors, 372; reconstruction—financial situation—taxation, 373; succession tax—industrial unrest, 374; aliens, 375; discrimination in naturalization, 376

Euler, Mr. William D.—*Con.*
Budget, 3589. Cost of living—industrial unrest, 3590; tariff and manufactures, 3591
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1727
Directors, 1805
Public ownership, 1750
Draftees sent overseas, ques. 2297
Eight-hour day, 2856
Farm help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1959
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1576, 1586
Grand Trunk Railway, obligations, 666
Immigration
Agents in United States, 2569-70
Exodus of settlers, 2580
Mennonites, 1927, 2570-1
Prohibition of certain classes, 1927
Ministers and Commons, motion, 1002
Naturalization, alien enemies, 4114-6, 4130, 4339
Prohibition, 2662
Railway Act Consolidation Bill
Power clause, 4163
Transmission lines on highways, Hydro-Electric, 3086
Roumania, credit to, 1110
Steamship services, 1296
Welland Canal, collapse of walls, 1593

Ewart, Mr., Public Works Department, 2331

Excess Profits War Tax, 419, 430, 526, ques. 977

Exchange Rate, ques. 2145

Exchequer Court
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership and, 664
Land expropriation, Belanger vs. The King, 1021

Exhibitions, ques. 1215, 2600, 4682

Experimental Farms, 2976. *See also* Agriculture
Number and location, ques. 1077
Report tabled, 111

Exports. *See also* Trade
Feed, ques. 2048
Woollens, ques. 845

Expropriation of buildings by the Government, 2506

External Affairs Department, 4669

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand (L'Islet)
Budget, 3522. Government by Order in Council, 3522; free speech—industry and finance, 3523; industrial unrest 3524; Military Service Act administration, 3525; minorities, 3526

Fafard, Mr. J. Fernand—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway, 1421
Fertilizers, 2979
Monk Station roadway, ques. 1438, 2202
"Montcalm," steamer, ques. 978
"Princess," steamer to replace, ques. 2797

Fairweather, Mr., Canadian Northern Railway arbitration, ques. 2145

Farm Help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1958

Farm Life, good roads and, 789

Farm Loans. *See* Banks

Federal District, 4385

Federal Hotel, Ottawa, lease of, ques. 2045

Ferguson, Sir Charles, and Canadian soldiers, 469

Fertilizers Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1568; 1r., 1570; 2r., com., 2286, 2463; 3r., 2510

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens (Shelburne and Queen's)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 473. Latitude of Debate on Address—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—returned soldiers in Parliament, Lt.-Col. Peck, V.C.—financial situation, 473; absence from Parliament of Ministers, 474; Peace Conference, war indemnity, 475; Peace Congress organization, 476; Canada's place therein, 477; Bolsheviki, 479; Canada's national status—Imperialism and Imperialism, 480; manufacturers and the West, 482; Laurier Government and the tariff, 483; party government, 484; Tariff Commission, 485; personal position as a candidate in election, 486; Union Government, 487; Liberals and Unionists, 488; conscription—Dominion grants and provincial rights, 489; highways—public health—prohibition, 490; franchise, 492; War-time Elections Act—aliens—"The word of an Englishman," 493; a free Parliament—titles, 494
Bank mergers, 1093
Board of Commerce, 4498
Bridges, Dominion responsibility, 2789-92
Budget, 3664. Fiscal situation, 3664; Civil Service—salaries of Ministers—currency, 3666; tax-free bonds, 3667; tariff—reciprocity, 3668
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3931-7
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1646
Closure, 2099
Directorate, 1628, 1633, 1653
Labour representative on, 2141
Returned soldier on, 1638

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Finance, 1698, 1702, 2098
Amdt., receipts and expenditures subject to Revenue and Audit Act, 2102
First meeting, 1666-7
Fiscal year, 1705-6
Head office, 1652
President's salary, 1657
Railway Act, application of, 1694
Supplies, purchase of, 3197
Canadian Press, news service, 4485
Chartered banks, excess circulation, 636
Civil Service, 2761
Extra work, deputy ministers, 2441
Overmanning of, 4671-2
Reclassification, 4488
Salaries, 964, 4476-7
Superannuation, 2761
Cost of Living Com., 4322
Daylight Saving, 917
Divorce Court Bill, 3779, 3784
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572, 4584-6
Fees, payment of officials by, 2692
Fish, cost of, 2890
Fisheries Com., 2463
Good roads, 784, 786, 4432-3
Government employees, compensation for injuries, 708
Halifax
Dry dock, 1281
Harbour master, 2692
House of Commons, Saturday and morning sittings, 3376, 3421
Housing scheme, 2537
Immigration Act Amdt., 1879
Illiterates, 1966
Income tax, 3720
Judges Act Amdt. Bill, 4377
Judges' salaries and taxation, 2956, 4231-4, 4436-9
Lobster, canned, 725
Migratory birds, 2165-6
Militia pensions, 2754-7, 2761
Parliament buildings, 2339
Peace Treaty, ratification, 2200
Pensions, 4178-83
Postage stamps used on cheques, 2031
Prohibition, 2349
Proprietary medicines, 2487
Soothing syrups, 2492
Provincial autonomy (technical education), 3169
Public health, 1374
Public works, Nova Scotia, 2783
Railway Act Consolidation
Senate amdts., 4156
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3095-8
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2696

Fielding, Hon. William Stevens—*Con.*
Seed grain advances, 627
Steamship services
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
United States ports to, proposed, 1296
West Indies, 1288
Subsidies—steamship vs. railway, 1297
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 837
Taxation, not to be increased by Com.—point of order, 2487
Technical education, 3169, 3796
Telephone companies, 2647
Titles, 1478, 2740
War Expenditures ($3,500,000,000) Bill, "Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2242-5
Borrowing powers under, 2248

Finance. *See* Budget; Canadian National Railway; Highways; Technical Education; Loans
Canada's war expenditure, 14
Imperial Munitions Board, ques. 977
Loans, public, flotation cost, 211, 274, 290

Finance Act Bill. Res., 633; 1r., 644; 2r., com., 1103; res. referred to com., 1102; 3r., 1111

Finance, Department of
Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379
Salaries, 4475
Vacancies, ques. 847

Finley, Mr. Albert Ernest (Souris)
Immigration of illiterates, 1952

Fire Prevention. *See* Criminal Code Amdt.

Fiset, Dr. Michael, ques. 1791

Fisheries Act, 1914, Amdt. Bill (British Columbia licenses). Res., 933; 1r., 936; 2r., 2097; ref. to special com., 2098; com., 3757; 3r., 3761

Fish and Fisheries
Alleged accumulation of Canadian fish in Great Britain, 3328
Breeding establishments, 2899
British Columbia, 426
Canadian Fisheries Association, 2888
Dogfish reduction works, ques. 979
Fisheries Com., 114, 2463
Report tabled, 111
Fishways, 2898
Graft alleged, Major Burde's charges, 427
Inspection. *See also* Fish Inspection Act
Maritime Provinces, in, 2896
Pickled fish, of, 2898
Lobsters, 2894, 2899. *See also* Meat and Canned Goods Bill
Canned, 2902
Hatcheries, 2899
Port Daniel West, 609
Marketing overseas, ques. 2750

Fish and Fisheries—*Con.*
Naval men, returned, and, 451, 1959
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Officers
British Columbia, Chief Inspector, ques. 1534
Maritime Provinces, Inspector, 2896
Overseers, 2893-4
Salaries and disbursements of, 2887
Oysters, 2894-9
Prices, 121
Protection service, 2848
Salesmen, 2889
Salmon fishing by farmers, 2896
Salmon and halibut, ques. 1535
Souris, P.E.I., fish drier, ques. 1662, ques. 3470
Tax on fishermen, 2144
Twine and cordage, 3708
Utilization of waste, 3341

Fish Inspection Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 949. 1r., 952; 2r., ref. to Com. on Marine and Fisheries, 2098

Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles
Letter from, 971
Payments to, 850, 1102
Pension, ques. 1109

Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 202, 2074

Flax Industry
Bounty, 3842
Res., Mr. Glass, 1537

Flint, the late Thomas Barnard, 1341

Fontaine, Mr. Joseph Eloi (Hull)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 417. Financial situation—the war and profiteering—War-time Elections Act, 417; returned soldiers, 418; Military Service defaulters—tariff, 418; surplus profits tax—economy—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 419
Civil Service, 2921
Cost of living, 2921
Government property in Hull, ques. 1215
Loans to Imperial Government, ques. 1215
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1328
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4249
Royal Air Force, repatriation of, ques. 1611

Food Board. *See* Canada Food Board

Food Control. *See* High Cost of Living

Foran, Mr. J. K., ques. 607

Foran, Mr. William, Secretary Civil Service Commission, 165, 289, 292

Forbidden Literature. *See* Censorship

Foreign Trade. *See also* Trade
Roumania, 3241
Sir Clifford Sifton, and, 1908

Forest Products Laboratories, ques., 3068

Forests. *See* Dominion Lands and Parks; Dominion Forest Reserves

Forests, Waterways and Water Powers
Com. appointed, 114

Forsyth, Mr. J. R., ques. 4379

Fort George Postmistress, ques. 602

Fortier, Mr. Hyacinthe Adelard (Labelle)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 508. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —centralization of government, 508; government by Order in Council, 509; conscription, defaulters, 510; autonomy and British connection, 511
Budget, 3554. "Produce and save," 3554; alleged persecutions under Military Service Act, 3555

Fort Lawrence, N.S., dredging, ques. 3680

Fort William Grain Company, ques. 2048

Foster, Mr. Thomas (East York)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 397, 399. Sir Thomas White, Acting Prime Minister, 397; immigration, 399; highways and the provinces —transcontinental highway, 401; farm work and Government highway assistance—housing, 402; temperance question, 403; Outside Civil Service—postmasters at sub-stations — Civil Service Commission, 404; women's franchise, 405; War-time Elections Act and aliens — Ministers in the Senate, 406
Canadian National Railway, 1649
Daylight Saving, 926
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4578-9
Fire prevention, 1586
Highways, 731
Live Stock Act Amdt., 1571
Prohibition, 2658
Public Works Department, unexpended balances, 1280
Railway Act Consolidation
Disagreement with Senate, power clause, 4162
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3093
Telephone companies, 2644
Toronto Harbour improvements, 2363

Fournier, Mr. C. A. (Bellechasse)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 176. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —Canada's war record—post-bellum conditions, finance, demobilization, returned soldiers, 176-7; franchise—tariff, 178; high cost of living, 179; profiteering—the Press, 180

Fournier, Mr. C. A.—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1649, 1801
Liquor for Siberian Expedition, ques. 845
Pilotage—Shipping Act Amdt., 2806
Proprietary medicines, 2484-7, 3824-7, 3939
Public ownership of railways, 1866
St. Valerie wharf, 2786

Franchise. *See* Women; Dominion Elections Act; Enemy Aliens
Governor General's Speech, 1
Nova Scotia franchise law, 518

Franking of Pamphlets, ques. 1791

Fraser, Mr. Evan E. (Welland)
Welland Canal lock tenders, 604

Fraser, the late John, Auditor General, 115

Fraser River works, 422

Fraser Seigniory, ques. 882

Fraser Valley, *See* Representation Act

Fraserville, Que., Riou Store, ques. 1611

Fraternal Societies, foreign. *See* Insurance Act Amdt.

Free Trade. *See* Budget; Tariff

French Language
Income tax forms, 3712
Loan, printing bonds, 4475
Use of in seconding Address, 17

French River, 1077, 2796

Fripp, Mr. Alfred Ernest (Ottawa)
Bankruptcy Bill
Order of court, 2010
Settlement and preference, 2008-9
Trustee, remuneration of, 2011-2
Board of Commerce, 4557
Daylight Saving, 920
Divorce Court Bill, 3776
Dominion Police, pay of, 2926
Horse racing, 1710
Letter postage rate, 745
Ottawa City and the Dominion Government, 2498, 4250
Pensions, 4191-6, 4207
Prohibition, 2349
War memorial building, ques., 1216
War Purchasing Commission, 3200

Frozen Beef, 1287, 1292

Fuel Control, ques. 612, ques. 1532, ques. 2145

Fulton, Mr. Frederick John (Cariboo)
Good roads, 3904
Judges' salaries, 2954-5
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4288

Fushimi, Prince, visit of, 2455

Gabarus, beach protection, 2780

Galicians and Poland, 3472. *See also* Poles and Ukrainains

Galvanized Iron, 3681, 3689

Game, protection of. *See* Migratory Birds

Garden Villages
Returned soldiers, for, 761, 4012. *See also* War, Soldiers; Soldiers' Land Settlement

Gauthier, Mr. Louis Joseph (St. Hyacinthe-Rouville)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 73. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—unemployment—war debt of France, 73; shipping and conscription—patronage in repatriation medical service, 74; industrial unrest—Liberal party, 76; reconstruction—capital and labour, 77; agrarian question—Opposition's duty, 78

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles Arthur (Témiscouata)
Alcohol in medicines, ques., 646
Berubé, Esdras, 2250
Canadians in Royal Navy, 1434
"Champlain," steamer, 2606
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 858
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 946
Intercolonial Pension Fund, ques. 605
Isle Verte, 2784
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1312
Medical officer to Indians, 1906
Military Service Act, 1313
Defaulters, 971, 1866, 1957, 2250
Privilege, correction, 970
Proprietary medicines, 2481-7
Public Information, Department of, 2145
Riou store, Fraserville, ques. 1611
Seigniorial rights, ques. 882, 2786-7
Taxation Bills originating in Senate, 2490

Gauvreau, Mr. Charles, fire ranger, 2921

Georgian Bay Canal, ques., 843, 1082. *See also* French River Waterway

German Fleet. *See* War

Gibson, Judge, ques. 1440

Gibson, Major, ques. 884

Glace Bay harbour, 4613

Gladu, Mr. Joseph Ernest Oscar (Yamaska)
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1240

Glass, Mr. Samuel Francis (East Middlesex)
Canadian National Railway, 1859
Daylight Saving, 900, 1431
Flax industry, 1537, 1553
London public building, 4611
Proprietary medicines, 3487

Gobeil-Simard investigation, ques. 619

Gold. *See also* Finance Act
Prohibition of export of, 1102
Shipments, ques. 614

Good Roads. *See* Highways

Goodwin, Dr. B. E., ques. 3377, ques. 4070,

Gordon, Hon. Major Rev. C. W., ques. 1440

Government Employees' Compensation Bill.
Res., 701. 1r., 708; 2r., com., 938; 3r., 1029
ques. 4465

Government Ownership
Aeronautics, of, 2053, 2059
Railways, of. *See* Canadian National

Government Printing Bureau. *See* Printing Bureau

Government Railways. *See* Canadian National

Governor General's Speech, 1
Address in reply. *See* Address

Goyette, Magistrate, 2400

Grain. *See also* Canada Grain Act
Fort William and Port Arthur, ques. 604, ques. 605
Interior terminal, 505
Terminal, statistics of, ques. 880
Great Lakes, on, ques. 599
Prices, 537
Seed, ques. 979
Wheat. *See that title*

Grain Supervisors, Board of, 3837

Grand Etang, 2609

Grand Trunk Railway. *See also* Grand Trunk Pacific; Canadian National
Superannuation and Provident Fund, ques. 1213

Grand Trunk Railway Company of Canada Bill. 1r., 111; 2r., 229; com., 1184; 3r., 1210
Government's offer, company's counter 659, 694

Grand Trunk Pacific Railway Receivership Bill. *See also* Canadian National
Res., 649; 1r., 696; 2r., com., 1112; 3r., 1261-2
Statement by Minister, 316

Great Lakes
Armed vessels on, 1261
Government ships on, 2255-8

Great War Veterans' Association
Housing, resolution, 762

Greece, contract with Canada for wheat, ques. 2907

Greek Catholics in communion with Church of Rome, 1383

Green, Mr. Robert Francis (West Kootenay)
Dominion lands, reclamation of, 641
Good roads, 3901
Immigration Act Amdt., 1914

Gregory, Mr. William T., ques. 601

Grey, Mr. George Edwin, habeas corpus, 111

Grierson, Mr. Frank, ques. 613

Griesbach, Brig.-Gen. William A. (West Edmonton)
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 3819; amdt., 3821; withdrawn, 4118
Militia, permanent force, 3976, 3981
Pensions, 4174, 4180, 4195, 4201, 4206, 4282, 4292
"Unmarried wife," 4282
Titles, 2717, 2719

Grisdale, Mr., Deputy Minister of Agriculture, 2961, 2965

Grocers, Wholesale. *See* Private Bills

Grosse Isle, 2784

Guelph Novitiate. *See* Military Service Act

Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3196, 3201, 3211

Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435, 1483

Gustave, Stuart, property bequeathed to Government, 544, ques. 604, 648, 2769, 2770

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh (Solicitor General)
Bankruptcy Bill, 229, 1981-95, 1998-2015, 2467-78
Arrest of debtor ("abscond"), 2266-8, 2279
Bona fide transactions, 2471
Claims, 2472-3
Composition, 1983
Assent to, 1984
Contributory, 2009
Court's jurisdiction, 2268-70, 2474-5
Dividends, no action for, 2471
Inspectors, 2015
Limited partnerships, 2270, 2475
Malicious proceedings, 2272-4, 2279
Meetings of creditors notices, 2014
Non-traders, 2477
Order of Court, 2010
Proof of debt, 2263-4
Secured creditors, by, 2265
Provinces, and, 1998-9, 2008
Settlements and preferences, 2008, 2469-70
Trustees
Appointment, 1984-90, 2468
Discharge, 2472
Insurance by, sale of patented articles, 2006-7
Powers, 2468
Reports, 2468
Security by, 1992-5, 2468-9
Surrendered, 2001
To be kept in force, 1998-9
Substitute, 2000-4
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens, 3816-23, 4110-32, 4257-74

Guthrie, Hon. Hugh—*Con.*
Criminal Code, Aliens and British subjects, 4357-8
Daylight Saving, 903
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1315
Religious conscientious objectors, 782
Sedition, report of Special Com., 3285

Guysborough public library, ques. 846

Halifax
Dennis building, ques. 972
Dry dock, 1281
Explosion, ques. 879
Overseas mails, 886, 929
Terminals, cost of, ques. 2398

Halifax Harbour Master Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2692; 1r., 2695; 2r., com., 2800; 3r., 2802

Halladay, Mr. Howard H. (Bow River)
Budget, 3582
Criminal Code (sexual offences), 2162
Daylight Saving, 902
Hanna townsite and Mr. D. B. Hanna, 1410

Hamilton, Mr. Charles McGill, Director Canadian National Railway, 1638, 1834

Hamilton, Major W. J., ques. 3067

Hanmer, Mr. I. B., cattle breeder, 2995

Hanna, Mr. D. B., 1408. *See* Canadian National Railway

Hanna, Alberta, townsite of, ques. 1535

Harbours. *See their names*
Dues, statement tabled, 40

Harold, Mr. John (Brant)
Budget, 3505. Reply to Mr. McKenzie, 3506; Canadian and American manufacturers, 3507; agricultural implements, 3508; business profits tax, 3509; land tax, 3510; free trade or protection, 3511
Canadian Expeditionary Force, files mislaid, ques. 1108
Freight rates, 3699
Gundy, the late W. P., 3201
Manufacturers' profits, 3699
Ploughs, duty on, 3701
Purchasing Commission, 3200-3
War; removal of bodies of the dead, ques. 1107

Harrison, Mr. Charles Robert (Nipissing)
French River waterway, 1077
Government employees' compensation, 945
Lake Nipissing water-power, ques. 1341

Hart, Mr. James I., ques. 602

Harvesters, admission into Canada, 1944

Hastings, Mr. J. R., appointment, 161, 283

Hawker, Mr., transatlantic flier, 2564

Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 2791

Hay, Mr. Thomas (Selkirk)
Budget, 3583
Immigration, illiterates, 1967
Indian Reserves, expropriation, 2302
Purchasing Commission, 3209

Head tax on Canadians entering United States, 1942

Health. *See* Public Health

Health Department Bill. 1r., 843; 2r., 1164; com., 1182, 1185, 1366; 3r., 1383

Hebrews, illiteracy among, 1967

"Helena," motor boat, ques. 3998

Henders, Mr. Richard Coe (Macdonald)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 454. Peace and its problems, 454; Union Government — Military Service Act, 455; public health—prohibition—daylight saving, 456; reconstruction—tariff, 457
Agriculture and Colonization Com., 4376
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 4010
Board of Commerce, 4558
Budget, 3647. War and after-war problems, 3648; Western farmers and direct taxation — tariff, 3649; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt.—co-operation of interests, 3650
Daylight Saving, 902
Grain trade
Appeal Board, 4100, 4103-4
Speculation, 4105-9
Warehouses and elevators, 4097
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 1572
Pensions, 4297
Ploughs, duty on, 3692
Prohibition, 2662
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2950

High Commissioner, ques. 3242
Reported resignation, 647

High Cost of Living, 394, 409, 523, 1594, 1663, 2921, 3280-3. *See also* Board of Commerce; Combines; Industrial Unrest
Butter, price of, 2063
Daylight Saving and, 896
Measures to reduce, ques. 1792
Minimum wage and, 2908
Special Committee
Appointed, 2953
Reports:
2nd, 4069. Motion (Mr. Nicholson) to concur, 4307; amdt. Mr. McKenzie, neg. on div., motion agreed to, 4333
3rd (recommendations), 4664

Highways, 16, 25, 43, 53, 135, 167, 184, 302, 312, 458, 490, 530, 542, 2791-2
British Columbia mountains, through, 431
Farm work, effect on, 402, 732
Government policy, 731
Prices and, 789
Provinces and, 401
Railways and, 742-4
Transcontinental, 401

Highways Aid Bill. Res., 729, 784, 3899; 1r., 3926; 2r., com., 4386; 3r., 4435

His Majesty the King
Banquet to President Wilson, 103, 148

Historical Monuments, report tabled, 184

Hocken, Mr. H. C. (West Toronto)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 155. Canada's sacrifice in the war—"Department of Public Welfare"—mothers' pensions, 156; old-age pensions, unemployment insurance—trades unions—housing, 157; returned soldiers, pensions, 159; franchise—Bolshevism—the Civil Service, 160; theft of examination papers, 164
Board of Commerce, 4502-3
Canadian National Railway, 1807
Civil Service
Commission, 160
Committees, list of, ques. 617
Examination papers, theft of, 164, 2082, 2084
Post Office Department, salaries, 2082
Toronto letter carriers, 1341
Daylight Saving, 905
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 876
Foran, Mr. J. K., ques. 607
Guelph Novitiate, 1237
National non-sectarian schools, 2430
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2023-6
Newsprint control, 4539, 4547
Post Office statistics, ques. 2903
Quebec City, post office, ques. 2751
Quebec and Hamilton post offices, ques. 2750
Toronto, Montreal, and Winnipeg post offices, ques. 2750
Transmission lines on highways; Hydro-Electric, 3126

Holbrook, Mr. George H., ques. 646

Homestead Entries, ques. 751

Horse Racing, 1710, 4466

Hospitals, 2774. *See also* War
Maternity, 1374
Quebec Military, ques. 844
St. Anne's, 1264
Toronto Base, ques. 845

House of Commons. *For questions of Parliamentary procedure see* Speaker; Deputy Speaker
Adjournments
Ascension Day, 2851
Ash Wednesday, 185
Easter, 886, 1075, 1109, 1162
Leave to discuss urgent matter
Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt, charges of, 1099
Quorum, for want of, 397
Board of Internal Economy, ques. 4, 605
Business of the House
Budget Speech, time of, 1343, 1712, 2752
Government business, precedence for, 1110
Initial Committee rule, suspension of, 4456
Legislation forthcoming or postponed, 599, 1342, 1616, 2398, 3999, 4690
Questions, outstanding, 1342
Chamber, acoustic properties of, 2331, 2337, 2396, 2538, 2657
Committees, standing, 4, 111-2, 696
Estimates, Committee on, proposed, 1557
Daylight Saving and sittings of the House, 970, 1432
Debates, official report of
Committee appointed, 114
Reports
Special editions of members' speeches, 1162, 1206
Volumes, publication of, 2198
Divisions. *See that title*
Galleries, admission to, 1910
Members
Apartments for, proposed, 2498
Representing two ridings. *See* House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill
Sessional indemnity of, 749
War record of, personal list, 195
Ministers in Senate, representation in, ques. 884, ques. 974
Motion, Mr. Euler, 1002
Officers
Clerk of French Journals, 357
Deputy Sergeant at Arms, 4
Messengers, pay of, 1558
Press Gallery, record in the war, 209
Privilege, Senate Address in place of request by Message, 642
Quorum, 397, 2361
Reading room, 318, ques. 843
Returns, inquiries for and statements concerning, 886, 1908, 4000
Sittings
Dominion Day, 4198
Non-suspension of, conference with Senate, 3948
House of Commons—*Con.*
Sittings—*Con.*
Saturday and morning, 3376, 3420
Wednesday, 1109
Speaker, living allowance, 2444
Vacancies, 1163. *See also* House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill
Votes and Proceedings and Journals, 41, 3065, 3292
House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 643
Housing, 15, 30, 45, 53, 144, 157, 223, 333, 530, 542, 1188. *See also* Public Health
Farm buildings in the West, 171
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 761
Loan to provinces of $25,000,000
Inquiry as to time of presenting measures, 1616
Order in Council tabled, 71
Resolution and debate, 2532
Hudson Bay and Strait, 2511
Hudson Bay Railway, 4409
Port Nelson terminals, 4688
Hughes, Gen. William S., 162, 285
Hughes, Lieut.-General Sir Sam (Victoria)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 195. House of Commons members' war record, 195; Military Service Act—Union Government—War Measures Act, 199; politics, patronage, independence — soldiers, regulars vs. irregulars, 200; Canada's rights—political intrigues, 201; the Press, 201, 203; Munitions Board—formation of Union Government, 202; "Canadian Official Record," 203; organization of Canada's forces at the front, 204; St. Julien, Cambrai, Mons, 205; demobilization and repatriation, 207; population, development — Press Gallery record in the war, 209; finance, public debt, 210; munitions—Victory Bonds, 213
Canadians entering United States, head tax, 1110
Canadian Expeditionary Force, rifles and ammunition, 1614
Canadians in Imperal service, 1997
Canadians in Royal Air Force, ques. 646
Canadian soldiers imprisoned, 1434
Circular, farmers and military service, 1326
Civil and religious liberty in re-established countries, 2043
Commercial Cable property, Hazel Hill, N.S., ques. 2046
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4584
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1658-70, 2464-5
Greek Catholic children, 1383-8
Guelph Novitiate, 4620
Motion for Com. of inquiry, 1218

Hughes, Lieut.-General Sir Sam—*Con.*
Halifax Harbour Master, 2801
House of Commons galleries, 1910
Immigration agents in United States, 2586
Interim supply—agreement of leaders, 842
Juvenile delinquents, 1383-8, 3843
Kinmel Camp riots, 316, 424
Land for soldiers, 3071-2
Marine insurance, Roumanian, etc., relief, ques. 2798
Military escort of Roman Catholic bishop, ques. 2296
Military management, charges of General Smart, etc., 1517, 1527
Military Service Act
Defaulters, 4238-9
Uniformity of administration, motion, 1308
Military trials in England, 1959
Militia pensions, 2755-7
Milk—marking of containers, 2345
Nova Scotia, farm conditions, 2586
Pensions, 4183, 4289-91
Committee, 139
Poles and Ukrainians, etc., 2343, 3472, 4466
Princess Patricia's Regiment, ques. 616
Prohibition, 2348, 2350-6, 2668
Purchasing Commission, 3204
Roumania, credit to, 3241
St. John Harbour—Fort Latour, 4302
Scientific research, 4461
Selkirk postmaster, ques. 1308
Service medal, ques. 883
Soldiers' complaints against authorities, alleged suppression, 1618
Soldiers' graves, 332
Trawlers built for Canada, 2210
Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880
War Purchasing Commission, 3199
Wireless stations, 2795
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 984

Hull
Armoury, ques., 1215
Government property in, ques. 1215
Industrial disputes, ques. 2905

Hutterites. *See also* Immigration; Mennonites
Admission to Canada, 1382, 1875
Mass meeting in Winnipeg regarding, 1920

Hydro-Electric. *See* Railway Act

Immigration, 90, 99, 217, 300, 342, 354, 395, 399, 433, 1047
Chinese, ques. 751

Immigration Act Amdt. Bills. *See also* Immigration and Colonization
1. (General.) 1r., 1206; 2r,. 1866; com., 1876, 1910, 1960, 2280; 3r., 2305; Senate amdt., 3175

Immigration Act Amdt. Bills—*Con.*
Alien Labour Act and, 1943
Aliens, enemy, 1945
Definition, 1876
Deportation, 1977
Deputy Minister, 1980
Domicile, 1942, 2286
Exclusion of certain classes, 1916, 1944, 1976-1969, 1923
Inquiry, Board of, 1972
Inspection, 1973
Non-immigrant classes, 1980
Officers, 1972-1980
Transportation companies, 1978-9
2. (Advocates of violence.) 1r., 3211; 2r.. com., 3r., 3213

Immigration and Colonization. *See also* Immigration Act Amdt
Aliens, Government policy respecting, 753
Belgians, 2587
Canada's attractions, 2573
Department of
Agents
United States, 2569, 2588
West, in, 2588
Staff and salaries, 2568-72
Deputy Minister, 1915, 2440
Interpreters, 1972
Exodus of settlers, 2579-81, 2590, 2595
Great Britain, from, 2594, 2596
Hutterites and Mennonites, 2570-1
Land, cheap, 2572-9
Naturalization papers, 754
Northern Ontario and Quebec, to, 2574
Nova Scotia, to, 2582
Policy for all Canada, 2585
Restrictions, proposed changes in the law, 769
Parliament's powers, 773

Imperial Board of Investigation, 3240

Imperial Court of Appeal, ques. 1075. *See also* Supreme Court

Imperial Government, loans to, ques. 1215

Imperial Guards, 2753

Imperial Munitions Board, 19, 2073

Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference, 40, 244, 1044
Cables, 1052
Minister's (Hon. Mr Rowell) statement., 1044
Passports, 1052
Ratification of acts of, 1059
Resolution, 1918 Conference, 1948
Resources of Empire, 1052

Income War Tax. *See also* Budget; Revenue Bills
Assessment, total, ques. 2049
Evasions, alleged, 429

Income war tax—*Con.*
Exemptions, 1917-18, ques. 611
Farmers, ques. 2049
Gross taxable income, ques. 2296
Judges and, 3711-3
Montreal office, ques. 2905
Officials, 2798
Unmarried women and, 3992

Independent Workers of the World. *See* Industrial unrest; Bolshevism; Winnipeg strike

India
Famine in, 2616
Status of, 1045

Indian Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 4171; 2r., com., 4254; 3r., 4257

Indians
British Columbia, 4062
Caughnawaga, 4057
Greater production on farms, 4664
Liquor and, 4063
Manitoba, Saskatchewan, Alberta, and Northwest Territories, 4061
Medical attendance, 4060
Medical officer, ques. 1906
New Brunswick, 4061
Nova Scotia, 4060
Reserves
Opening up of, 414
Parks, expropriation for, 2302
Restigouche, ques. 609
Returned soldiers, lands for, 3807, 4015
Roads and bridges on, 4057
St. Peter's, ques. 1076
Seabird Island, 414
Schools, 4063
Tuberculosis and, 4062

Industrial Disability, Government insurance against, 994

Industrial Relations Commission, 1260, 4620
Personnel, 1305
Scope, 1432

Industrial and Scientific Research, 4376
Com., 1709, 2097, 4457
Report, motion to concur, 4457
Health laboratory, 1370
National Institute proposed, 1565
Vote of $120,000, 3341

Industrial Unrest, 16, 20, 26, 57, 73, 150, 296, 374, 393, 443, 574, 890, 899, 1858, 2883, 2929. *See also* Bolshevism; Board of Commerce; High Cost of Living; Industrial Relations
Conference to settle disputes, 2908, 3194
Discussion on motion to adjourn, 3004
Situation in the West, 2798

Industrial Unrest—*Con.*
Strikes
Canada, in, since signing of Armistice, ques. 2143
England, in, delaying return of Canadian soldiers, 3741
Montreal, 1482, 1615, 1663
Ottawa Street Railway, 4535
Sympathetic, "Collective bargaining," 2851
Time lost due to, 1792
Winnipeg, 2508, 2565, 2616, 2752-4, 2598, 2953, 3241, 3472, 3927. *See also* Post Office Appointments Bill
Arrests and trials, 3740
Prisoners' mooted removal to Kingston, 3587
Riots, 3843
Western situation, 2908

Infant Mortality. *See* Health

Inland Revenue
Bonded warehouses and liquors, 966
Violations, ques. 1536
Department
Expenses of, ques. 3242
Report tabled, 550

Inland Water Navigation
Railway Commission Control Bill. 1r., 71. *See also* Railway Act Amdt.

Inspection and Sale Act Amdt. Bill (Containers). Res., 2344; 1r., 2345; dropped, 3940

Insurance. *See also* Criminal Code
Department, 4479
Marine, Roumanian, etc., relief, ques. 2798

Insurance Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1259; 2r., 1567; ref. to Banking and Commerce Com., 1568; com., 3987; 3r., 3988

Intercolonial Railway. *See also* Canadian National
Express parcels, ques. 2047
Freight stolen at Charmy, ques. 2396
Mulgrave services, 1302
Operation, 4616
Position of, 2131
Property, earnings, expenses, ques. 750
Provident Fund, ques. 605, ques. 2045. *See also* Government Employees' Compensation

Inter-Imperial Trade, proposed Investigation Board, 3327

Interior Department
Deputy Minister, extra salary for immigration work, 2440

International Joint Commission, 462, 1901-4, 2396, 4670
Lake of the Woods Board, 1904

International Waters, sewage in, 1195

Interpretation Act Amdt. Bill (Superior Courts). 1r., 1957; 2r., com., 3r., 2313; Senate amdts., 2959

Interpreters for immigration service, 1972

Intoxicating Liquors
Custom houses as storage places for, 956, 966
Illicit stills, 969
Interprovincial trade in, opinions of Minister and Acting Deputy Minister of Justice, 4133
Northwest, in, statement tabled, 229
Quebec, entered at, ques. 1533
Shipments, prosecutions for, ques. 882
Siberian expedition, for, ques. 845

Intoxicating Liquors Act, 1919, Amdt. Bill. Res., 2345; 1r., 2396; 2r., com., 2654; 3r., 2752. Amdt. (Mr. Cronyn), 2656-7; neg., 2689
Senate amdt., 3782; House disagrees, res., Sir Robert Borden agreed to on div., 4071-2, 4133; Senate insists, 4475; free conference, 4497, 4550, 4572; House insists, 4659-60
Dominion Alliance, 2685
Intemperance
Causes of, 2686
Recreation, a cure for, 2686
Labour and, 2660, 2670-1, 2680
Medicinal value of liquor, 2667, 2682
Native wines, 2668
Ontario Temperance Act, 2655, 2678 2688
Prohibition, extension of, 2658-9
Provinces, 2347, 2662, 2679
Manitoba, 2673, 2678
Ontario, 2676, 2682
Rowntree and Sherwell report, 2685
Saleeby, Dr., opinion of, 2683

Inverness Railway, 4614

Iron, material for galvanizing, 3781, 3689

Irrigation, 4601

Irrigation Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 633; 3r., 696

Isle Perrot bridges, 733

Isle Verte wharf, 2784

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel William (George Etienne Cartier)
Alpine Club, 4046
Bankruptcy Bill, 1983-5, 1992-5, 2000-15, 2264-73, 2468-78
Board of Commerce, 4460, 4552
Bolshevism, 2284

Jacobs, Mr. Samuel William—*Con.*
British Remount Commission, ques. 976
Budget, 3624. Reply to Minister of Finance—Mr. M. Clark and party government, 3625; post-war tariff revision, 3626; Hon. Mr. Crerar's resignation, 3627; Bankruptcy Bill—vacancies in House of Commons, 3630; Hon. Mr. Rowell and Cabinet secrets, 3627, 3631
Butter, price of, 1618
Canadian National Railway
Finance, parliamentary control, 2128
Head office, amdt. 1648, neg. 1653
Combines, 4569, 4590
Amdt., "British subjects," 4590-8; neg., 4591
Criminal Code, 4356-63
Aliens and British subjects, 4356-61
Sexual offences, 2164
Daylight Saving, 893
Deputy Minister of Interior, 2443
Electric and power companies, 4577-9
Employment works, Welland canal, 1600-4
Franchise, 4639
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 940-8
Hebrews
Crime, absence of, 1881
Illiteracy unknown, 1967
Juvenile delinquents, 1386
House of Commons Act Amdt. Bill, 643
Immigration Act Amdt. Bill
Deported conspirators, 1949
Illiterates, 1952, 1967; amdt. proposed, 1960
Open-door policy, 1880
Temporary residents, 1942
Travelling musicians, 1942
Violence against constituted authority, 2284
Income tax, judges—personal explanation, 3720, 4234
Industrial unrest—Winnipeg strike, Peace Conference labour principles, collective bargaining, etc., 3043
Interned alien enemies, ques. 1611
Judges' salaries, 2956-9, 4374
Naturalization, 4118
Amdt., 4120; neg., 4126
Radziwill, Princess, ques. 618
Roumania
Credit to, 1618
Proposed Canadian guard for border, 1618
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, resignations, 4673-6
War expenditure, 1865
Weights and measures, 2150-2, 2159

Japan
Fushimi, Prince, visit of, 2455
Immigration from. *See* Asiatics; Immigration
Market for ships, 2220

Jellicoe, Admiral Sir John, ques. 751

Jenkins, Colonel, report of, 2285, 2294

Jesuits. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Johnston, Mr. J. Fred (Last Mountain)
Budget, 3462. Industrial unrest, 3462; wheat and prices, 3463; School Lands Trust Fund, 3463; Hudson Bay Railway—Victory Loans, 3463; tariff and the land, 3465
Canadian National Railway, 1834
Franchise, 4641
Livestock, pure-bred, 2994
Ploughs, duty on, 3693
Titles, 1478

Jones, General Guy Carleton, ques. 615

Judges Act Amdt. Bills
1. (British Columbia.) Res., 2305; 1r., 2313; 2r., com., 2954; 3r., 2959
2. (Salaries.) Res., 4063, 4212; 1r., 4376; 2r., 4435; com., 4436; 3r., 4439; Senate amdts., 4661
3. (From the Senate.) 4135; 1r., 4377

Jurisdiction, federal and provincial. *See* Public Health; Highways; Technical Education

Juvenile Delinquents Act Amdt. 1r., 970; 2r., com., 1383; not proceeded with, 3843

Kay, Mr. William Frederic (Missisquoi)
Automobiles, Government-owned, ques. 880
Ayrshire and Holstein bulls, ques. 601
Canadian merchant marine, ques. 3998
"Canadian Volunteer," steamer, ques. 3998
Daylight Saving, 921
Food Board revenues, ques. 611
Fuel Control Board, ques. 1532
Military service payments, ques. 601
Newsprint control, ques. 613
Oleomargarine, 3708
Opposition and lower duties, 3703
Public Information Department, ques. 728

Keefer, Mr. Francis Henry (Port Arthur and Kenora)
Canadian Grain Act Amdt., 3955, 4097
Canadian National Railway
Annual meetings, 1646
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1718, 1754
Directors, 1632
Expropriation, 1696
Head office, 1648

Keefer, Mr. Francis Henry—*Con.*
Cost of Living Com., 4317
Demobilization, N.W.M. Police, 2175
Dominion Police, 2926
External Affairs Department, 4669
French River waterway, 1083
Proprietary medicines, 2479-81
Public health, 1195
Medical profession and, 1378
Sewage in international waters, 1195
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2175, 2326
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2946

Kemp, Hon. Sir Edward, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Overseas Military Forces from Canada in the United Kingdom)
Administration of overseas forces, 2294, 2856-83
Demobilization, strikes delaying, 3741
Jenkins, Col., report of, 2294
Negroes, rioting in England by, 3741
Permanent Air Force in Canada, 2867-8

Kennedy, Mr. William Costello (North Essex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 101. Government promises—franchise, 101; Paris Conference, Ministers in attendance, 102; foreign trade, 103; Bolsheviki—returned soldiers, 105; Siberian expedition—pensions, 106; employment of returned soldiers, 107
Budget, 3512. Taxation and public debt, 3512; tax-free debts, 3513; bank amalgamations, 3516; unwise regulation of trade, 3517
Head tax on Canadians entering United States, 1942

Kingsmill, Admiral, ques. 1340

Kingston, Calvin residence as nurses' home, ques. 3377

Kinmel Camp Riots, 315, 462, 550, 1100, 1320. *See also* War
Courts-martial, ques. 3469
Statement by Acting Prime Minister, 512

Knox, Mr. Andrew (Prince Albert)
Budget, 3646. Soldiers' land settlement, 3646; a protectionist Budget, 3647
Fisheries of Prairie Provinces, 2892

Kohn, Mr. Louis, ques. 747

Kriegoff, paintings of, 2447

Labelle, Mr. F. A., ques. 1306

Labour. *See also* Industrial
British Columbia, in, during war, 754
Eight-hour day, 914, 1996, 2856
Farm, shortage—returned soldiers, 140, 3905

Labour—*Con.*
Interprovincial Convention, Calgary, ques. 2143
Organized, opinions on prohibition, 2660
Peace Conference, principles on, 2852
Strikes in 1918, ques. 619

Labour Bureaux, 4607

Labour Department
Crothers, Hon. T. W., resignation as Minister, 139
Representation in House of Commons, ques. 884
Work of, 145

Labour Disputes Board, Chairman, ques. 1535

Lachute, Custom house, ques. 976

Laferriere, Capt. Alban, ques. 3135

Laflamme, Mr. J. K. L., ques. 750, 2042, 2084

Lake of the Woods Technical and Control Boards, 1904, 2067

Lake St. Joseph hotel, ques. 3067

Lalor, Mr. Francis R. (Haldimand)
Bank mergers, 1098
Board of Commerce, 4553
Income tax, 3714
Farmers and, 3733
War expenditures, 1363
Woollen trade, orders, 1363

Lamontagne, Miss Yvette, ques. 1957, ques. 2145

Lanctôt, Mr. Roch (Laprairie and Napierville)
Budget, 3321. The war, 3321, 3324; Province of Quebec—national debt, 3322; expenditure, 3323; French language—tax-free bonds, 3324; indirect taxation, 3326
Judges' pensions, ques. 1109
Loans to Allied countries, ques. 2565

Land. *See also* Dominion
Grants
Canadian Northern Railway, ques. 975
Railway companies, 1873
Religious denominations, ques. 2462
Policy, 587
Settlement of British sailors on, 1875
Surveying—Paris foot, 952-4
Tax, 819. *See* Revenue Bills

Lang, Mr. Norman (Humboldt)
Budget, 3467. Finance and tariff, 3467; aliens and franchise, 3468; pensions and land settlement, 3469
Grierson, Mr. Frank, ques. 613

Langlier, Mr. Justice, 1312

Lapointe, Mr. Ernest (Kamouraska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 242. Canada's soldiers—Peace Conference and world peace, 242; indemnity payable by Germany—Prime Minister's presence at Peace Conference, 243; Imperial War Cabinet—Canada a nation, 244; Mr. M. Clark—reconstruction, 245; tariff — national unity—The Press, 246; Bolshevism—War-time Elections Act, 247
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 3926, 4008
Air Board Bill, 2052
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, schedule, 1787
Directors, 1654
Government ownership, 1746
Head office, 1648
Labour representatives, amdt., 1643, 2137-40
Collective bargaining, 2908
Daylight Saving, 647, 917
Divorce Court Bill, 3785, 3791
Dominion Elections Act, 4622, 4650, 4658
Experimental Farm labourers, war bonus, 2924
Good roads, 4431
Provincial jurisdiction, 3906
Government Employees' Compensation 704, 947-8
Imperial Cabinet and Conference
Constitutional changes resulting from, 1068
Ratification of acts, 1059
Intoxicating Liquors Bill, Senate amdt., 4072
Judges' salaries, 4213, 4228-9, 4237
Laflamme, Mr., expenses of, 2084
Mail-car route, Quebec-Edmundston, 2083
Naturalization, 3816, 3820-2, 4117-26, 4249
Retroactive effect, amdt., neg., 4126
Peace Treaty labour provisions, 4239
Pensions, 4209
Seigniorial rights, 2787
Statistics Act Amdt., 599
Tea duty, 4005
Technical education, 3794, 3804
Titles, 1477
War Measures Act, 2148

Lapointe, Mr. Louis Audet (St. James)
Canadian National Railway
Directors, 1654
Head office, 1649
Labour, industrial unrest, etc., 1663, 3009, 3194
Steamship services, 1285, 1291
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 840
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-4

Laurier, Right Hon. Sir Wilfrid, death of
Adjournment out of respect for, 4
Eulogies: Sir Thomas White, 5; Mr. McKenzie, 7; Mr. Lemieux, 9; Mr. Redman, 14; Mr. Manion, 18; Mr. McMaster, 32; Mr. Sinclair, 51; Mr. Gauthier, 73; Mr. Dechene, 87; Mr. Kennedy, 108; Mr. Duff, 116; Mr. Cockshutt, Mr. Ethier, 133; Mr. Du-Tremblay, 149; Mr. Clark (Red Deer), 231; Mr. McIsaac, 248; Mr. McCoig, 251; Mr. Edwards, 254; Mr. Cannon, 264; Mr. Maclean (Halifax), 272; Mr. Whidden, 221; Mr. d'Anjou, 224; Mr. Cooper, 339; Mr. Pelletier, 393; Mr. Savard, 407; Mr. Stacey, 412; Mr. Fontaine, 419; Mr. McQuarrie, 420; Mr. Archambault, 436; Mr. Denis, 447; Mr. Sinclair (Queen's), 458; Lt.-Col. Peck, V.C., 463; Mr. Fournier, 176; Mr. McGibbon (Muskoka), 181; Mr. Pedlow, 185-6; Mr. Turgeon, 307; Major-General Mewburn, 319; Mr. Cooper, 339-40; Mr. Demers, 344; Mr. Euler, 370; Mr. Anderson, 495; Mr. Ross (Middlesex), 508; Mr. Fortier, 508; Mr. Prevost, 521; Mr. Maharg, 529; Mr. Parent, 540; Mr. Currie (Simcoe), 545; Mr. Lemieux, 567; Mr. Reid (Mackenzie), 587; Mr. Michaud, 166; Mr. Fielding, 473; Mr. Béland, 3293
Monument to, 2797
State funeral ordered, 2

Lavigueur, Mr. Henri E. (Quebec County)
Canada-Great Britain steamship service, ques. 1107
Canadian National Railway
Improvements, ques. 978
Quebec bridge, ques. 977
Quebec and Halifax, ques. 977
Daylight Saving, 891
Dominion exhibitions, ques. 1215
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
National harbours, Quebec, 3752-3
Quebec, Champlain market wharves, ques. 1438
St. Malo workshops, ques. 1212
Transcontinental Railway, ques. 2398

Leader of the House, congratulations to Sir Thomas White as, 397

Leader of the Opposition
McKenzie, Mr. D. D.; Congratulations on election as Leader of the Opposition, 27, 51, 254, 567

League of Nations, 308, 348, 367, 1382, 2042. *See also* Peace
Covenant tabled, 138
Reference in Governor General's Speech, 2

Leduc, Mr. J. Alfred (Westmount-St. Henri)
Dorval building, ques., 610

Leger, Mr. Auguste Théophile (Kent, N.B.)
Agricultural pamphlets, 2991
Canadian National Railway, 1652
Cold storage, 2986
Daylight Saving, 904
Lobster, canned, 722
Local mills and wheat, 2973
Members of Parliament, accommodation for, 2498
Moncton and Buctouch Railway, 1382
Military Service Act, defaulters, 1208; ques. 2566
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Soldiers, furlough in France, 271
Weights and measures, 2153

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe (Maisonneuve, and Gaspé)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 567. Tariff and embargo—new Opposition leader—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 567; "Quebec situation"—Liberals and Unionists, 568; victory and peace—Canada's national status—party government, 570; a free Parliament, 571; outlook for Canada, balance of trade, industrial unrest, 574; complaint of Government inaction, charges by General Smart and Col. Pratt, 575; Council of Agriculture platform, 578; Ministers interrogated, 579; Canada and the Empire, 582; national unity, 585
Aerial service, 1264
Air Board, 2053, 2055-7
Agriculture
British embargo on Canadian cattle, 2962
Literature in both languages, 2975
Production, 2959-60
Baie St. Paul, branch line, 2450
Bank mergers, 1088
Bankruptcy Bill, 1982-93
Belgium, 1874, 2586
Borden, Sir Robert, birthday congratulations, 4133
British sailors on land, settlement of, 1875
Bruce report, 4000
Budget, 3363. Party politics, 3363; Prime Minister and Cabinet, 3364; public debt and economy, 3366; war indemnity—reconstruction, 3369; low tariff, 3370; industrial unrest, 3374; French Canadian Liberals, 3375
Budget Speech, date of, 1712
Business profits war tax, suggested booklet, 4003

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Cables
St. Lawrence, 2794
State control of, 1827
Cadet corps, 1888
Canadian National Railway, 1399
Capital stock, 1826
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1713-5, 1728-9
Directors, ex-soldier, 1638
Finance — receipts and expenditures through consolidated revenue, amdt. 1415, neg. 1418
Lines to be included, 1678-9
Securities of other companies, 1781
Canadian Press news service, 4483
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, oath, 2016
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4699
Canals
Trent, 3187-9
Welland, deepening of, 3184-6
Caughnawaga and St. Lambert roads, 4058
Cavell, Edith, proposed monument, 2447
Civil Service
Commission
Appointment of woman as member of, 2909
Commissioners' salaries, 4496
Commissionership of Customs, 3927, 4380
Post office appointments after strike, 4346-8
Salaries, 2914
Superannuation, 2914-5
Cold storage and food, ques. 2906
Combines, 4593-4
Coté, Eugenie, alias "Venus," case of, 2440, 2808
Criminal code—medietate linguae, 4363-6
Daylight Saving, 888, 1208
Government policy, 970
Ottawa time and parliamentary time, 1342, 1422
Divorce
Fees remitted, number of divorces, 2779
Provincial authority in, 1438, 2779
Dominion Parks, bird sanctuaries, 2304
Dominion Police, 2925-6
Dominion Steel Company, 2251
Drummond, Sir George, sale of paintings, 2447
Fish, inspection, 950
Foreign trade
Credits, 1615, 2171
North Europe, Canada barred, 1909
Japan, 4019
France, need of steamship service to, 1291

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Franchise, 4621-3, 4637
Woman suffrage, 4638
Fuel control, ques. 612
Government measures, time of presentation, 1617
Grand Trunk Railway bondholders, 4245
Housing scheme, 2557, 2562
Immigration, exodus, repatriation, 2581
Imperial Cabinet and Conference, 1070
Imperial Guards, 2753
Income tax, 3712-4
Children, allowance for, 3723
Judges' and others' pensions, 3713
Military pensions, 3722
Montreal office, ques. 2905
Industrial unrest, cause of, 2883
International Joint Commission, 462, 4670
Judges' salaries, 2312, 2955-6, 4221
Kreigoff, paintings of, 2447
Land grants, Canadian Northern, 1873
Langelier, Mr. Justice, 1312
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 9
Loan, $100,000,000, 4243-6
Magdalen Islands, 623, 1300
Mail order houses, 2093
Maps, engraving and distribution, 4047-8
Mercier, Cardinal, visit of, 1482; ques. 1611
Mignault, Mr., K.C., 462, 4670
Military management overseas, 2883-7
Charges of Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1483, 1494-5
Military Service Act, 1312
Guelph Novitiate, 1232
Militia Department, overseas administration, 1099-1100
Militia
Pensions, 2758
Permanent force, 2980-1
Policy concerning, 1888
Mining industry, 4007-8
Montreal income tax office, ques. 2905
Murray Bay, ferry, 4335
Naturalization, 4111-31
Judicial vs. administrative powers, 4111
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1562, 2016, 2024-30, 4482
Nile Voyageurs, 4380
Ocean rates, 1051
Orders in Council, government by, 2554
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4248-50, 4380-3
Ottawa highways, 2792
Paradis, Mr., claim of, 3189
Paris agency, 1901
Parliament Building, 4621
Peace Treaty, 3473
Ratification of, 3937
Text, receipt of, 2096

Lemieux, Hon. Rodolphe—*Con.*
Pensions, 4186, 4200-4, 4206-9
"Unmarried wife," 4275, 4278, 4284-6
Amdt., neg. on div., 4338
Pilotage—Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 2805
Press, The, attitude of, 2917. *See also under this head* Newspapers
Proprietary medicines, 2488, 2492, 3939
Purchasing Commission, 3216, 4445
Advertising, 3232
Amdt. (six months' hoist), 3220; neg. on div. 3226
Exclusive power, 3232
Supplies that may be purchased, 3238-9
Religious conscientious objectors, 781, 784
Rental of buildings for the Government, 3236
Returned soldiers as mining prospectors, 4045
Rimouski and overseas mail, 886
St. Charles River improvements, Belanger vs. The King, 1021, 1026
St. Lawrence River water powers, 886, 1796, 1901, 4048
Schools and religious teaching, 2415
Seigniorial rights, 2787
Shell Oil Company, 929, 4070
Shipbuilding, transportation, trade, 2227
Sifton, Sir Clifford, office in London, ques. 1908
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2762, 2765, 2771
Technical education, 3171
Titles, 2742
Trade and Commerce Department, 2171, 2227-9
Transatlantic mail service, 1711
Vancouver harbour, 4017-9
Votes and Proceedings, and Journals, 3292
War expenditures ($350,000,000), 2169-71
"Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2172, 2241
Washington, representation at, 1075, 2075-7, 2201
Witley Camp riot, 3472
Woman masquerading as man, 2440, 2808
Woman suffrage, 4638
Ypres war memorial, 4465

Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612

Lesage, Mr. Joseph Edmond (Hochelaga)
Montreal, conveyance of mails, ques. 979
Public health—Orders in Council, 1369
Registration of defaulters, ques. 610

Letter Carriers, 1341. *See also* Civil Service

Letter postage rate, ques. 745, 4621

Lévis
Aqueduct, ques. 1789
Rifle Association, ques. 1213
Station, 2458

Lewis, Mr. J. H., 270

L'Hereux, Major Napoleon, ques. 978

Library of Parliament
Committee, 114-5
Report, 2

Life-saving stations, ques. 606, 2850

Lighthouses and keepers, 2608-13

Little Current, 2789

Little Sands, 2609

Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1570; 1r., 1572; 2r., com., 2061; 3r., 2143

Livestock, shipments, inspection, 2603

Livingstone's Cove, 2780

Loans
Allied countries, to, ques. 2565
Imperial Government, to, ques. 1215
Printing of bonds in both languages, 4475
Temporary, outstanding, report tabled, 138
$100,000,000, New York, cost of, ques. 1907
$75,000,000, 4198
$100,000,000 Loan Bill. Res., 1r., 4242; 2r., com., 4243; 3r., 4335

Loggie, Mr. William Stewart (Northumberland, N.B.)
Bankruptcy Bill, 2005, 2012
Budget, 3651. Free food, 3651; manufacturers' profits, 3652; cost of living—wheat prices—Union Government, 3653
Fish, refrigerator service, 2890
Live Stock Amdt. Bill—cold storage, 2063
Lobster, canned, 714-727
Pilotage, 2610, 2805
Steamship services
Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, 1303
West Indies, 1287-8
Weights and measures, 2156

Lunenburg Harbour, 2607

Lyons Fair, 3840

Macauley, Capt. A. C. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Macdonald, Mr. E. M., trade discrimination, cable from, 140

Macdonell, soldier imprisoned, 1434

Mackenzie & Mann. *See* Canadian National; Railway Act Consolidation

Mackie, Mr. Henry Arthur (East Edmonton)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 347. League of Nations, 348; Canada's national status—Province of Quebec—tariff, 349; freedom of the Press and of the Bench, 350; military service defaulters—Peace Conference and attendance of Prime Minister—war indemnity—education, provincial rights, 351; autocracy and democracy, 352

Mackie, Mr. Henry Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway
Extension of time, 1713-9, 1726, 1745
Public ownership, 1745
Canadian Northern Railway
Arbitration, ques. 1214
Bonds, ques. 4241
Equipment Trust, ques. 4240
Securities, ques. 1214
Civil Service Act Amdt., 2921
Civil Service and returned soldiers—Rangers Gauvreau and Trudel, 2921
Coal, railway contracts for, 1909
Criminal Code—neglect, 4362
Daylight Saving, 910
Deputy Minister of Railways, ques. 1215
Fairweather, Mr., ques. 2145
Good roads, 4422
Henry and Ferguson, Messrs, ques. 2045
House of Commons, difficulty in hearing speakers, 1211
Housing scheme, 2538-9, 2548
Immigration, 1932
Labour situation in the West, 2799
Militia, permanent force, 3978
Naturalization, 4262-8
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4282, 4286
Post office appointments after strike, 4354
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2619-22, 2628, 2652
Judges, transportation on railways, 2640-1
Schools, national, 2430
Ukrainians, 1932-8

Mackie, Mr. Herbert J. (North Renfrew)
Canadian National Railway, coal, res., 2906
Mail contracts, 2081
Pembroke wharf, 2787
Pensions, case of Col. G. Hunter Ogilvie, 2761
Upper Ottawa dams, 2796

MacLennan, Judge F. S., ques. 1075, ques. 1106, ques. 1906, ques. 2905

Maclean, Hon. A. K. (Minister without portfolio)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 272. Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister, 272; finance, public loans, 274; Civil Service Commission, appointments, methods, Secretary, 274
Air Board Bill, 1864, 2050-6
Buoys, Atlantic coast, 1910
Bureau of Statistics, 3838-9
Canada Grain Act, administration, 3837-8, 4094-4109
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3942
Senate amdts., 4664
Canada Trade Commission, 4493-4

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Canada Year Book, 3839
Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 3842
Canadian National Railway
Directors, payment of, 1654
First meeting, 1660
Head office, 1649
Civil Service
Commission. *See also, under this title,* Address
Appointments, 3230
Returned soldiers and women representation on, 2909, 2918
Salaries and contingencies, 4496-7
Efficiency, Committee of Inquiry, 1556-7
Labour and statistics, 4672
Overmanning of, 4604
Reclassification, 2203, 3519, 3927-8. *See also under this head,* Civil Service Act Amdt.
Returned soldiers and, 1001, 2921
Trade and Commerce Department, salaries, 4606
War bonus, 2924-8
Civil Service Act Amdt. Bill, 2909-22
Arthur Young & Co., 2111
Commissioners, 2914
Salaries of civil servants, 2914, 2922
Superannuation, 2915
Coasting, reciprocity in, 1209
Copyright, 4022
Editorial Com., 1566
Eight-hour day, 2856
Fertilizers Act Amdt. Bill, 1568, 2286-90, 2463-7
Fisheries
British Columbia licenses, 933, 936
Fish Inspection Act Amdt. Bill, 949-952
Flax, bounty, 3842
Foreign credits, 3832-6, 3831
Foreign trade
Lyons and other fairs, 3340
North Europe, Canada barred, 1909
High cost of living, 2908
House of Commons—Free conference with Senate, no suspension of sitting of House, 3249
Industrial and scientific research, 3341
Industrial unrest
Strikes
Montreal, 1566, 1615, 1663
Winnipeg, 2508, 2799, 2854-5, 2665, 3845
Danger to constituted authority, after-war conditions, etc., 3046
Magdalen Islands—Pictou service, 625
Marking of containers, 2344-5
Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt.—lobsters, 713-727

Maclean, Hon. A. K.—*Con.*
Montreal power strike, 1566
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1565
Nova Scotia fishing fleet, 1866
Panama Canal, trade via, 1283
Patent, Trade Mark and Design, Copyright and Timber Marking Act Amdt., 4021
Patents Branch, 3808
Proprietary Medicine Bill, 2479-87, 2492-3, 2653-4, 3823-7, 3939-40
Royal Navy, Canadians in, 1568
Shipping and shipping rates, 4684-6
Statistics Act Amdt., 139, 595-9
Steamship services, 1105-6, 1282-1305
Australia, etc., 1105
Baddeck and Iona, 1300
European ports, subsidy not needed, 1291
Freight rates, 3830
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
Great Britain, 1282
Gulf of St. Lawrence, 3827-8
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1301
Mulgrave, 1302-4
Newfoundland, 1283, 1294
Petit de Grat and Mulgrave, 1303
Petitcodiac and Cumberland, 1303
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, 1304
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or, 1304
South Africa, 1289
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
West Indies and South America, 1283
Trade Commissioners, 3831
Units of electrical measure, 139
Weights and Measures Act Amdt. Bill, 952-4, 2149-59, 2290
Senate amdt., 4021

Maclean, Mr. W. F. (South York)
Canadian National Railway, 1824
Cost of Living Com., 4317, 4325
Daylight Saving, 906
Freight rates and Government-owned railways, 3697
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 672
Non-ferrous metals—nickel, 3681-2
Railway Act Consolidation—Municipal and provincial freight bargains, 4141, 4147, 4150
Railway question and tariff question, 675
Railways, public ownership of, 672, 3694
Senate and House of Commons, 643
Senate reform, 4167
Tariff and public ownership, 3694
Weights and measures, 2157
Wheat prices, 4466

MacNutt, Mr. Thomas (Saltcoats)
Budget, 3567. Production and taxation, 3568; land tax—manufacturers' prices, 3569

McCoig, Mr. Archibald Blake (Kent, Ont.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 250. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—tariff—free tractors and ditchers, 251; prices, competition in agricultural implements, 252; highways—housing—commissions, Food Board, 253; Civil Service—demobilization of men in camps in Canada, 254
Board of Commerce, 4501-5
Budget, 3601. Production and economy, 3602; profiteering — conscription of wealth, 3603; agricultural implement duties—tractors, 3604; food prices, 3605
Daylight Saving, 892, 903
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569, 2465
Government railways, private cars, 1589
Livestock Act Amdt., 1572
Oleomargarine, 2201
Rural mail couriers, pay of, 2926
Weights and measures, 2157
Wheat, price of 1919 crop, 4466

McCrea, Mr. Francis N. (Sherbrooke)
Bank mergers, 1096
Board of Commerce, 4515
Canadian National Railway, 1850
Civil Service organization, 1271
Daylight Saving, 925
Deputy Minister of Interior, 2443
Good roads, 4410
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 1154
Newsprint control, 4541, 4547
Seed grain, 1033-5
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 838

McCurdy, Mr. F. B. (Colchester)
Civil Service appointments, ques., 2049
Intercolonial Railway rates, 4170
Public Buildings, 4610
Truro, 4611
Resignation from Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 4676
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, res., 981; withdrawn, 1002

McDougald, Mr. Bryson, ques. 2398

McFall, Mr., Food Controller, ques. 4464

McGibbon, Mr. Peter (Muskoka)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 181. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Liberal party, 181; Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister—public debt and resources, 182; returned soldiers—tubercular cases, 183; highways—public health, 184

McGibbon, Mr. Peter—*Con.*
British Nationality, Naturalization, etc., Bill, 3823
Canadian Expeditionary Force, patients in England, ques. 615
Civil Service Commission, returned soldier for, 2918
Divorce Court Bill, 3779, 3790
Good roads, 3909
Housing scheme, 2534, 2547
Interned enemy aliens, ques. 844
Jones, General Guy Carleton, ques. 615
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1244
Militia, Permanent Force, 3974
Paralytic military patients in Euclid Hall, ques. 749
Pay and Allowance Board, ques. 3998
Pensions, 4172
Board, ques. 3066
Payments, ques. 1307
Pratt, Col. A. C., statements of, ques. 1213, ques. 1216
Proprietary medicines, 2480-6, 2492, 2654, 2825-6
Public Health Department, appointments, 1182
Purchasing Commission, 3227
Scientific research, 1193, 1371
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2767-8, 2774-6
Deputy Minister, ques. 2586
Staff, ques. 4240
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3886
Technical education, 3174, 3805
Telephone companies, 2648
Totally disabled soldiers, ques. 1213
Transatlantic flight, ques. 2143
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2988

McGibbon, Mr. Peter Robert (Argenteuil)
Farming will save the country, 2963
Lachute custom house, ques. 970
Live Stock Act Amdt., 2066-7
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1502
Soldiers' land settlement, 3870

McGregor, Mr. Alexander (Pictou)
Pictou registrar, ques. 2144

McGregor, Mr. James D., cattle breeder, 2995

McIsaac, Mr. James (Kings, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 248. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Canada's status after the war, 248; franchise—alien enemies—Opposition critics—Peace Conference and presence of Prime Minister, 249; Liberal party—national unity, 250
Boughton Island, 2784
"Brant," steamer, 2607

McIsaac, Mr. James—*Con.*
Budget, 3517, 3519. Policy of protection—debt and revenue, 3518; reciprocity, 3519; labour troubles, East and West, 3520; public debt, 3521
Divorce Court Bill, 3779
Good roads, 3906
Judges' salaries, 2306, 4214, 4372
Little Sands, 2609
Magdalen Islands-Pictou service, 624
North Lake, 2784
Pictou-Montague service, 1304
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3190
Prohibition, 2687
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Souris fish drier, ques. 1662, ques. 3470
Technical education, 3799, 3893, 4136

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D. (Cape Breton North and Victoria). *See also* Leader of the Opposition
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 21. Chosen leader of the Opposition—congratulations to mover and seconder—Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 22; returned soldiers—distribution of population, 23; Canada's war record—orders in council—franchise, 24; highways—public health, 25; capital and labour, 26; economy—standard of living—Liberal party—"Light in the window," 27
Agricultural implements, freight rates on, 4010
Agriculture, increased production, 2959-60
Small farms, 2975
Agriculture Department, publications, 2989-91
Air Board Bill, 2051-2, 2059
"Alert," The, 1966
Alien enemies, 773. *See also under this head,* Immigration
Baddeck and Iona wharves, 2611
Bankruptcy Bill, 933
Proof of debts, 2264
Trustee, 1981, 1986-8
Remuneration of, 2012
Replacement by creditors, 2003
Banks, excess circulation, 635
Board of Commerce, 4471, 4530, 4554, 4566
Bronze coins, 638
Budget, 3487. Reply to Mr. Cowan, 3487; coal and iron duties, 3490; bounties and protective duties, 3491; public expenditures, 3493; cost of living, 3494; Hon. Mr. Rowell, 3495; Government control of profits—"produce and save," 3496; fisheries, 3497; aliens—labour, 3498; industrial court proposed, 3499; party government — Liberal party's

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
trade policy, 3501; lessons of the war, 3504
Business of the House
Measures forthcoming, 1342, 3999
Business profits and income taxes, 3709
Cabinet Ministers in Senate, 1009, 2073
Canada Evidence Act Amdt., 1389-93
Canada Medical Act Amdt., 3240
Canada Shipping Act Amdt., 3755-6, 3935
Canadian National Railway Bill
Capital stock, 1842
Committee, reference to, suggested, 1621
Constituent companies, 1694
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1709, 1719, 1721, 1730, 1760-7
Directors, 1656, 1661
Responsibility to Parliament, 1674
Executive Com., 1668
Expenditures, how controlled, 2115
First meeting, amdt., 1667
Fiscal year, 1705
General policy, 1730
Labour troubles, reported, 1617
Lines to be included, 1677-80
Management and "politics," 1675
Parliamentary control, 1418
Power to acquire securities of other companies, 1862
Public ownership, 1398-9, 1730, 1750, 1757, 2115
Questions asked, 1610
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association —oath, 2016, 2295
Canadians in distress abroad, 2600
Canadians in the war—the nation's gratitude, 4698
Canals
Positions on, and returned soldiers, 3176-7
Welland, deepening of, 3180
Cape Breton public works, 2782
Censorship: Lewis, Mr. J. H., case of, 270
Christmas Island-East Bay postal route, 2083
Civil Service
Commission, 3234
Efficiency, special com., 1560, 2913
Extra employees during war, 4706
Patronage, 3234
Sessional employees, bonus, 2313-4, 2927
Clark, Mr. Michael, and protection, 3748
Closure, interpretation of rule, 1796
Coal, briquetting of, 4489
Coal used by government railways, ques., 611
Cold storage, 2980-1, 2986
Combines, 4601

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Corporation, influence in public affairs, 2039
Cost of Living Com., 4320
Criminal Code
Seditious books, etc., 4368
Sexual offences, 2166, 4689
Unlawful associations, 4356
Customs, preventive service, 966
Customs warehouses as storage places for liquor, 956
Customs war tax, 3708
Deserters, punishment of, 72
Divorce Court Bill, 3783-9
Divorce, Privy Council decision, 4535
Dominion Elections Act, 4623, 4648, 4655-7
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt., 2298-9
Mineral claims, 2300
Dominion Steel Company, 2251, 2254
Dominion water powers, 2519, 2531
Economy in expenditure, 4245
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4587
Elevators and American grain, 3837-8
Employment works and contracts, 1604-6
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2288
Finance Department salaries, 4477
Fire prevention, 1578-9, 1583
Fisheries
British Columbia canning, 2098
Guardians, 2890-3
Inspection, 949, 951
Maritime Provinces, 2896
Pickled fish, of, 2898
Fisheries Act Amdt. (Salmon), 3759
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payment to, 865
Flint, the late Thomas Barnard, 1341
Foreign credits, 1359, 2188, 2196, 3832
Gabarus beach protection, 2780
Government advertising, 2038
Government by Order in Council, 4488
Government Printing Bureau, strike, 513
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 651, 1145, 1161
Government's legal position, 695
Grand Trunk Railway Bill, 1184
Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435, 1483
Halifax harbour master, 2694, 2801
Halifax-St. Pierre-Miquelon mails, 2092
Health Department, 4380
Highways, 731, 4408, 4431-3
Horse racing, 4466
House of Commons
Privileges of—Senate's action, 642
Procedure, reinstatement, preliminary motion under rule 25, 398
Saturday and morning sittings, 3376
Vacancies, 1615
Housing scheme, 2555, 2559, 2564

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Immigration and Colonization
Aliens, 2584
Chinese, 2599
Clearance, 1975
Deportees returning, 1977
Illiterates, 1954-67
Inspection, 1973
Lands and land policy, 2575, 2582-3
Nova Scotia, to, 2582-6
Income tax, judges, 3175-9
Indians and Eskimo, 4669
Industrial unrest—Government responsibility; cost of living, capital and labour—tribunal to settle disputes, etc., 3051, 3499
Inland Revenue Act Amdt., 1588
Irrigation Act Amdt., 633
Judges' salaries, 2308, 2955-9, 4368, 4373, 4437-9, 4661
Kinmel Camp, 462
Labour disputes, conference, 2908, 3051
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 7
Little Bras d'Or, 2789
Live stock, pure-bred, 2992-7
Live Stock Act Amdt., 1570, 2062-6
Loans made and to be made, 2245-50
$100,000,000, 4245
$75,000,000, 4198
Lobster packing, 2989
Magistrates and Military Service, 1313
Mail contracts, 2079-83
McRae, Col. J. D., 2234
Migratory birds, 2165
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1529
Military Service Act, 1313
Defaulters, 4238
Guelph Novitiate, 1257-9
Mining Act, need of, 425-7
Minister of Railways, annual statement expected, 1588-9
Ministerial changes, 139
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners, 3757
National harbours, control of, 3742, 3745
Naturalization, 4265-73
Naval service
Charges of Mr. Duff, 2842
Halifax, demobilization of men, 2224
Rebuff by master of N.R. 30, 2947
Neil's harbour, 2781-2
Newsprint control, 4548, 4662
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2038
Opposition and the tariff, 3701
Orders in Council, 1368
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4248
Ottawa Street Railway strike, 4535
Partisan appointments, 2095

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Peat, 4490
Pensions, 3000, 4187-90, 4208
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4293
Pilotage, 2806-7, 3158, 3160
Post office revenue and expenses, 2037
Printing Bureau strike, 312
Public Health Bill, 1186, 1189, 1203
Social welfare, 1193-4
Public ownership, 1398-9, 1730, 1750, 1757, 2115
Purchasing Commission, 3228-39, 3810, 3814, 4454
Radiotelegraph service, 2849
Railway Act Consolidation, 2617-33
Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2631-3
Disagreement with Senate, proposed three-year limit, 4169
Telephone companies — compensation, 2649, 4168
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3090, 3098, 3103, 3115
Railway crossings, 937
Railway rates, municipal and provincial bargains, 4142
Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209
Reclamation of Dominion lands, 639
Royal Naval College, 2851
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1025
St. John harbour, 2359, 4306, 4337-8
Scotch Cove, breakwater, 2782
Seed grain, 1036, 1041
Shipbuilding, 2251, 2254
Soldiers' war gratuity, 2234
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 4681
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 2778, 3870
Default, re-sale, 3883
Exemption from legal process, 3885-7
Expropriation, 3889-90
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Steamship subsidies
Baddeck and Iona, 1296, 1299
Home prices and, 1292
Newfoundland, 1295, 3829
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
Strikes
Calgary, postal employees, 3194
Post office appointments after strike, 4351
Winnipeg, 2855, 2953, 3070, 3241, 3328, 3472, 3587, 3843, 3927
Trial of arrested parties, 3740
Supply, interim vote, 1919-20, 842
Sydney port, charges, 3158
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 808
Taylor, Senator George, death of, 885

McKenzie, Mr. Daniel D.—*Con.*
Technical education, 3166, 3173
Payment of subsidy by population, 3893
Provinces and, 3894-8
Titles, 1471, 2703
Trade Commissioners, 4494
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2989
"Tyrian," steamer, 2793
Vancouver harbour, 4017-20
Vocational training, under-age soldiers, 1019
War expenditure, 1359
Vote of $350,000,000, 2166, 2187, 2198, 2224-6, 2232
"Any measure deemed necessary or advisable," 2244
War indemnity, Canada's claim, 777-780
War Measures Act, 2148
Weights and measures, 952-3, 2154-8, 2290
Welland Canal contracts, 1597-1610
Wrecking plants, 2604
Yarmouth bar, 2783
Yukon Act Amdt., 593-5
Yukon placer mining, 630-2

McLean, Mr. Hugh Havelock (Royal)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1989, 1992-4
New trustee (amdt.), 2002-4
Notice of purpose of meeting, 2014
Order of court, 2010
Security, default, 2000
Trustee, remuneration, 2011

McLean, Mr., Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2631

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross (Brome)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 32. League of Nations, 32; financial position — taxation — franchise, 33; congratulations to mover and seconder—national unity—labour and capital, 34; Bolshevism, 35; Siberian force, 36; orders in council —party government, 37; finance and tariff, 38
Agricultural implements, freight on, 4009
Alpine Club, 4046
Bankruptcy Bill, 1985, 1992-5, 2006-8, 2265-74, 2278-80
Beef production, 2962
Board of Commerce, 4528-33, 4549-54, 4561
Budget, 3242; amdt. moved, 3260
War expenditures—purchase of Canadian Northern Railway, 3243; national debt—Canadian currency, 3244; taxation, 3247, 3251; trade balance, 3250; estimates, 3251; "Canadian Official Record"—Bureau of Public Information—shipbuilding—housing scheme—Roumanian loan, 3252; high cost of living—tariff, 3254; duty on coal, 3256; mergers, 3259

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1647, 1805
Capital stock, 1821
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1715-7
Directors, amdt., 1632; withdrawn, 1636
Expenses to be paid out of revenues, 1701, 1705, 2111
First meeting, 1659
Government policy asked for, 1396-7
Orders in Council, 1692
Parliament and expenditure, 2111
Canadian Press news service, 4482-6
Cheese, 2962
Civil Service, equality of conditions in, 4479
Combines, 4591
Criminal Code, 4356-62
Aliens and British subjects, 4358-9
Sexual offences, 2161
Unlawful associations, 4356
Dominion Elections Act, 4658
Dominion Iron & Steel, and Nova Scotia Steel & Coal, 2342
Dominion water powers, 2526-9
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2289-90
Fisheries inspectors, 2891
Flour mill machinery, 4006
Good roads, 4389
Government by Order in Council, 2549
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 940-6
Grain Act Amdt., Appeal Board, 4101
Housing scheme, 2537, 2549
Immigration Act Amdt.—deportation, 1977
Income War Tax
Payment on making return, 3737
Personal and living expenses, 3988-9
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3727
Unmarried women, 3993
Irrigation Act Amdt., 633
Judges' salaries, Mr. Justice Weir, 4369
Labour's share in railway management, 1823
Lobster, canned, 715-6
Militia
Permanent force, 3967-9
Policy and expenditure, 1889
Milk—marking of containers, 2345
Mines Branch, 4490-1
Newsprint control, 4539
Objectionable words addressed to, point of order, 2538
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4005
Ottawa, Wellington street, 2497
Parliament Buildings, Hall of Fame, 2503
Patronage, 1271, 1278

McMaster, Mr. Andrew Ross—*Con.*
Pensions, 4280, 4292
Grandjean, Julien, case of, 4032
"Unmarried wife," 4280
Press, the, and Government advertising, 1822
Public health, 1377
Purchasing Commission, 3222, 4449
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2631
Seed grain, 1040, 1043
Shipbuilding, 2255
Steamship subsidies, 1290
Subsidies, policy, 1298
Tariff—amdt. to Supply, 794
Titles, 1464, 2710
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3110
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1015
Wheeler, Mr. S., wheat grower, 2973
Wireless on Government vessels, 2809
Yukon placer mining, 631

McQuarrie, Mr. William Garland (New Westminster)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 419, 424. British Empire and Canada, 419; Royalty and aristocracy and the war—Canada's war record—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 420—new leader of the Opposition—Peace Conference, attendance of Prime Minister—Ministers and their duties, 421; Fraser river works, 422; Canadian Northern and New Westminster, 423; Canadian National Railway, 424-5; New Westminster and railways—British Columbia fisheries, 426; International Commission, Major Burdé's charges, 427; waste of fish, 428; Chief Inspector of Fisheries, office—income tax, abuses, 429; business profits tax—highways, 430; highway through British Columbia mountains—"Official Record"—technical schools—Health Department, 431; cost of living—immigration, Orientals in Canada, 433; Bolshevism—returned soldiers, 433, 435
Canadian National Railway, director from British Columbia, 1629
Civil Service war bonus, 2927
Daylight Saving, 904
Fisheries, British Columbia inspector, ques. 1534
Good roads, 3904
Railway Act Consolidation
Amdts., opportunity to make, sought, 2929, 3476, 4064, 4137
Municipal agreement, 4137

McQuarrie, Mr. William Garland—*Con.*
Railway Act Consolidation—*Con.*
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3095
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2948

Magdalen Islands, 623, 1910, 2794
Pictou service, 625

Magistrates. *See* Military Service

Maharg, Mr. John A. (Maple Creek)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 529. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 529; Peace Conference—Party and the farmers, 530; highways—housing—prohibition, 531; farmers' platform, 532; tariff, 534; manufacturers and Western farmers, 535; Union Government, 536; question of markets, 537; grain prices, 539; possible by-elections, 540
Bankruptcy Bill, provinces and, 2007
Budget, 3634. Returned soldiers—Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3635; direct taxation—freights, 3636; Hon. Mr. Calder, 3637; Western farmers' organizations, 3638; Western farmers and co-operation and income tax, 3639; apples—oleomargarine—labour troubles, 3640; regulation of food prices—land values tax, 3641; tariff reductions, 3642
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 4957-65, 4084-7
Appeal Board, 4101-5
Excess profits tax, ques. 977
Franchise, 4641
Good roads, 3899, 3910, 3925
National harbours and grain trade, 2749-52
Ploughs, duties on, 3690-6
Amdt., 3704
Seed grain, 1038, 1043
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3869
Incumbrances, 3884
Initial payments, 3881
Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties on, 3707

Mahon, Mr. C. E., ques. 1612, ques. 1790, ques. 2295

Manion, Mr. Robert James (Fort William and Rainy River)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (seconder), 17. Bi-lingualism, 17; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Victory—demobilization, 18; Canada's war record, 19; employment bureaux—Canada's development—war work of women, 20; public health—immigration—Canada's duty, 21
Budget, 3280. Tariff changes, 3280; high cost of living, profiteering, 3281; New Zealand's experience, 3282; profiteering and revolution condemned—

Manion, Mr. Robert James—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
natural resources, development of, 3283
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3943, 3957
Appeal Board, 4103-4
Canadian National Railway, 1803
Civil Service Commission, returned soldier as member, 2909
Elevators and American grain, 3838
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 871
Military management, charges of General Smart, etc., 1526
Militia pensions, 2760
Parliament Buildings, 2339
Pensions, 4199, 4203
Case of John Taylor, 3001
"Unmarried wife," 4281
Proprietary medicines, 2491-3, 3824-6
Public Health Bill, 1179, 1202-3
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2325
Shipbuilding, 2259-60
Slate River—Roslyn station, ques. 3191
Technical education, 3798
Titles, 1475, 2718
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 985

Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
ity and, 711

Manitoba Surface Waters, Dominion author-

Manufacturers. *See* Tariff

Maple Syrup and Sugar, ques. 645

Marcil, Hon. Charles (Bonaventure)
Armed vessels on Great Lakes, 1261
Atlantic, Quebec and Western Railway, ques. 605
Canadian National Railway
Branch lines, 1677, 1681-2
Directorate, representation of provinces, 1670
Carleton, Que., mail service, ques. 727
Civil Service reclassification, ques. 610
Fisheries jurisdiction, ques. 609
Good roads, 4424
Matapedia Valley, ques. 1662
Government vessels, employees on, ques. 609
Matapedia aqueduct, ques. 745
Naturalization, 4258-9
New Carlisle postmaster, ques. 727
Oyster culture, ques. 609
Pensions, 4178, 4201, 4205-9
Port Daniel lobster hatchery, ques. 609
Quebec Oriental Railway, ques. 605
Restigouche Indian Reserve, ques. 610
Strikes, 1663
Vocational training, ques. 971
West Indies, trade with, ques. 1533

Marcile, Mr. Joseph Edmond (Bagot)
National Service registration, ques. 1075, ques. 1307, ques. 2296

Marine and Fisheries
Committee, 114
Department
Quebec buildings, ques. 1217, ques. 1439, ques. 1439
Report tabled, 40
Staff and salaries, 2600

Marine Hospitals, 1201

Market Gardening, profits of, 764

Marlow, Col. F. W., ques. 3066

Marshall, Mr. David (East Elgin)
Canned goods, net weight, 2153
Daylight Saving, 903

Marshall, Lieut. Hall, ques. 1790

Martin, Mr. Peter Francis (Halifax)
Pilotage, 2808

Massett, wharf, ques. 603

Masters and Mates, examination, 2601

Matapedia
Aqueduct, ques. 745
Bridge, 2790
Highway expenditure, ques. 1662

Matches, stamps on, 969

Mayrand, Mr. Hormisdas (Maskinongé)
Coast protection, ques. 745
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, ques. 603
Guinness, Hon. Rupert, and, ques. 603

Meat and Canned Foods Act Amdt. (Lobsters). Res., 713; 1r., 727; 2r., ref. to standing com., 2097

Meat Supply and foreign demand, 3831

Medicines. *See* Proprietary

Meighen, Hon. Arthur (Minister of the Interior and Superintendent General of Indian Affairs)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 514. Tariff, duty on implements, 514; freedom of Parliament—party government, 515; War-time Elections Act, 518; disfranchisement—Canada at the Peace Conference, 518; Union government, 521
Alien enemies, 756
Alpine Club, 4046-7
Bills to be introduced, 4456
Board of Commerce, 4466, 4524, 4528-9, 4549-67
British subjects interned in Canada, 1713
Canada Evidence Act Amdt. Bill, 1388-94

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway Bill
Abandoning lines, 1709
Capital stock, 1776-8
Advances and securities, 1778
Canadian Northern subsidiaries, 1784
Closure of debate, 1789
Interpretation of rule, 1796
Constituent companies, 1694
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1715, 1727, 1760, 1765
Schedule, 1785
Directors, 1624-7, 1653-6, 1783
Executive Com., 1668-74
Expenses to be paid out of revenues, 1703, 1781-2
First meeting, 1664-6
Fiscal year, 1706
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1675-6
Head office, 1652
Inquiries, 1782
Labour representation, 2139
Lines to be included, 1679
Parliamentary authority for construction, 1779
Railway and Expropriation Acts to apply, 1695-6
Securities of other companies, 1781; amdt., 1782; withdrawn, 1862
Work for general advantage of Canada, 1706
Criminal Code amdts.
1. Unlawful associations, concealed weapons, etc., 4134, 4355-67
Senate amdts., 4660
2. Sexual Offences, 1710, 2159, 2164
Senate amdt., 4634, 4689-90
3. Fire prevention, 1573-85
Combines Bill, 4198, 4567-70, 4588-4601
Cost of Living Com., 4327
County Court judgeships, vacancies, 1796
Daylight Saving, 1422
Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks Act Amdt.
1. Corrective, 1789, 2297-2305
2. Land for soldiers, 2953, 3070-3
Dominion Lands Act Amdt., 1111, 1112
Pre-emptions, power sites, mining, timber, etc., 4251-4
Dominion Lands and Parks. *See above,* Dominion Forest Reserves and Parks
Dominion Lands Surveys Act Amdt., 72, 930-1
Expenditures, 4046-56
Dominion Power Board, 4048
Dominion water powers, 2291, 2512-31
Doukhobor lands, 2044
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 852
Forestry and timber limits, 4053-4

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 1149-59
Greek Catholics in communion with the Church of Rome, 1383-8
Guelph Novitiate, 1227, 1258-9
Indian lands, mining rights, etc., 4254-7
Indians
Greater production, 4664
Liquor and, 4063
Medical attendance, 4060
Ontario and Quebec, 4668
Reserves, roads and bridges on, 4057-60
Schools, 4063
Tuberculosis and, 4062
Industrial unrest—Winnipeg strike, pretensions of strikers, duties and responsibilities of Government, Bolshevism, collective bargaining, etc., 3035
Interpretation Act Amdt. (Superior Courts), 1957, 2313, 2959
Irrigation, 4603
Irrigation Act Amdt., 71, 632-3, 696
Judges Act Amdt. Bill (British Columbia), 2305-13, 2954-9
Judges Act Amdt. Bill (salaries), 4063-4212-38, 4435-9
Senate amdts., 4661
Juvenile Delinquents Bill, 1383, 3843
Langelier, Magistrate, 1324
Mennonites and Hutterites, 1260
Migratory birds, 4604
Convention, 2164-6
Military Service Act
Amdts. by Order in Council, 2294
Defaulters, 971, 1910, 2198, 4238
Uniformity of administration, 1308
Wright County, administration, 2400-2
Mining laws, 4257
Oil-bearing lands, 929, 4136
Pelee Island, 4042
Post office appointments after strike, 4349
Railway Belt Act Amdt., 5, 592
Railway policy of Government, 1397
Reclamation of Dominion Lands by Drainage Bill, 71, 639-642, 708-713
Returned soldiers
Government policy concerning, 759
Mining prospectors, as, 4045
St. Lawrence river dams, 886
Seed grain advances, 625-9, 1029-40, 4047, 4054-5
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 2291, 3848-91, 4012-7. *See also, under this head,* Returned soldiers
Land from forest reserves, 2953
Royal Air Force, inclusion of, 1438
Surveys, 4049-51
Taber irrigation district, 4210-2
Tuberculosis and Indians, 4062

Meighen, Hon. Arthur—*Con.*
War Measures Act Extension Bill, 1433, 1566, 2097, 2148
Water-power, 4049
Winnipeg strike, 3845
Yukon Act Amdt. Bill, 5, 592
Yukon, government of, 4045-6
Yukon Placer Mining Act Amdt. Bill, 71, 629-632

Members of Parliament, accommodation for, 2498

Mennonites, 1260, 1913, 1920-7. *See also* Immigration

Mercier, Cardinal, 1482, ques. 1611

Messeroy, Mr. John A., ques. 1610

Mewburn, Major-General Hon. S. C. (Minister of Militia and Defence)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 319. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Siberian expedition, 319; demobilization, 322; pensions—soldiers' land settlement, 323; dispersal areas, documentation, transportation, 324; the returned man and his job, 328; priority in return—war service badges, orders, decorations and medals, 327; war records and documents, 330; French Canadian Brigade, 331; soldiers' graves, 332
Air Board and Air Service, 2054, 4687
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Canadians in Imperial Service, 1997
Demobilization, 2173-6
Dental Service, and, 2775
Farmers' sons, of, 1958
Ministerial statement, 1793
Portland, 648
Port of debarkation, 2403
Progress of, 4535
St. John, men in garrison, 2236
22nd Battalion, 1616
Enlisted and conscripted men, lists, preparation of, 1908
Guelph Novitiate, 1222
Imperial Guards, 2753
Jenkins report on Canadian Army Medical Corps, 358
Kinmel Camp riots, 315
Military management, charges of General Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1493
Military Service Act, defaulters, 1208, 4238
Military trials in England, 1959
Militia
Allowances, 1886
Annual drill, 4495
Associations and bands, 1892
Cadet corps, 1888, 1892

Mewburn, Major-General Hon. S. C.—*Con.*
Militia—*Con.*
Command pay, 1886
Engineer services and works, 1892
Headquarters and district staffs, 1893
Returned soldiers and, 1893-8
Peace rank of war officers, 1890
Permanent force, 1898-9, 4495
Rifle ranges, 1894-8
Surveys, 1899
Training areas, camps, 1900
Transport and freight, 1900
Units, war, continuance of, 1887
War record of militia, 1889
Militia Act Amdt. (Permanent Force), 3469, 3966-87
Militia Pensions Act Amdt., 2691-2, 2754-61
Period of service, 2754
Widows and children, 2758
Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, 550
Purchasing Commission, 4448
Roumanian border, proposed Canadian guard, 1618
Siberian expedition, 971
Soldiers
Complaints against authorities, alleged suppression, 1618
Furlough in France, 272
Halifax, discharge or leave, 1663, 1711
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1896
War expenditure ($350,000,000), 2173
War trophies and paintings, 2043
Winnipeg strike, 2753
Witley Camp riot, 3472

Michaud, Mr. Pius (Restigouche and Madawaska)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 166. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—after-war conditions, 166; women's war work—national unity—highways, 167; railways — tariff — soldiers' dependents, 168
Canadian National Railway, 1816
Clair, N. B., Immigration agent, 2569
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 944-5
Militia, permanent force, 2969
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1000

Middlebro, Mr. William S. (North Grey)
Bankruptcy Bill, 1995, 2266-7, 2279
Board of Commerce Bill, 4559
Second reading—Yeas and nays asked for, 4527
Canadian Pacific Railway Company Bill, 3214
Criminal Code Amdt. (Sexual Offences), 2163

Middlebro, Mr. William S.—*Con.*
Exportable wheat, ques. 1790
Fire prevention, 1577-82
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 869
Population of cities and provinces, ques. 1535
Prohibition, 2665
Railway Act, disagreement with Senate, power and telephone clauses, 4164
Railway Committee, permission to sit while House is in session, 1864
Revenue, expenditure, ques. 1217

Mignault, Mr., K.C., 462, 4670

Migratory Birds, 4604

Migratory Birds Convention Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 2097; 2r., com., 2164; 3r., 2305

Militarism, 1888

Military Defaulters' Disqualification Bill. 1r., 2198, 2293

Military Escort of Roman Catholic Bishop, ques. 2296

Military Hospitals Commission, 1264. *See also* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment

Military Service Act
Administration
Expense of, ques. 601, ques. 645, ques. 749, ques. 973, ques. 1306, ques. 1438
Localities: Montreal, ques. 973; L'Islet, ques. 979; M.D. No. 3, ques. 1076; Hull, ques. 1306; M.D. No. 4, ques. 1439; Wright, 2399
Persons: Archambault, Dr. J. U., ques. 1306; Boudreault, Mr. Benjamin, ques. 1439; Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566; Cousineau, Mr. L., ques. 1306; Harris, Mr. S. L. Dale, 3926; Labelle, Mr., ques. 1306; Lennie, Mr. R. S., ques. 1612; Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066; Woodbury, Mr. Harry, ques. 2048
Uniformity of, res., Sir Sam Hughes, 1308
Amdts. by Order in Council, 2294
Conscientious objectors, 781, 1929
Defaulters, 134, 227, 264, 346, 351, 396, 451, 461, 545, ques. 883, 971, 1910, 2250, 4238
Deserters, 72
Disfranchisement of, 496, ques. 1957, 2198, 2293
Evaders, Chicoutimi, 409
Imprisonment of, ques. 2566
Return of, 1866
Shot at, alleged, 1208
Draftees sent overseas, ques. 2297
Exemptions, ques. 884, ques. 1108
Farmers, and, 1233
Guelph Novitiate, 4620
Motion, Sir Sam Hughes, 1218; withdrawn, 1259

Military Service Act—*Con.*
Number conscripted, ques. 972
Police employed, ques. 972, ques. 973

Military Votes Overseas, Judge Gibson, ques. 1440

Militia
Allowances, 1886
Annual drill, 4495
Associations and bands, 1892, 4495
Barrack labourers, etc., 1899
Barriefield Militia buildings, 3985
Cadets, 1888, 1892
Command pay, 1886
Department
Audit of accounts, ques. 2199
Engineers' service and works, 1892
Headquarters and district staffs, 1893
Officers, peace rank, 1890
Overseas administration, Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt charges, 1099
Printers in department plant, 312. *See also* Printing Bureau
Salaries, 1532
Permanent force, 1898, 4495. *See also* Militia Act Amdt.
Rifle ranges, 1894-8
Steam shovels, ques. 1907
Surveys, 1899
Training areas, 1900
Transfers and promotions, report tabled, 40
Transport and freight, 1899
War record of, 1887
War units, continuation of, 1887

Militia Act Amdt. Bill (Permanent Force). 1r., 3469; 2r., 3966; com., 3968, 3971; 3r., 4002; amdt., Mr. Robb, neg., 4002

Militia Council, report tabled, 40

Militia Pension Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2690; 1r., 2692; 2r., com., 2753-4; 3r., 2856; Senate amdts., 3782

Mines and Minerals
Canadian Mining Institute, 4492
Coal, lignite briquetting, 4488
Committee, 114
Copper refineries, ques. 1106
Mineral rights in Dominion lands, 4251-7. *See also* Dominion Forest Reserves
Non-ferrous metals, 1052, 3681
Prospectors' tools, etc., 4007
Returned soldiers as prospectors, 4045

Mines Branch estimates, 4489

Minister of Marine, speech at Verdun, 3241

Ministers of the Crown
Absence from Parliament, of. *See* Address
House of Commons and, 1002

Ministers of the Crown—*Con.*
Resignations
Hon. T. A. Crerar, 3193. *See also that title*
Hon. T. W. Crothers, 139
"Minto," icebreaker, ques. 3242
Model Towns. *See* Garden Villages
Molloy, Mr. John Patrick (Provencher)
Budget, 3309. Protection, 3309; farming and tariff, 3311; industrial unrest—Victory loans, 3313; elections, 3314
Hutterites, 1382
"Montmagny," Government steamer, ques. 1613
St. Peter's Reserve, ques. 1076, ques. 1613
Sheep industry, pure-bred stock, 2994
Moncton and Buctouche Railway, 1382
Money. *See also* Banks
Bank and Dominion notes, figures at end of war, 634
Bronze coins. *See* Currency
Gold held against notes, 635
Monk Station roadway, ques. 1438, 2202
Montreal
Admiralty Court, ques. 1440
Conveyance of mails, ques. 979
Port, labour at, ques. 3997
Terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
Montreal-Ottawa highway, 2791-2
Montreal and Quebec Harbour Commissioners Bill. 1r., 3293; 2r., com., 3757; 3r., 3761
Morphy, Mr. H. B. (North Perth)
Air Board Bill, 2051
Bankruptcy Bill
Order of court, 2010
Trustee, replacement of, 2005
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3961, 3965
Canadian National Railway
Capital stock, 1829
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1723
First meeting, 1665
Head office, 1665
Civil Service
Efficiency, inquiry into, 1560
Salaries, high and low, 3811
War bonus, 2925
Wounded soldiers, positions for, 997, 1002
Combines, 4596-7
Criminal Code—aliens and British subjects, 4359-61
Demobilization, Canadians in British units, 2175
Fisheries, refrigerator service, 2890
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 870
Highways, 786
Housing scheme, 2544, 2550-2, 2560
Morphy, Mr. H. B.—*Con.*
Income war tax—trainmen's expenses, 2990-1
Judges' salaries, 4226, 4371
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2662
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1334
Militia, permanent force, 3970
Naturalization, property rights of aliens, 4260-1, 4270-1
Pensions, 4179, 4181, 4195, 4206-9
"Unmarried wife," 4295
Proprietary medicines, 2486
Purchasing Commission, 3811
Quebec officer charged with embezzlement, 2294
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2621-34
Assistant Chief Railway Commissioner, 2632
Telephone companies, 2643
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, 3129
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2762-3
Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066
Trade Commissioners, 4493
Weights and measures, 2150-1
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 997, 1002
Morris, Col., ques. 2565
Mothers' Pensions, 156
Mounted Police. *See* Royal Northwest
Moving Pictures, 267
Mowat, Mr. Herbert Macdonald (Parkdale)
Air Board Bill, 2057
Bankruptcy Bill, 1986-8, 1994, 2274
Farmers and, 2007
Order of court, 2010
Trustees, 2003, 2006
Board of Commerce, 4558-60, 4566
Civil Service, efficiency of, 1558
Divorce Court Bill, 3783, 3786-8
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4585
Electrocution Bill, 1957
Fire prevention, 1582
French River waterway, 1082
Garden villages for returned soldiers, 761, 4012-3
Judges' salaries and duties, 2312, 2956
Militia, permanent force, 2982
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2620-4, 2637
Power clause, amdt., 4147; withdrawn, 4165
Telephone companies, 2643
Transmission lines on highways, consent of municipalities, Hydro-Electric, 3073; amdt., 3082; neg., 3133; 2nd. amdt., 3133; agreed to, 3134
Universal military training, 1891

Murphy, Hon. Charles (Russell)
Bell, Col. McKelvey. *See under this head,* Soldiers
Bruce report, 4071
Canadian Army Medical Service, 358, 513
Censorship, 1110
Dominion Elections Act. Amdt., 4652, 4658
Dominion water powers, 2512, 2515
Doukhobor lands, 2043
Easter adjournment, 886
Farmers' sons overseas—labour shortage, 140
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 942
House of Commons, Wednesday evening sittings, 929
Kinmel Camp riots, 315, 357
Labour situation in the West, 2798-9
Lobster, canned, 715
Marlow, Col. F. W., ques. 3066
North Bruce, returning officer, ques. 2406
Oil, Peace River district, 4135
Pratt, Lt.-Col., statements of and reported resignation of High Commissioner, 647
Printing Bureau strike, 314, 398
Sedition, 3291, 4134
Seed grain, 1029
Shaughnessy, Lord, report interview, 648
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, Director of Medical Services, 3240, 3472, 4240
Soldiers, penal servitude, cases, 1029, 1163
Trade discrimination against Canada, 115, 229, 314
Winnipeg strike, 3069
Postal employees, replacement of, 2855
Witley Camp riots, 462

Murray Bay
Ferry, 4335
Train service, 2449

Musicians, travelling, immigration of, 1942

Myers, Mr. Edward Thomas Wordon (Kindersley)
Budget, 3526. Tariff revision — wheat prices, 3526; returned soldiers and the land—income tax, 3529; natural resources of Western Provinces—tariff, 3530; optimism, 3531
Eston, Sask., experimental farm, 2979
Live stock, pure-bred, 2993-4
Shipbuilding, 2261
Wheat
Crop of 1919, 3471
Shipment facilities, 2261

Napadogan, ice at., ques. 972

National Battlefields Commission, 138, 4482

National Gallery, 2797

National Research Institute, 1565, 1709. *See also* Industrial

National Service Registration, ques. 1075, ques. 1076, ques. 1306, ques. 2296, ques. 2296, ques. 2296
Assistant Registrars, payment of, ques. 1907
Bagot County, ques. 1307
Employees, ques. 2145
Expenditure, ques. 2296
Rental, ques. 2145
Salaries, ques. 1306, ques. 1440, ques. 2565
Unpaid accounts, ques. 2296

National Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Natural Gas, Pelican Rapids, 4605

Naturalization, 1046. *See* British Nationality; Immigration

Natural Resources. *See* Dominion Lands; Mines and Minerals
Development of, 302, 3283

Naval Air Bases, ques. 1532

Naval Service
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 1340, ques. 1534
Canadians in Royal Navy, 1434, 1483
Courts martial, members of, ques. 1534
Department of
Report tabled, 111
Staff and salaries, 2811
Destroyers, ques. 880, ques. 1534
Discharge of men, 1959, 1996
"Hochelaga," dismissal of officer, ques. 1340
Kingsmill, Admiral, ques. 1340
Ministerial statement, 2810
Newfoundland R.N.R. ratings, ques. 1611
Pay claims, ques. 746
Recruiting, ques. 646, ques. 747
Seymour Narrows battery, ques. 975
Trawler No. 30, ques. 975
"Tuna," H.M.C.S., sale of, ques. 1534
Wireless, separation allowance, ques. 1905

Navigation, Aids to, 2608-10

Negroes, Rioting in England by, 3741

Neil's Harbour, 2781

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward Walter (North Oxford)
Bank mergers, 1095
Bankrupty Bill
Order of court, 2010
Trustees, 2006, 2012
Board of Commerce, 4506, 4551-3
Budget, 3547. Cost of living, 3547; tariff and profits, 3549; business profits war

Nesbitt, Mr. Edward Walter—*Con.*
Budget—*Con.*
tax, 3551; tariff and freight rates, 3552; taxes, tariffs and tax-free bonds, 3553
Canadian National Railway Company
Commission control, 1403
Executive Com., 1673
Cost of Living Com., 4313
Daylight Saving, 899
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 691
Immigration of illiterates, 1961, 1964
Income tax, number of taxpayers, 3726
Militia pensions, 2757-8
Pensions, 4182-98, 4201-10
Prohibition, 2351
Public ownership of railways, 692
Purchasing Commission, 3205
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2626-34, 2640
Telephone companies, 2643-4, 2649
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3131
Railway crossings, 937
Seed grain advances, 626
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2763, 2769

New Carlisle postmaster, ques. 727

Newfoundland. *See* Steamship services

New Harbour, N.S., 2783

Newspaper Postage, ques., 727

Newspapers and Periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1562, 2016, 4483

Newsprint Control, ques. 613, ques. 752

Newsprint Control Bill. Res., 4535; 1r., 4549; 2r., 4662; 3r., 4663

New Westminster, railways, and, 423, 426

New Zealand, markets in, 2222

Nicholson, Mr. Donald (Queen's, P.E.I.)
Judges' salaries, 4369, 4373

Nicholson, Mr. George Brecken (East Algoma)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 143. Returned soldiers, 143; housing—capital and labour, 144, 145; tariff, 144; Department of Labour—franchise, alien enemies — Bolsheviki, 145; returned soldiers — patronage — commissions, 146; General Pau—prohibition—His Majesty's complimentary banquet to President Wilson, 147; Prime Minister and Peace Conference —Canada's war record, 148

Nicholson, Mr. George Brecken—*Con.*
Board of Commerce, 4499
Canadians in Imperial service, 1997
Canadian National Railway, 1402-19
Combines, 4571
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 683, 1137
High Cost of Living Com., 4009
Special report, motion for concurrence, 4307-8, 4333
Immigration Act Amdt.
Illiterates, 1962
Interned alien enemies, 1947
Land for soldiers, 3071
Liquor, illegal exportation, 960
Little Current, 2789
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1527
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1333
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4287
Post office appointments after strike, 4352
Prohibition, 2669
Public ownership of railways, 682
Purchasing Commission, 3205
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 2627
Telephone companies, 2649-50
Railway engineers—cattle on track, 2617
Rural postmasters, 2035
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769
Titles, 2720
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2951

Nickel, 1053, 3681

Nickle, Mr. William Folger (Kingston)
Board of Commerce, 4519
Coasting trade with United States, 1110, 1209
Criminal Code
Election by prisoner, 4366-7
Unmarried registering as married, 2160
Divorce Court Bill, 1662, 3761, 3779, 3883-91
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 858
Good roads, 3910, 4416
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 677
Immigration, orchestras, 1943
Income tax, 3736
Judges, 3716
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3728
Industrial unrest — after-war conditions, profits, sympathetic strikes, etc., 3025
Military Service Act, uniformity of administration, 1336
Militia pensions, 2755-60
Militia, permanent force, 2967, 3971, 3985
Pensions, "Unmarried wife," 4283-5
Public ownership of railways, 680

Nickle, Mr. William Folger—*Con.*
Railway Act Consolidation
Disagreement with Senate
Form of resolutions, 4157
Free conference, rep. 4067
Power clauses, 4159
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities; Hydro-Electric, 3105, 3109
Railway crossings, 700
Railway situation, responsibility for, 678
Returned soldiers, appointments to Civil Service, 290
Scientific research, 1566
Seditious books, etc., 4367
Titles, 1441, 1479, 2395
Correction of report, 2615
Motion for adoption of Com.'s rep., 2696, 2713-4, 2722, 2743
Votes and Proceedings, and Journals, 3292
Wounded soldiers
Civil Service positions for, 987
Disability, insurance against, 994
Vocational training for under-age, 1018

Nile Voyageurs, 4380

Nipissing Lake, water power, ques. 1341

Non-ferrous Metals. *See* Mines

Non-sectarian Schools. *See* Education

North Bruce, Returning Officer, ques. 2046

Northern Canada, development of, 302

Northern Construction Company, 1645

"Northland" Inquiry, rep. tabled, 111

North Sydney, works at, 1263-78

Northwest Territories, Commissioner of, 4045

Nova Scotia
Fair wage officer, ques. 1907
Fishing fleet, 1866

Nova Scotia Carriages, Limited, ques. 3066

Nova Scotia Steel and Coal Co., 2342

Noxious Weeds, 4091

Nurses, Military, residence for at Kingston, ques. 3377

Oath, administered by private parties, 2016

Oaths of Office Bill, 2

Ocean Freight Rates, 1051. *See also* Waterborne traffic

O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., 2452

"Official Record," 431

O'Halloran, Mr., 4021

Oil-bearing Lands
Leases, ques. 2199
Northern Alberta, 4070
Peace River district, 4135
Shell Transport and Trading Co., 929, 4070

Old Age Pensions, 157

Oleomargarine, 2201, 3708

"One Big Union"—Calgary, ques. 2143

O'Neill, Mr., contractor, 1274

Ontario, North, Vacancy, 4

Ontario, Prohibition Votes, 2663

Ontario and Quebec, Northern, colonizing of, ques. 748

Opposition Leadership
Congratulations by Sir Thomas White, 27
Mackenzie, Mr. D. D., announces his election as temporary leader, 21-2
Robb, Mr., Chief Whip, 3

Orchestras, admission to Canada, of, 1943

Orders in Council under War Measures Act, 4486. *See also* War Measures Act Extension
Alien enemies, deportation of, 1977
Number passed, ques. 2145

Ottawa. *See also* Parliament Buildings
Central Station, ques. 1213
Government arrangement with, 2495, 4380
Highways, 2791
Hunter Building, 2507
Public buildings, lighting, 2503
Wellington street, repairs, 2495

Ottawa and Georgian Bay Canal, 2855

Ottawa-Hull Bridge, 2790

Ottawa Improvement Commission, 138. *See also* Ottawa

Ottawa Improvement Commission Bill. Res., 4246; 1r., 4251; 2r., com., 4380; 3r., 4386

Ottawa River Dams, 2796

Oyster Culture, ques. 609. *See also* Fish

Packing Companies
Overcharges, 3281
Taxation of, 4478

Palmer, Rev. Kennedy H. *See* Military Service, Guelph Novitiate

Panet, Mr. Louis Charles, 4

Papineau, Mr. Louis Joseph (Beauharnois)
Bust of Sir Robert Borden, ques. 2050, ques. 2295

Papineau, Mr. Louis Joseph—*Con.*
Canadian Northern Railway, ques. 1212
Civil Service, state of, 4605
Fuel Controller, ques. 2145
Leases of oil lands, ques. 2190
Public health, social welfare, ques. 1205
Rate of exchange, ques. 2145

Pardee, Mr. Frederick Forsyth (West Lambton)
Budget, 3532. Tariff and popular unrest, 3542; profiteering, 3544; income tax—tax-free bonds, 3545; duties of labour and of capital, 3546
Daylight Saving, 918
Housing scheme, 2547
Judges' salaries, 2955
Railway Act Consolidation: transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3123
Shipping, transfers, 3928

Parent, Mr. George (West Quebec)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 540. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 540; returned soldiers, 541; highways—housing—Northern Quebec, Ungava, 542; excess profits tax—Military Service defaulters, 544; Quebec and national unity, 545
Bankruptcy, remuneration of trustees, 2013
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Consolidation Bill, 3821
Canadian National Railway
Deficit, 2456
Quebec, conditions in, 2457
Dominion water powers, 2517, 2529
Parliament Buildings, 2331-41
Pilotage, 2806
St. Charles River dredging, 2788
St. Laurent, Isle of Orleans, 2785
St. Lawrence ship channel, 2608
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769-70
Steamers, "Lady Evelyn" and "Princess," ques. 3680

Parent, Dr. Rufus H., ques. 1213

Paris Agency, 1901

Paris or French Foot (measure), 952-4

Pariseault, Lieut., ques. 884

Parkinson, Lieut.-Col., ques. 1441

Parliamentary Procedure. *See* Speaker; Deputy Speaker; House of Commons

Parliament Buildings, 2331-41
Allocation of space, joint Committee with Senate, 3782, 3585, 3680
Materials, construction, plans, probable date of completion, etc., 2331-41, 4621

Parliamentary Documents, distribution of, 2455

Parliamentary Restaurant, Committee on, 115

Paroles, McMillan, Pearson and Heaton, 4070

Party Government and parties, 15, 27, 32, 37, 55, 69, 97, 108, 125, 268, 344, 371, 376-391, 412, 440, 489, 515, 530, 566, 570, 807, 1633, 1746

Patent Medicines. *See* Proprietary

Patent Record, 3842

Patent, Trade Mark and Design, Copyright and Timber Marking Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 3808; 2r., 4021; com., 3r., 4023

Patents, Commissioner of. *See* Patent, etc., Bill

Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic

Patronage, 146. *See also* Highways
Canadian National Railway, 1639
Civil Service and, 387. *See also* Civil Service
Medical men and, 171
Port Hastings, 961
Postmasters, 410, 412
Printing Bureau and, 387

Pau, General, visit of to House, 137, 141, 147

Peace, 1, 125. *See also* League of Nations; War; Reconstruction
Armistice, terms of, 2042
Celebration of, 4238
Costa Rica, message, 2

Peace Conference, 446
Canada's position in, 248, 777
Canada's representation at, 1, 14, 18, 132, 142, 148, 169, 182, 242, 249, 265, 272, 351, 367, 389, 421, 474, 478, 495, 530, 1381, 3676
Poland and Ukrainians, etc., 3472. *See also* Poles

Peace Treaty, 2096
Civil and religious liberty, 2043
Copy of terms, 4239
Labour provisions, 4239, 4692
Eight-hour day, 2044
Ratification, 2200
Signing of, 3473
Summary, 2146

Pearson, Sir Arthur, 2874

Peat, 4489

Peck, Lieut.-Col. Cyrus Wesley, V.C. (Skeena)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 463. Thanks for reception—late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—answer to criticisms of leaders of Canadian Corps, 463; Cambrai, 464; La Vicoigne—Sir Arthur Currie's care of soldiers' lives, 466; his promotion—Mons, 467; Canadian soldiers and British press and public, 468; Sir Charles Ferguson, 469; reconstruction, support of public opinion needed—women's war work, 470; Kinmel Camp riots, conduct of Canadian soldiers at Rhyl—Union government—Liberals and Unionists—free trade, 471; Grand Trunk Pacific—unifying effect of the trenches, 472
British Columbia salmon and halibut, 1535
Budget, 3676. Prime Minister and Peace Conference—free trade, 3676; social unrest—income, inheritance and land values taxes, 3677
Enters House of Commons Chamber, 185
Massett wharf, ques. 603
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 1501
Pensions, 4174, 4178, 4180, 4293
Railway Act—municipal rate bargains, 4141
Soldiers' graves, 332

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac Ellis (South Renfrew)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 185. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 185-186; Col. Peck, V.C., 185; victory and peace, 186; returned soldiers, 187; Liberal party, 189; finance, 191; tariff, 193
Agricultural implements, duties on, 3694, 3705
Arthurs, Col. James, M.P., ques. 2653
Bankruptcy, 2472-3
Bureau of Statistics, 3178
Business profits war tax, 3710
Canadian National Railway, 1410
Capital stock, 1816
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1773
Finance, Parliamentary control, 2137
President's salary, 1658
Canadian Press news service, 4485
Canal statistics; salaries, 3178-9
Cold storage, 2984, 2987
Combines, 4568-71, 4588
Draper, Mr. P. M., Printing Bureau, ques. 3999
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4586
Electric wiring in public buildings, 2505
Exchange, rate of, 1362

Pedlow, Mr. Isaac Ellis—*Con.*
Fire prevention, 1574-81
Good roads, 4409
Government agricultural publications, 2991
House of Commons, cross benches, desks for, 2503
Housing scheme, 2562
Income war tax, 3718-23
Bad debts, 3722
Garment factory operators, 3994
Travellers on commission, 3990
Insurance Act Amdt. (actuaries), 3988
Letter postage rate, 4621
Military Service Act, 1312
Naturalization, 4128-9, 4258-9
Newsprint control, 4538
Ottawa City, agreement with, 4250
Oysters, 2899
Pensions, 4200, 4204, 4206
"Unmarried wife," 4287
Proprietary medicines, 2487, 3824
Purchasing Commission, 3207
Railway mail service, 2087-9
Soldiers' Land Settlement, 3872-3
Exemption from legal process, 3866-7
Notice of expropriation, 4016
Technical education, 3174-5, 3895-7
Titles, 1468
War expenditures, 1362
Weights and measures, 953, 2152-9
Wheat, market for, 1711, 2998-3000
Wool, 2989

Pelee Island, 4033

Pelican Rapids Gas Well, 4605

Pelletier, Mr. Francois Jean (Matane)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 393. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—industrial unrest, 393; cost of living, 394; soldiers' land settlement—immigration—War-time Elections Act, 395; national unity—titles—military service defaulters, 396; "Light in the window," 397
Canadian National Railway, 1831
Cold storage, 2984
Industrial unrest, after-war conditions, etc., 3017
Lumber purchases for railways, ques. 1217
Order, relevancy, 2725
Pilotage, 2808, 3160

Pembroke wharf, 2787

Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 1616. Res., 4033; 1r., 4033; 2r., com., 4171, 4199, 4274; 3r., 4335
Amdt., Mr. Lemieux, neg. on div., 4336
"Unmarried wife," 4198-9, 4274

Pensions, 17, 79, 92, 107, 159, 294, 323, 343, 497, 502, 588, ques. 882
Board, ques. 1790, 2448, ques. 3066
Appointments and returned soldiers, ques. 605
Employees, ques. 611
Vancouver office, ques. 3377
Committee, 139, 424, 550, 3926, 3997
European war and active militia (vote of $28,000,000), 3000
Number, etc., ques. 1076
Orders in Council tabled, 312
Payments, ques. 1307
Widows of Generals, 2448

Permanent Force. *See* Militia Act Amdt.

Peticlerc, Mr. Joseph, 164

Petitcodiac River, 2898

Piche, Lt.-Col., ques. 600, ques. 2871

Pictou Island, 2793

Pilotage, 2610
Report tabled, 185. *See also* Canada Shipping

Ploughs, Duty on, 3690. *See also* Agricultural implements; Budget

Poles and Ukrainians, etc., 3472, 4465, 4534, 4620, 4690. *See also* Peace

Pollution of Navigable Waters Bill. 1r., 2199

Pomeroy, Major A. L., Inspector of Farms, ques. 2567

Population
Cities and provinces, ques. 1535
Trend to urban centres, 896

Porter, Mr. Sydney P., 1638, 1834

Port Felix, Custom House, 956

Port Hood Wharf, 2782

Portland Cement, duty on, ques. 1612

Port Mann, ques. 979

Port Nelson. *See* Hudson Bay

Postmaster General
Report tabled, 40
Representation in House of Commons, ques. 1974. *See also* Ministers

Post Office. *See also* Industrial unrest; Strikes
Calgary employees after strike, 3194
Letter carriers
Bonus, 2084
Overseas service, 2444
Toronto, 1341
Letter rate, 4621
Lewis, Mr. J. H., ques. 3068
Mail carriers, 413
Mail contracts, rural mail, rural post offices, surplus, 2079-96

Post Office—*Con.*
Mails and Canadian National Railway, 2087, 2094
Ottawa-Pembroke service, 2034
Outside service, salaries, 2079
Postmasters, rural, 413, ques. 1536
Quebec City, ques. 2751
Quebec and Hamilton, ques. 2750
Refusal to deliver mail, 1435
Rural mail boxes—parcel post, 2093
Rural mail couriers, 2926
Salaries and allowances, 1435, 2016
Statistics, ques. 2903
Toronto, Montreal, and Winnipeg, ques. 2750
Transatlantic mails, 886, 929

Post Office Appointments Bill. 1r., 3809; 2r., com., 4345; 3r., 4355

Power Companies. *See* Electric and Power Companies; Canadian National Railway

Power, Mr. Charles Gavan (South Quebec)
Allowance to officers, ques. 1667
Argue, Lieut.-Col. J. F., ques. 3068
Ballantyne, Hon. Mr., speech at Verdun, 3241
Canadian National Railway
Directorate to include a returned soldier, amdt. 1637, neg. 1638
Lines to be included, 1686
Steamships, 1689
Canadian Pacific Railway Station, Quebec, ques. 3587
Civil Service vacancies, ques. 2049
Daylight Saving, 923
Employment agent, Quebec, ques. 1791
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 1569
Fire prevention, 1573-8
Fiset, Dr. Michael, ques. 1791
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Forest Products Laboratories, ques. 3068
Gregory, Mr. William T., ques. 601
Immigration Act Amdt.—conspiracy, 1948
Industrial unrest, eight-hour day, after-war conditions, etc., 3032
Influenza patients, ques. 845
Kinmel Camp riots, ques. 3469
Lake St. Joseph hotel, ques. 3067
Lévis Rifle Association, ques. 1213
Marine Department, Quebec buildings, ques. 1217, ques. 1439
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, etc., 1523, 1531
Militia
Permanent force, 1898
Staff positions and returned soldiers, 1893
Units and members, war record of, 1890
Pensions, 4288-92, 4297

Power, Mr. Charles Gavan—*Con.*
Piché, Lt.-Col., ques. 600
Public Health, social welfare, 1206
Quebec terminal facilities, ques. 3469
Questions and answers, complaint of contradiction, 648
St. Louis Road property, ques. 604, 2769-70
Soldiers
Courts martial, 3470
Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry, ques. 1307
Returned
Port of debarkation, 2402
Usurers and, ques. 977
22nd Battalion, 1616
Russia, in, 1216
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2770, 2773-4
Allegations of Lt.-Col. McKelvey Bell, 3422
Solicitors, Department of Railways and Government Railways, 1591-2
Strikes, 1918, ques. 619
Titles—Com. to consider. Points of order—unanimous consent, and acceptance of principle, 1482
War bonus, arsenal and marine employees, 2926
War service gratuity, ques. 1791
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2945

Pratt, Lieut.-Col., charges by, 1099, ques. 1213, ques. 1216, ques. 1483

Precious Metals in Nickel Ores, 3682-9

Press, The, 201-3, 246, 267
Attitude of, 2917
Freedom of, 350
Government advertising, 1822
Public announcement of ownership, 1562

Preston, Mr. W. T. R., 1912, 4135

Prevost, Mr. Jules Edouard (Terrebonne)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 521. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 521; allegations of Gen. Hughes and Gen. Smart, 522; after-war problems, 523; prices, 524; tariff, 525; excess profits tax, 526; Union government, 528; French Canadians—grants for housing, highways, public health, 529
Casualties amongst French Canadians, ques. 644
Catholics, enlistment of, ques. 3998
Exemption tribunals, ques. 1438
Georgian Bay Canal, ques. 843
House of Commons reading room, 318, ques. 843
Military Service Act, ques. 2296
National Service Registration, ques. 1306, ques. 1440
War tax, income, exemption, ques. 611

Prices. *See* Canada Food; Combines; Cost of Living; Board of Commerce; Budget; Industrial unrest

Prince Edward Island
Greater production grant, ques. 601, ques. 2566

Prince of Wales, 420
H.R.H. visit to Canada, 2629

Princess Patricia's Canadian Light Infantry. *See also* War
Travelling accommodation, ques. 1307

Printing Bureau, 424
Commission of investigation, 1812
Editorial Com., 1435
Expenses, ques. 844
Printing done by, ques. 844
Report, 229, 230
Strike, 398, 513, 1561
Statement by Minister, 312

Printing Com., 113, 115

Printing and Stationery Dept., 4687

Private Bills Com., 112

Private Bills Discussed
Athabasca, Grande Prairie and Fort Vermilion Railway, 2778, 4534
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 4344
Canadian Pacific Railway Company, 3782
Senate amdt., 3214
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 1211, 2015, 2295
Senate amdts., 2903
Grey, Margaret, divorce, 4533
Lachine, Jacques Cartier and Maisonneuve Railway, 1404
London and Port Stanley Railway, 1184

Privilege
Borden, Sir Robert—Manitoba Cold Storage Company, 4695
Bureau, Mr.—Statement of Mr. H. A. Mackie, 4002
Edwards, Mr.—Report in Ottawa Journal, 1997
Fournier, Mr.—Public ownership of railways, 1866
Gauvreau, Mr.—Hansard, correction, 970
Lemieux, Mr.—erroneous report of speech of Mr. J. D. Reid, 3378
Stacey, Mr.—misunderstanding of remarks of Mr. Lemieux, 3422

Privileges and Elections Com., 112

Privy Council Department, salaries, 4486

Production, grants to encourage, ques. 2566

Profiteering. *See* Board of Commerce; Budget; Combines; Cost of Living; Industrial unrest

Prohibition, 2, 137, 147, 223, 343, 403, 437, 456, 490, 531, 588, 2658. *See also* Intoxicating Liquors; War Measures Extension

Properties Leased by Government 3377

Proportional Representation, 3069, 4620

Proprietary Medicines
Alcoholic content of, ques. 646
War tax, ques. 1107

Proprietary Medicine Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 1259; 2r., com., 2479; ref. to special com., 2653; com., 3823; 3r., 3938

Prorogation, 4701

Protection. *See* Budget; Tariff

Proulx, Mr. Edmond (Prescott)
Bankruptcy, 2279, 2469-70, 2474
Budget, 3460. Taxes—economy in public expenditure, 3460; good roads, 3461
Canadian National Railway, coal, ques. 1211
Civil Service, specialists, 1184
Currie, Sir Arthur, proclamations by, ques. 607
Customs and Inland Revenue, salaries, 954
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 855
Fort William, railway lands, ques. 883
Franchise, 4622
Good roads, 3908
Hanna, townsite of, ques. 1535
Hart, Mr. James I., ques. 602
Hawkesbury-Grenville bridge, 2791-2
Judges' salaries and duties, 2311, 2958, 4226, 4370, 4375
Exemption from income tax, 4234
O'Connor, Mr. W. F., K.C., 2453
Port Mann, ques. 979
Repatriation Committee, ques. 613, ques. 1340
Ridley, Mr. John, ques. 2398, ques. 2566
Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216
Speaker, Mr., living allowance, 2445

Provident Fund. *See* Intercolonial

Provincial Autonomy. *See* Housing; Highways; Technical Education

Public Accounts, 138
Committee, 113

Public Buildings, 2508, 4610. *See* Parliament; *also names of localities*

Public Debt. *See* Budget; War expenditure

Public Health, 2, 15, 21, 25, 94, 97, 135, 184, 214, 223, 456, 490, 504. *See also* Health Department Bill
Department of, 82, 174, 301, 431, 445, 4380
Appointments, 1182
Director General, 2572
Infant mortality, 336
Medical profession and, 1378

Public Health—*Con.*
Provincial rights and, 1369
Scientific research and, 1390. *See* Scientific
Tuberculosis, 498
Soldiers, returned, amongst, 183

Public Information Department, 40, 203, ques. 728, ques. 728, ques. 748, ques. 750, 4673
United States Representative, ques. 2145. *See also* Public Information

Public Ownership of Railways. *See* Canadian National
Shaughnessy, Lord, and, 1630, 1820, 1825

Provincial Subsidies, ques. 744

Public Welfare, Department of, proposed, 156

Public Works, 2780-97
Department
Cleaning, 2495
Clerk of Works, 2502
Concentration of works under, 1262-3
Contingencies, inspection service, 1278
Deputy Minister, 2330
Reform in, 2496
Report tabled, 40
Solicitor, 1270-8
Staff and salaries, 1262, 1266, 2330
Travelling expenses, 2331
Expenditure on, 44, 47
Ottawa
Hunter Building, 2507
New departmental building on Wellington St., proposed, 2507
Parliament Building, 2331-41
Public buildings, elevator service, lighting, heating, cleaning, repairs, furniture, etc., 2494-6, 2504
Rentals, 2505-7
Quarantine stations, 2503
Tender and contract, works not done under, 1263

Pugwash Spur, ques. 3067, ques. 4239

Purchasing Commission, appointments, 3470

Purchasing Commission Bill. Res., 3810, 4439; 1r., 1162; 2r., 3195-3211, 3215-27; amdt. (6-mos. hoist), 3220; neg., 3226; com., 3227
Commission, membership, powers, etc., 3227, 3232, 3236, 3810
Directors, 3228
Estimates, 3238
Records, 3236
Requisitions, 3237
Staff, 3228
Supplies to be purchased, 3238
Tender, 3239

Quarantine, 4682

Quebec and Saguenay Railway, 2449

Quebec Bridge, ques. 977

Quebec City
Canadian National Railway, improvements, ques. 978
Canadian Pacific Railway station, ques. 3587
Employment agent, ques. 1791
Federal buildings on Grand Allee, ques. 976
Kent House site, ques. 976
Military hospitals, ques. 844
Ross Rifle Factory, ques. 976
Terminal facilities, ques. 3469

Quebec Harbour and Port
Property and insurance, ques. 601
Spirituous liquors entered at, ques. 1533

Quebec Oriental Railway, ques. 605

Quebec Province
Northern, resources of, 542

Quebec Railway, Light and Power Co., 2504

Quorum. *See* House of Commons

Radiotelegraph, 2794, 2848

Radziwill, Princess, ques. 618

Rails, Canadian, sent overseas, 2239, 3863

Railway Act Amdts.
1. Coastwise and inland water rates. 1r., 71
2. Consolidation. 1r., 357; 2r., ref. to standing com., 936; com., 2617, 2929, 3073; 3r., 3157
Disagreement with Senate, 3293; message—consequential amdts., 3473; free conference: proposed, 3473; proposal accepted, 3679; managers appointed, 3738; meeting appointed, 3782; sitting of House not suspended, 3948; report, 4012; considered, 4064
Amdt. to clause 325 (the Board and tariffs), motion to insist, 4136-7, agreed to, 4139; amdt. to clause 374 (Power companies), motion to not insist, 4139, agreed to on div., 4165; amdt. to clause 376 (Telephones), motion to not insist, 4166, agreed to on div., 4169; Senate concurrence, 4456
3. Crossings. Res., 697; 1r., 701; 2r., com., 936; 3r., 1029
4. Location. 1r., 2342; 2r., com., 2510

Railway Belt Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 5; 2r., com., 592; 3r., 625

Railway Commission
Daylight Saving, decision, 1422
Officers of, and Civil Service Commission, 2633
Report tabled, 71

Railway War Board
Daylight Saving, and, 907, 910
Railway time tables, 929

Railways. *See their several titles, including* Government *and* Canadian National
Cash subventions by provinces, ques. 604
Cattle on tracks—charge against engineers, 2617
Daylight Saving and. *See* Daylight
Railways extending into United States, 688
Level crossings. *See* Railway Act Amdt. Bill (Crossings)
Public ownership of. *See* Grand Trunk Pacific Receivership

Railways and Canals Department
Deputy Minister of, ques. 1215
Lumber purchases, Matane, ques. 1217
Salaries, 1588

Railways, Canals and Telegraph Lines Committee, 112
Leave to sit while House is in session, 1864, 1886

Raw Materials within the Empire, 1053

***Read, Mr. Joseph** (Prince, P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 214. Victory loan, 214; Department of Health—food control and European contracts—Union government, 215; general election, 216; Canada's immigrant citizens, 217; Hon. Mr. Calder—returned soldiers, non-productive employment, 218; shipbuilding—Liberalism, 219; tariff, 221
Civil Service, employment in, disadvantage of, 962
Daylight Saving, 901
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 947
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, motion for, 690
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 822

Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209

Reading Room. *See* House of Commons

Reciprocity, 309, 794. *See also* Tariff

Reclamation of Dominion Lands by Drainage Bill. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 639, 708; 3r., 784

Reconstruction. *See* Board of Commerce; Budget; Highways; Housing; Immigration; Industrial unrest; Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment; Soldiers' Land Settlement; Technical education; War, demobilization

Red Cross. *See* Canadian Red Cross

*Deceased April 6

Redman, Mr. Daniel Lee (East Calgary)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech (mover), 13. Canadian Expeditionary Force, 13; Governor General, appointment of His Excellency, Duke of Devonshire — late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—Peace—co-operation of British Empire and United States—Paris Conference—Canada's war record, 14; reconstruction—public health—housing, 15; vocational training — highways — franchise—immigration—industrial unrest, 16; returned soldiers—land settlement—pensions, 16
Allied soldiers, settlers, 3881
Divorce Bill, 3781
Fire prevention, 1584
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1922
Immigration, exclusion of certain classes, 1922
Militia pensions, 2754
Soldiers, wounded, Civil Service positions for, 982

Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904

Registration. *See* National Service

Reid, Hon. John Dowsley (Minister of Railways and Canals)
Department of Railways and Canals
Salaries, 1588
Solicitor, 1592
Canadian National Railway. *See also, under this head,* Canadian National Railway Company Bill
Construction and betterments, 3190, 4614
Death of employee, compassionate allowance, 3175
Expenditure, estimated, 4688
Intercolonial Railway, 2133
Labour trouble, reported, 1617
Operation, 4615-8
Patronage, 1642
Prince Edward Island Railway, 3190, 4618
Private cars, 1590
Rates, 4171, 4615-8
Canadian National Railway Company Bill, 1395-1404, 1405-22, 1620-30, 1640-7, 1653-9, 1667-71, 1676-95, 1705, 1713-6, 1724-5, 1750-4, 1760, 1766-70, 1774, 1779, 2098, 2133-6
Com., suggested ref. to., 1623
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1713-6, 1724, 1769
Charters, schedule of, 1766
Directors, 1627, 1630, 1640, 1654
British Columbia, from, 1629
Executive Com., 1667
Management and operation, 1677-81, 1691

Reid, Hon. John Dowsley—*Con.*
Canadian National Railway—*Con.*
Powers to construct under Order in Council, 1767
Provinces, representation of, 1570
Railways to be included, 1677-81
United States, in, 1693
Securities, 1769-70
Canals
Power development and export, 1599
Trent, 3188-9
Welland, deepening, work for returned soldiers, 1592-1610, 3175-87
Civil Service
Com. of inquiry, 1709
Salaries, 1591
Coal, railway contracts for, 1909
Correction of report of speech, 3188, 3221, 3378
Custom houses, as storage places for liquor, 956, 964
Daylight Saving, 919
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4572-3, 4583-7
Freight rates on raw sugar, 3471
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 701-8, 938-948
Government railways, reference to ministerial statement, 1589
Private cars, 1590
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 399
Highways Aid Bill, 730, 785, 3899-3926, 4391, 4423, 4426-8
Amdt. (agreement with Province), 4431
Lévis station, 2458
Location of railways, 2510-1
National Research Institute, 1709
Paradis, Mr. M., claim of, 3189
Railway Act Consolidation Bill, 936, 2617-52, 3134
Senate disagreement, 4064-9
Board control of rates, 4136, 4139
Telephone companies, 4166
Transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3134
Railway crossings, 697-701, 936-8
Railways and Canals Department
Salaries, 1588
Solicitor, 1592
Railways and steamships, 4683-5
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1023
St. John and Quebec Railway, 2567, 2798
St. Lawrence River water powers, 1796
War Board, railways and Daylight Saving, 909, 929
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2939

Reid, Mr. John Flaws (Mackenzie)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 585. Tariff, 585, 589; late Sir Wilfrid Laurier — Government's land policy, 587; prohibition—returned soldiers, pensions—land settlement, 588; farmers, workers and manufacturers, 590
Agriculture, live stock, 2970
Briquetting lignite, 3472
Budget, 3593. Income tax—tariff, 3594; undue profits, 3596; agricultural implements—markets and prices, 3597; operation of grain elevators—agricultural implements, 3598; insurance of returned men, 3599
Daylight Saving, 926
Export of feed, Fort William Grain Company, ques. 2048
Good roads, 3916-8
Immigration, illiterates, 1953
Shipbuilding, ques. 610, ques. 644
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2948

Repatriation Com., ques. 1340

Representation Act (1914) Amdt. Bill (Fraser Valley). 1r., 4; 2r., com., 625; 3r., 727

Returned Soldiers. *See* War, soldiers

Revenue Bills
Business Profits War Tax Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 3154; 1r., 3738; 2r., com., 3988; 3r., 4003
Customs Tariff, 1907, Amdt. Bill. Res., 3151; 1r., 3738; 2r., 3988, 4003; com., 4003; 3r., 4012
Income War Tax Act, 1917, Amdt. Bill. Res., 3154; 1r., 3738; 2r., com., 3988; 3r., 4003
Dependents, 3992
Garment factory operators, 3994
Military pensions, 3994
Inland Revenue Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 1586-7; 1r., 1588

Rhodes, Hon. Edgar N. (Cumberland). *See* Speaker

Rhyl. *See* Kinmel

Richardson, Mr. Robert Lorne (Springfield)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 376. Young men and politics, 376; abolition of partyism — Union government — Liberalism, 377; tariff, 378, 391; party tyranny — Senate reform, 380; Liberalism defined, 381; leaders needed, 383; history of party, 384; vicious features of party, 385; public expenditures, 386; Printing Bureau and patronage—Civil Service — translators — Debates Com., 387;

Richardson, Mr. Robert Lorne—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
Canada's troops—war work of Canadian women, 388; Peace Conference and Canada's representation, 389; Mount Carmel, 390; national unity, 392
Board of Commerce, 4509
Budget, 3654. War and aftermath of war, 3654; parties and protection, 3655; Liberal party and the tariff, 3656; tariff commission — East and West, 3660; public ownership—Civil Service—regulation of profits, 3663; Union-War government, 3664
Budka, Bishop, 1917
Canadian National Railway
Construction of lines, extension of time, 1755
Directors, 1635
Head office, 1648
Public ownership, 1630, 1757, 1760
Canadian Press news service, 4484-6
Conner, Mr., Immigration Agent, 2590-3
Cost of Living, 4323
Daylight Saving, 891, 923
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 874
Government printing, Editorial Com., 1435
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1210
Grand Trunk Pacific Railway receivership, 1116, 1152
Hutterites and Mennonites, 1924
Immigration
Exclusion of certain classes, 1916
Deported conspirators, amdt., 1951
Treatment of immigrants, 1916
Judges' railway expenses, 2641
Militia, permanent force, 3972
Newsprint Control, 4541
Prohibition, 2673
Public ownership of railways, 1630, 1757, 1760
Railway Act, local freight rate agreements, 4139
Subsidies, mistaken policy of, 1297
Titles, 1451, 2731
Winnipeg strike, 2799

Rideau Hall, 2500-2

Rideau Junction townsite, ques. 2398

Ridley, Mr. John, ques. 2566

Rimouski and overseas mail, 886, 929

River Beaudette-St. Zotique roadway, ques. 2144

Roads. *See* Highways

Robb, Mr. James Alexander (Chauteauguay-Huntingdon)
Agricultural implement duties and freight rates, 3697-8, 3706
Béland, Dr., M.P., welcome to, on release from German prison, 4
Board of Commerce, 4528-30
Business of the House
Legislation to be brought down, 1616, 2398
Weekly statement of prospective legislation, 599
Canada Grain Act Amdt., 3956-60
Canals, contracts, system of, 1598-1600
Canadian Trade Commission, ques. 644
Caughnawaga Reserve, 2902, 4057-8
Civil Service, enlisted men, 2925
Committee, Standing, 2
Cost of Living, 4316
Customs, rebate of duty, ques. 646
Dairy products and the war, 2966-8
Delayed returns, 886
Dominion water powers, 2513-7, 2523
Exhibitions, 2973
Toronto fair, 2997
Export trade, Trade Commission, etc., 2238
Farm help, demobilization of farmers' sons, 1958
Flour mill machinery, 4006
Franchise Bill, probable date, 2906
Good roads, 3902, 4392
Grain trade—operation of elevators, 4087, 4099-4100
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 686
Greece, supply of wheat to, ques. 2907
Housing scheme, 2540, 2564
Income tax and judges' and others' pensions, 3711, 3719
Income, taxable, gross, ques. 2294
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 3
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2061-7
Militia
Accounts, audit of, ques. 2199
Permanent force, 2968, 2974
Amdt. to 3r. of Bill, 4002
National harbours and grain trade, 3751
Oil for asphalt manufacture, 4005
Pension cases, 3003
Rails from Canadian railways sent overseas, 2239
Railways
Public ownership of, 686
Provinces and branch lines, 695
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 708
Schools and religious teaching, 2413
Seed grain advances, 1040, 1042, 4047
Sharpe, Lieut.-Col., death of, 3
Siberia, economic commission, ques. 613
Statistics Act Amdt., 595-9
Trade discrimination in Britain, 72

Robb, Mr. James Alexander—*Con.*
War expenditure
Vouchers for overseas payment, 1710
$350,000,000 vote, 2237
War Measures Act, 2148
Water-borne traffic, control of rates, 2942, 2950
Weights and measures, 2149
Wheat, free, 3707
Winnipeg strike, postal employees, 2508

Roe, Mr. James Sydney, ques. 1216

Ross, Commander J. K. L., offer of destroyer, ques. 880, 1534

Ross, Mr. Duncan Campbell (West Middlesex)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 500. Sir Arthur Currie, 500; demobilization — prospective deficit, 501; vocational training, pensions, land settlement, 502; franchise — War-time Elections Act, 503; public health—farmers and profiteering, 504; Daylight Saving — interior terminal elevators, 505; rural credits—tariff, 506; national unity, 507
Canadian National Railway Bill, 1669-70
Daylight Saving, 903
Fisheries, officers, 2893, 2895
Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill, 2065-6
Railway Act Consolidation; transmission lines on highways; Hydro-Electric, 3091
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 641

Ross, Mr. P. D. 2915-7
Buildings owned by, rental of, ques. 1438

Rosslyn, 3191

Ross Rifle, ques. 976, 1614

Roumania. *See* Foreign trade

Rowell, Hon. Newton W. (President of the Privy Council)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 358. War's effect on Canada's national status—Canada and Germany contrasted, 358; Imperial War Conference, 359; Dominions and foreign affairs — Imperial War Cabinet or Council, 360; the Dominion and the Crown — Imperial War Cabinet and Parliament of Canada, 362; Dominions and Prime Minister of Great Britain, direct communication, 365; consulting Parliament, 366; Peace Conference, Canada's representation — League of Nations, 367; Russia, Bolshevism, 368; Canada's war troops, Gen. Sir Arthur Currie, 370

Rowell, Hon. Newton W.—*Con.*
Air Service, mail by, 2036
British Nationality, Naturalization and Aliens Consolidation Bill, 3821-2
Budget, 3401. Victory bonds, 3402; Hon. Mr. Crerar and prices—iron, steel and coal industries, 3405; national debt, 3406; tariff revision, 3407; cost of living and industrial unrest, 3409; Bolshevism, 3412; unity and strength, 3413
Cabinet secrets, alleged revelation of, 3628, 3631
Canadian National Railway, 1747
Public ownership, 1749
Canadian representation at Washington, 2202
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association —oath, 2016
Civil Service
Overmanning of, 4671
Postal workers' correspondence, 2342
War bonus, 2314, 2924-8
Consular officers, payments to, 1900
Dominion Police, pay of, 2925-6
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4576-80
Flavelle, Sir Joseph, 2074
Good roads, 4392-5
Government by Order in Council, number of orders passed, 4487
Gundy, Mr. W. P., death of, 3196
Gunning, Mr. John G., 1435
Health, 1366-80
Social and industrial conditions, 1366
Health Department Bill, 843, 1164, 1182-3, 1186-1206
Housing scheme, ministerial explanation, 2532, 2539, 2551-64
Imperial War Cabinet and Imperial War Conference
Ministerial statement, 1044
Naturalization, East Indian immigration, cables and passports, resources of the Empire, Canada's status, War Graves Commission, etc., 1047-70, 4125-6
India, famine in, 2616
International Joint Commission, 1901-4
Lake of the Woods, technical and control boards, 2067
Mounted Police Bill, Senate amdt., 3809
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 2026, 4482
Newsprint control, 4663
Ocean rates, 1051, 2069
Paris agency, 1901
Peace Treaty, 2146
Eight-hour day and, 1996, 2044

Rowell, Hon. Newton W.—*Con.*
Pensions
Commission, expenses, 2448
Com., 139
Pension Act Amdt. Bill, 4172-96, 4199-4208, 4274-99
Resolution and explanation, 4023
Taylor, Mr. John, 3002
"Unmarried wife," 4274, 4279
Vote, $28,000,000, 3000-4
Postal Service
Canadian National Railway and mails, 2094
Finance and expenditure, 2032, 2040, 2092
Mail contracts, 2079-81
Ottawa-Pembroke service, 2034
Postage rate, suggested reduction, 2041
Postmasters, substation and rural, 2030
Post Office officials serving overseas, 2040
Rural mail, 2081
Salaries and allowances, 1435, 1794. *See also, under this title,* Winnipeg
Prohibition, 2675-82
Purchasing Commission Bill, 1162, 3195-6, 3223-7, 4441-52
Salaries of Commissioners, res., 3810-6
Railway Act Consolidation, disagreement with Senate, 4160
Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Appropriation accounts tabled, 40
Supply; Ministerial explanation; history of force, war record, etc., 2313-30
Royal Northwest Mounted Police Bill, 2510, 2695-6
St. Lawrence water powers, 1995
St. Lawrence River Power Company, 2396
Shale Oil Company, 1056
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2761-78
Officials, 4674-6
Titles, 2739
Transatlantic mails, Rimouski and Halifax, 929, 1794
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1016
War appropriation; demobilization appropriation, 2564
War Measures Act, Orders in Council under, 4135
War tax on cheques—postage stamps for, 2031-2
War Trade Board, 2072
Washington, Canadian representation; War Mission, 2070, 2076, 2202
Winnipeg strike, 3843-5
Post office employees and, 2508, 3809, 4345

Royal Air Force. *See* War

Royal Assent, 1111, 3213, 4701

Royal Military College building, Clerk of ques. 4377

Royal Naval College, 2850

Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 173, 4672
Appropriation accounts tabled, 40
Supply: Increase of the force; history, war record, etc., 2313

Royal Northwest Mounted Police Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 2509; 1r., 2532; 2r., com., 2695; 3r., 2752; Senate amdt., 3809, 3823

Royal Society of Canada, report tabled, 138

Rural Credits, 506

Ruthenians, 1938, 3472. *See also* Poles

Ste. Anne de Bellevue, soldiers' hospital, ques. 1212

Ste. Barnabé Island, ques. 4464

St. Catharines Bay and Tadoussac service, 411

St. Charles River
Belanger vs. The King, 1021
Contract for damming, ques. 677
Works, 1279, 2788

Ste. Famille wharf, 2786

St. Gedeon, postmaster, 410, ques. 972

St. John Harbour, 2359

St. John Harbour Commission Bill. Res., 4299; 1r., 2r., com., 4306; 3r., 4339

St. John and Quebec Railway Bills
1. Gagetown and Westfield. 1r., 41; 2r., com., 696; 3r., 784
2. Centreville and Andover. Res., 2567; 1r., 2568; 2r., com., 2799; 3r., 2800

St. Laurent wharf, 2785

St. Lawrence
Coal trade, shipping for, 4335
Dams, 886
North shore, communication, 411
Ship channel, 2608
Water power. *See that title*

St. Lawrence River Power Company, 2396

St. Louis Road property, ques. 604. *See* Gustave

St. Malo Workshops, ques. 1212

Ste. Marie wharf, ques. 1958

St. Pierre-Miquelon mails, 2092

St. Stanislaus Novitiate. *See* Military Service, Guelph

St. Zotique-River Beaudette roadway, ques. 2144

Saguenay and Labrador winter communication, ques. 2565

Salmon Fishing Licenses. *See* Fisheries Act

Salvarsan, sale of, ques. 2144

Sanders, Lieut. J., ques. 3067

Saskatoon public building, 739

Savard, Mr. Edmond (Chicoutimi-Saguenay)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 406. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—French Canadians, 407; enlistment in Chicoutimi and Saguenay, 408; draft evaders—cost of living—woman suffrage, 409; patronage, local postmasters, 410, 412; returned soldiers, 410; North shore communication, 411
Boudreault, Mr. Benjamin, ques. 1439
Coté, Mr. Louis, ques. 2566
L'Hereux, Maj. Napoleon, ques. 978
Military Service Registrar, Montreal, ques. 973
Pariseault, Lt., ques. 884
St. Gedeon, postmaster, ques. 972
Saguenay-Labrador, ques. 2565
Tadoussac-Labrador, ques. 3327

Saw Pit Wharf, 2782

School and Dominion Lands in Taber irrigation district, 4210

Schools, Dominion, non-sectarian, 2403. *See* Education

Schools of Navigation, 2601

Scientific Research. *See* Industrial

Scotch Cove, 2782

Scott, Mr. Frank Stewart (South Waterloo)
Budget, 3302. Siberian expedition—tariff—shoe manufacture, 3302; business profits tax—income tax, 3307; Canada's record, 3309
Canadian National Railway, 2111
Public ownership of railways, 2111

Seaweed, 2787

Secretary of State
Powers of in naturalization. *See* British Nationality
Report tabled, 138

Sedition and Seditious Propaganda Com,, 1956, 3285. *See also* Criminal Code; Immigration; Naturalization

Seduction. *See* Criminal Code

Seed Grain, ques. 979, 2446, 4047, 4054-5

Seed Grain Advances Bill. Res., 625; 1r., 629; 2r., com., 1029; 3r., 1111

Seguin, Mr. Paul Arthur (L'Assomption-Montcalm)
National Service Registration, ques. 1907, ques. 2296

Selkirk, postmaster, ques. 1308

Semolina, 3681

Senate
Cabinet Ministers in, 406, 1002-11
Speaker of, living allowance, 2444

Sergeant-at-Arms, Deputy appointed, 4

Sexsmith, Mr. John Albert (East Peterborough)
Bran and shorts, 4007
Cow testing, 2982
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2465-7
Good roads, 794, 3901
Income tax, farmers and, 3733
Military Service Act, 1323
Oleomargarine, 2982
Pensions, 4184
Railway Act Consolidation — telephone clause, 2644-8, 4168

Seymour Narrows Battery, ques. 975

Shale Oil Company, 929, 1056, 4070

Sharpe, Lieut.-Col. Sam, D.S.O., M.P., death of, 3, 549

Shaughnessy, Lord, 648, 1630, 1820, 1825

Shaw, Mr. Hugh Murray (Macleod)
Budget, 3583

Sheard, Mr. Charles (South Toronto)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 78. After-war problems—pensions, 79; franchise, 80; aliens—Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 81; Health Department, 82; public revenues and taxation, 84; Civil Service Commission, 85; Civil Service salaries, 86
Canadian National Railway, 1649
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 1211, 2295
Civil Service
Appointments by Commission, 2633
Reclassification, 2292
Divorce Court Bill, 3785
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4580-3
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 3464
Pensions and disability, ques. 882
Proprietary medicines, 2482
Soothing syrups, 2491
Public Health Bill, 1175, 1182-5, 1205
Public health and social conditions, 1366

Sheard, Mr. Charles—*Con.*
Soldiers' votes, statement of Mr. W. T. R. Preston, 4135
Titles, 2705
Transmission lines on highways; powers of municipalities, 3100, 3117

Shell Oil Company, 929, 1056, 4070

Shipbuilding, 43, 53, 123, 219, 1688, 4682
Canada's achievements for war, 19
"Canadian Volunteer," ques. 3998
George, Right Hon. David Lloyd, opinion of, 2253
Government programme, ques. 613, ques. 644
Vote of $30,000,000, ministerial statement, 2202, 2251
Tariff and, 2217, 2223
Vessels built by Government since 1917, ques. 610

Shipping. *See also* Canada Shipping Act Amdt.
Inter-imperial, 1051
Registration, 2602
Shortage of Canadian tonnage, 2207

Ships. *See* Vessels

Siberian Economic Commission, ques. 613, ques. 747, ques. 1535

Siberian Expedition, 143, 227, 334, 3297, 3741
Alleged imprisonment of Canadian soldiers, 4000
Draftees in, 321
Liquor for, ques. 845
Return of, 971, ques. 1216
Statements by Ministers, 319, 1062

Sick Mariners' Fund, 40, 2615

Sifton, Hon. Arthur Lewis (Minister of Customs and Inland Revenue)
Budget, 3260. Hon. Mr. Crerar's resignation, 3260; taxation methods—tariff changes — people seeking special favours — tariff commission, 3261; after-war problems, 3262

Sifton, Sir Clifford, 1908

Signal Service, 2610

Simpson, Mr. Thomas Edward (West Algoma)
Budget, 3565. Canada's debt incurred at home—pensions, 3565; cost of living, 3566; iron and steel industries and the tariff, 3567

Sinclair, Mr. John Ewen (Queen's P.E.I.)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 457. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—highways—public health, 458; production and marketing, 459; P.E.I.

Sinclair, Mr. John Ewen—*Con.*
Address—*Con.*
railway, broadening the gauge, 460; fisheries and returning naval men—Orders in Council — deserters — franchise, 461; aliens—national unity, 462
Agricultural Gazette, 2990-1
Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296, ques. 4464
Cold storage, 2983
"Earl Grey," icebreaker, ques. 2145
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2287-9
Good roads, 4434
Greater production grant, ques. 600, ques. 2566
Judges' salaries, 4223
"Minto," icebreaker, ques. 3242
Oyster culture, 2892, 2898
"Prince Edward," car ferry, 4618
Prince Edward Island Railway, 460, ques. 4377
Soldiers at Halifax, 1663

Sinclair, Mr. John H. (Antigonish and Guysborough)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 51. Mr. McKenzie, leader of the Opposition — late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 51; victory and peace, 52; highways and housing, provincial rights—shipbuilding, 53; Military Service Act, 54; Union government—party, 55; patronage and graft—public loans, 56; food and Food Board—prices—industrial unrest, 57; Civil Service—trade with the United States, 58; efficiency, 60; Government commissions, 61; labour and reconstruction, 62
Air Board Bill, 2051, 2057
Alien enemies, property of, ques. 1535
Amherst
Doctors, payments to, ques. 3377
Internment camp, 2565, 3848
Mineral Water Company, ques. 3997
Anti-loafing, ques. 883
Arisaig Wharf, 2780
Ballantyne's Cove, 1302
Bankruptcy Bill, 2004
Bear River, ques. 3242
Bliss, Dr. C., ques. 3397
Board of Commerce, 4556-8, 4566
British Columbia fishing licenses, 934
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Business Profits Tax, ques. 1791
Canada Food Board, ques. 602
Canada Shipping Act, 3756-7, 3931-7
Canadian Expeditionary Force, ques. 1440, ques. 2798
Canadian Generals, portraits of, ques. 1905

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
Canadian Mission in London, ques. 1905
Canadian National Railway
Abandoned lines, 1709
Annual meeting, 1810
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1721
Directors, 1671, 1810
Finance, parliamentary control, 1417, 2124
Fiscal year, 1706
Governor in Council instead of shareholders, 1676
Steamships, 1681-4
Canadian Northern Railway, net earnings, ques. 2462
Canadian vessels requisitioned by Admiralty, ques. 1908
"Canadian Voyageur," steamer, ques. 1212
"Canadian Warrior," steamer, ques. 3327, ques. 3470, ques. 4241
Canals
Positions on, and returned soldiers, 3177
Welland, deepening of, 3181-4
Canso
Distressed seamen, 2614
Harbour master, 3158
Cars and rails, contracts for, ques. 1907
Censorship, Hazel Hill and Canso, ques. 847
Civil Service
Appointments, 963
Commissioners, 2909, 2916
Efficiency, 1559
Overmanning of, 4672
Combines, 4570, 4592-7
Copyright, 4022
Dominion Elections Act, 4621, 4629, 4648-51
Dominion Parks, sites in Western Nova Scotia, 2304
Dominion water powers, 2513, 2515
Duchemin, Mr. H. P., ques. 1536, ques. 1791
Economic Commission to Siberia, ques. 1535
Economy, 4051, 4673
Experimental Farms, 2977
Fair wage officer, Nova Scotia, ques. 1907
Farm tractors, ques. 1536, ques. 2048
Fertilizers Act Amdt., 2286-9, 2464-6
Fish and Fisheries
Compulsory inspection, 951
Lobsters, 714-726, 2894, 2899, 2900
Oysters, 2894
Protection service, 2848
Salmon (Fisheries Act Amdt.), 3758-61
Twine and cordage, 3708
Waste, utilization of, 3341
Foreign credits, Italy, 3831-3
Fort Lawrence, dredging, ques. 3680

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*

Freight rates
Farmers and, 3698
Raw sugar, on, 3471
Gold, prohibition of export, 1103
Goodwin, Dr. B. E., ques. 4070, ques. 4465
Gordon. Hon. Major Rev. C. W., ques. 1440
Government Employees' Compensation Bill, 702-7, 938-9
Government-owned vessels, 974-5, ques. 1306
Grand Etang, 2609
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1185
Guysborough public building, ques. 846
Halifax
Harbour master, 2802
Pilotage rate, 2694
Terminals, ques. 2398
Heatherton-Canso mail route, 2090
"Helena," motor boat, ques. 3998
Homestead entries, ques. 751
House of Commons—questions and returns, 648
Housing scheme, 2562
Immigration Act Amdt.
Discharged seamen, 1979
Illiterates, 1966
Penalty on transportation complaints, 1978
Immigration and Colonization Department, 2572
Income war tax, 3717-8, 3725
Losses, 3991
Unmarried women, 3993
Intoxicating liquors, illegal handling of, ques. 883, 960
Judges
County Court, 1769, ques. 2565
Salaries, 4375
Land values tax, 3839
Lands for school purposes, ques. 848
Live stock shipments, 2603
Livingstone's Cove, 2780-1
Loans, public, 4242
$100,000,000, cost of, ques. 1907
Lobster, canned, 714-726
"McKee," steamer, ques. 1212, ques. 2397
Marine hospitals, 1201
Marine rates, ques. 4241
Matches, stamps on, 969
Military Service
Deserters and absentees, ques. 879
Expenditure, ques. 973
Guelph Novitiate, 1248
Militia
Pensions, 2759
Permanent force, 2986
Morris, Col., ques. 2565
Mulgrave services, 1302, 1304
National harbours, 3743-4

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*

National Parks, 4051-2
Naturalization, 4270-2
Naval recruiting in Prince Edward Island, ques. 646
Naval Service, 2836
Bronze Star, ques. 602
Discharge of men, fisheries needing help, 1959
New Harbour breakwater, 2783
Newspapers and periodicals, publication of ownership and control, 1564, 2021-3
Old-age pensions, 1268
Parliament Buildings, 2334
Patriotic Fund, 1164
Pensions, 4188, 4199
"Unmarried wife," 4281
Pictou Island, 2793
Pilotage, 2612, 2803, 2804, 2807, 3159
Port Felix custom house, 956
Postage rate
Letters, suggested reduction, 2041
Newspapers, ques. 727
Post Office supplies, 2091
"Prince George," steamer, ques. 746
Provident Fund Act, ques. 2045
Provincial subsidies, ques. 744
Public Health Department, 1191
Appointments, 1182
Public Works, Nova Scotia, 2781
Purchasing Commission, 3230, 3238-9, 4454
Railway Act Consolidation — telephones, 4167
Railway crossings, 936
Railways, subventions to, ques. 604
Reclamation of Dominion Lands, 709-713
Rideau Junction townsite, ques. 2398
Royal Naval College, 2850
Rural postmasters, ques. 1536
St. John Harbour Commission, 4302-3, 4337-8
Seed grain, 627, 1035-40
Shipbuilding, 1688, 2211, 2259-61, 4683-4
England, in, cost of, 2213
Permanency in Canada, 2260
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 1770-2
Soldiers' Settlement Board, 1075
Soldiers' Land Settlement
Nova Scotia loans, ques. 847
Solicitors, ques. 883
Statistics Act Amdt., 596
Steamship services, 1283, 1284
Steam shovels for Militia Dept., ques. 1907
Taxation, statistics of, 3839
Technical education, 3167-73, 3793, 3896
Telephone companies, 2646
Trawlers
Built in Canada, 2213
Sale of, ques. 751

Sinclair, Mr. John H.—*Con.*
"T. J. Drummond," steamer, purchase of, ques. 2397
War Purchasing Commission, ques. 1216
War Trade Board, 2073
Weights and measures, 2149
"Willihad," steamer, ques. 616
Wine Harbour, 2783
Wrecking plants, subsidies, 2603-5

Slate River, 3191

Slides and Booms, 4607

Smart, Brig.-Gen., charges by, 1099, 1483

Smith, Mr. William (South Ontario)
Daylight Saving, 893

Social Hygiene Conference, ques. 3068

Social Welfare. *See* Public Health

Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 81, 1896, 4673
Department of
Allowances; vocational training, 2776
Buildings, etc., vocational training, 2764
Deputy Minister, 3586
Director of Medical Services, resignation of, Col. F. McKelvey Bell, 3240, 3422, 3472, 3926, 4674
Hospitals, 2774
Maintenance of patients, 2770
Officials without overseas record, 4240
Parliamentary Secretary, resignation of, Mr. F. B. McCurdy, 185, 974, 4676
Report tabled, 270
Representation in House of Commons, 974
Staff and salaries, 2761, 2772, ques. 4240, 4479

Soldiers' Land Settlement, 88, 96, 153, 185, 300, 323, 343, 395, 413, 446, 588
Board, ques. 1075
Salaries, 2452
Solicitors, ques. 883
Land from forest reserves, 2953
Offers of land, ques. 610
Royal Air Force, inclusion of, 1437
Santa Lucia, troops at, ques. 615
See also Soldiers' Land Settlement Bill; Dominion Lands and Parks; Dominion Forest; Reclamation

Soldiers' Land Settlement Bill, 1616. 1r., 2291; 2r., com., 3848, 4012; 3r., 4073
Board of Commissioners, 3873
Compulsory purchase, 2875
Default, resale, 3882-4
Exemption from seizure under ordinary laws, 3885
Free soldier grants, 3879, 4014
Garden villages, 4012. *See that title*

Soldiers' Land Settlement—*Con.*
Indian reserves, land from, 3875, 4015
Lands sold to Board free of commission, 3891
Liens, statement of, 3888
Loans on stock, fruit trees, etc., 3890, 4014
Regulations, 4014
School lands, 3879
Security, 3887
Surveys, 3890
Taxation, 3888
Title to land, 3874

Soothing Syrups. *See* Proprietary

Sowden, Mr. Felix M., ques. 729

Speaker (Hon. Edgar N. Rhodes)
Living allowance, 2445
Rulings and statements of
Adjournment—matter of urgent public interest—leave to discuss (Gen. Smart and Col. Pratt's charges), 1099, 1101
Appeal from decision to House—Daylight Saving, 1432
Bills
Introduction, unprinted, not in order, 3754
Motion to commit, limits of debate on, 2617
Second reading, limits of discussion, 3200, 3818, 4506-9
Chair to be addressed, 3639
Committees
Appointment of members opposed to principle, 1482
Reference in House to proceedings of, 3590, 3603
Report of—to be accepted as regular, 4313, 4320
Amendment of, procedure in, 2722
Clerical errors, correction of, 2616
Daylight Saving
Motion, form of, 928
Time of meeting of House under, 1432
Debate, special latitude of, 4141
Debating same subject twice—Mr. McMaster's amdt. to the Budget allowed, 3260, 3677
Divisions—not needed if no contrary voice, 4527
Galleries of House, 1910
Internal Economy, Board of, report under Rule 9, 605
Language: "defraud the electors," 1325; "culprit," 1326; "miserable, cowardly slander," 1334
Lapsed order
Member speaking at time of lapse continues only by consent, 399
Reinstatement, motion for, not debatable, 398

Speaker (Hon. Edward N. Rhodes)—*Con.*
Rulings and Statements—*Con.*
Member speaking may not interrogate another, 3638
Motions, form of, 2722
Withdrawal of, 1259
Newspapers referring to proceedings of the House, 3660
Orders of the Day: appropriateness of discussion on calling, 271, 318, 357, 2201, 2202, 2294, 2399, 3472, 3473, 4239, 4335
Attack on Government not in order, 3194
Questions only, no debate, 1435, 1483
Reading of document, 1711
Privilege
Address instead of message from Senate, 642
Limitation of speech, on rising to, 1998
Procedure under general resolution takes precedence over procedure subsequently set, 398
Question in interruption of speaker, 275-6
Questions and answers
Answers not debatable, 648
Copies, supplying of, 612, 647
Reading of documents from outside criticising members of House, 1488
Reconsideration, 4140
Relevancy, 643, 878, 1330, 1335, 1337, 1382, 4146, 4150, 4167, 4506
Senate
Amdts., advisability of form of, 4153, 4157
Non-concurrence in, form of motion, 3810
Conference with, no suspension of sitting of House, 3948-9
Message to, motion not debatable, 4170
Reflection upon proceedings of, 4148, 4154
Six months' hoist, 903
Unanimous consent, 936, 1479, 2653, 3175, 4140
Bill, amdt. on. 3r., 696
Necessary, resuming speech on lapsed order, 399
Written speeches, 117

Stacey, Mr. Frank Bainard (*Fraser Valley)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 412. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier—party government, 412; Soldiers' Land Settlement, 413; Indian reserves—rural mail carriers and postmasters, 414—amdts. to B.N.A. Act—national unity, 415

Stacey, Mr. Frank Bainard—*Con.*
Budget, 3390. Farmers and the tariff, 3390; after-war troubles, 3391; industrial unrest, 3392; reasons for vote, 3394
Representation Act Amdt., 4, 727
Soldiers' Land Settlement
Compulsory purchase—Indian reserves—amdt., 3875-9, 4016
Payments, 3882

Stamp Taxes, alleged abuses under, 334

Standardization, Canadian Engineering Standards Association, 3842

Standing Orders, Com. appointed, 112

Starrar, Mr. Hall, ques. 616

Statistics
Imperial, 1057
Industrial, 1917, tabled, 550

Statistics Act Amdt. Bill. 1r., 139; 2r., com., 595; 3r., 625

Stead, Mr. R. J. E., appointment, 280

Steamship Services
Australia and New Zealand, 1105
Baddeck and Iona, 1296
France, service advocated, 1291
Freight services, 1285
Froude's Point and Lockeport, 1301
Grand Manan, 1301
Great Britain, ques. 1107, 1282
Gulf of St. Lawrence, ques. 3827
Halifax and West Cape Breton, 1301
Liverpool, 1294
Magdalen Islands-Pictou, 623
Need of, 1290-6
Newcastle, Neguac and Escuminac, 1303
Newfoundland, 1283, 1294
Petit de Grat and Mulgrave, 1303
Petitcodiac and Cumberland, 1303
Pictou and Montague, 1304
Pictou, New Glasgow and Mulgrave, 1304
Pictou, Mulgrave and Cheticamp, 1304
Port Mulgrave and Bras d'Or, 1304
Railway subsidies vs. steamship, 1296
South Africa, 1289, 1291
Sydney-Bras d'Or, 3829
West Indies and South America, 1283

Steam shovels for Militia Department, ques. 1907

Steel Plate Plant, Dominion Steel Company, 2209, 2251-60

Steele, Mr. Michael (South Perth)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 96. Returned soldiers—land settlement, 96; Liberal party—Union government—public health, 97; immigration, 99

*Name changed: formerly Westminster District. *See* pp. 4, 625, 727

Steele, Mr. Michael—*Con.*
Canada Food Board, ques. 2750
Canadian Wholesale Grocers' Association, 2015
Civil Service, Committee to inquire into efficiency of, 1554
Daylight Saving, 911
Divorce, 3781, 3790
Famine in India, 2616
Fish, Canadian, marketing overseas, ques. 2750
Immigration
Medical examination of passengers, 1974
Prohibiting certain classes, 1924
Mail contractors, 2088
Mennonites in Ontario, 1925
Orders in Council, number passed, ques. 2145
Parliament Buildings, 2337
Portland cement, duty on, ques. 1612
Proprietary medicines, 2479-81, 2485, 3826, 3938
Opium and derivatives, 2489-92
Public Health Bill, 1189
Child welfare, 1375
Rural postmasters, 2089

Stefansson Expedition, 2849

Stevens, Mr. Henry Herbert (Vancouver Centre)
Air Board Bill, 2051
Board of Commerce, 4470
Budget, 3315. Foreign credits—tariff, 3316; war and protection, 3318; high cost of living, 3319; coal duties and freight rates, 3329
Canada Grain Act Amdt.—grain trade, operation of elevators, 3947-9, 4077-84, 4090
Chinese immigration, ques. 751
Civil Service, appointment of returned soldiers, 281
Combines, 4569
Copper refineries, 1106
Daylight Saving, 911
Elevators at Fort William and Port Arthur, ques. 604
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 872
Foreign trade—credits and ships, 2167, 3835
Grain on Great Lakes, ques. 599
Immigration, restrictions, 769-773
Judges, County Court, 2954
Judges' salaries, British Columbia, 2305, 2310
Mounted Police, service in Northwest Rebellion, 2322
Panama Canal, trade via, 1283
Railway Act Consolidation; transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3083

Stevens, Mr. Henry Herbert—*Con.*
Telephone companies, 2646
Transatlantic flight of Hawker, 2564
Vancouver harbour, 4021
Vancouver pension office, ques. 3377
Vocational training for under-age soldiers, 1011, 1020

Stewart, Mr. John A. (Lanark)
Insurance Act Amdt.—"actuary," 3987
Judges and income tax, 4230
Prohibition, 2351, 2356
Proprietary medicines, 2480-2, 2486
Coal tar derivatives and opium, 2490
Purchasing Commission, 4450

Stewart, Mr. Thomas Joseph (West Hamilton)
Canadian Niagara Bridge Company, 4345
Railway Act Consolidation
Commission's control of rates, 4142
Reconsideration of clause 325 objected to, 2929, 4140
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2943
Telephone companies, 2650

Stewart, Maj.-Gen. J. W., 2868

Stock Feed, purchase of, 2447

Stock Yards. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt. Bill

Strikes. *See* Industrial Unrest

Submarine, gift to Canada, 229, ques. 2868

Sugar, raw, freight rates on, 3471, 4683

Supply, Com. of, ordered, 592

Supply, 842, 954, 1044, 1105, 1262, 1282, 1483, 1588, 1886, 2016, 2067, 2202, 2251, 2291, 2313, 2359, 2440, 2493, 2761, 2780, 2808, 2887, 2952, 2959, 3175, 3827, 4033, 4475, 4601, 4664

Supply Bills. *See* Appropriation Acts

Supreme Court
Chief Justice, allowances to. *See* Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles
Final appeal, 1059

Surveys, 4049-51, 4055
Geodetic, 4045
Military, 1899

Sutherland, Mr. Donald (South Oxford)
Air Board Bill, 2060
Board of Commerce, 4512
Civil Service
Efficiency, 1561
Transfers, 1269
War bonus, 2929
Daylight Saving, 896
Good roads, 3904

Sutherland, Mr. Donald—*Con.*
Grain trade—elevators and mills, 4091
Immigration, 1884, 1910, 2595
Industrial unrest, causes of, 2929
Labourers needed, 3905
Live Stock Amdt. Bill—price of butter, 2064-5
Mail contractors and city postmen, 2081
Noxious weeds, 4091
Pensions Board; appointments and returned soldiers, ques. 605
Public Health Bill, appointments, 1184
Railway Act
Senate amdts., telephones, 2645-50, 4154
Rural mail delivery and closing of offices, 2086-7, 2928
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2767-9
Terminal elevators, ques. 880
Titles, 1478
Wounded soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 995

Sweeney, Cpl. George, ques. 3067

Sydney Wharf, 4613

Taber Irrigation District Bill. 1r., 3997; 2r., com., 4210; 3r., 4211

Tadoussac-Labrador winter communication, ques. 3327

Tariff. *See also* Address; Budget; Taxation
Boots and shoes from United States, ques. 978
Commission, 311, 484
Implements and raw materials, 142, 514
Luxuries, on, ques. 749
Proposed amdt. of Mr. McMaster, 794

Taschereau, Mr. Alleyn, ques. 3066

Taxation. *See also* Address; Budget; Tariff
Commissioner of, 2798
Staff of, 3712
Methods, 830
Provincial taxation of Dominion lands, 709

Taylor, John, pension case of, 3001

Taylor, Senator George, death of, 885

Technical Education Bill. Res., 3164; 1r., 3175; 2r., com., 3791, 3891; 3r., 4136
Question as to time of presenting, 1616

Telegraphs and Telephones
Government, 4608
Nova Scotia, 2793

Thanksgiving Day Bill. 1r., 1305-6

Thompson, Mr. Alfred (Yukon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 298. Union government, 298; Orders in Council, 299; women's franchise—Opposition leader—land for soldiers—immigration, 300; Health Department—foreign trade, 301; highways—aerial navigation and Canada's great hinterland, 302; world commerce via Canada by airship, 305; Canada's lead in great enterprises, 306
Immigration, medical examination, 1975
Mining machinery, 3692
Naturalization, 4273
Red Cross Society, 3168
Scientific Research, 4462
Shale oils, 3692-3
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2763-4, 2766, 2771
Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070
Yukon Act Amdt., 503-5
Yukon Placer Mining Amdt., 629-632
Yukon, wheat growing, 2973

Thompson, Lt.-Col. Alfred, M.P., ques. 747

Thompson, Mr. Thomas Henry (Hastings East)
Daylight Saving, 906
Income tax, 3714-5

Thomson, Mr. Levi (Qu'Appelle)
Air Board Bill, 2057
Board of Commerce, 4568
Budget, 3579. Representative government, 3579; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 3580; free trade or protection, 3581; income tax, 3582
Judges and income tax, 4234
Naturalization, 4263
Prohibition, 2682-4
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 823
Titles, 2739

Timber purchases in Canada, 1361

Time. *See* Daylight Saving

Titles
Address to His Majesty the King, motion for (Mr. Nickle), 1441
Amdt., appointment of Special Com. (Mr. J. D. Reid), 1464
Amdt., to change phraseology (Sir Thomas White), 1479; agreed to on div., 1481
Committee report, 2359
Correction, 2615
Day fixed for discussion, 2617
Motion to adopt (Mr. Nickle), 2696; agreed to on div., 2749
Amdt. (Mr. Nicholson, Algoma), 2722; neg. on div., 2749
Address to the King acknowledged by H.E. the Governor General, 3377

Tobin, Mr. Edmund William (Richmond and Wolfe)
"Bayfield," steamer, ques. 608
Boots and shoes from United States, ques. 978
Canada Registration
Persons registered and cost, ques. 728
Use made of information, ques. 728
Canadian National Railway, ties, 3900
Commanders Thurston and Seddon, ques. 608
Grand Trunk Provident Fund, ques. 1213
Kingsmill, Admiral, visit to Victoria, ques. 1340
Kohn, Mr. Louis, Secretary, Economic Commission to Siberia, ques. 747
Land grants to railways, ques. 975
Members of Parliament, sessional indemnity, ques. 749
"Mildred McColl," H.M.C.S., ques. 747
Military Service Act
Defaulters, ques. 883
Exemptions, ques. 1108
Expenditure, ques. 645
Men of 19 years, registration of, ques. 615
Police employed, ques. 972, ques. 973
Regulations in force, ques. 646
Militia, permanent force, 3984
Montreal terminal and tunnel, ques. 1213
Naval air bases, ques. 1532
Naval Service, Canadian ratings in Grand Fleet, ques. 608
Ottawa
Central Station, ques. 1213
Federal Hotel, lease of, ques. 2045
Proprietary medicines war tax, ques. 1107
Seed grain, ques. 979, 1030
Soldiers' Land Settlement, ques. 610
"Stadacona," H.M.C.S., ques. 747

Tolmie, Mr. Simon Fraser (Victoria City)
Air Service
Air Board Bill, 2060
Aviation in Canada, ques. 1340
Mails by, 2036
Budget, 3569. Tariff and Japanese competition—development of natural resources, 3570; labour unrest, 3571; dairy products, beef and pork, 3572; British embargo on Canadian cattle, 3573
Cold storage, 2986
Good roads, 4429
Judges' salaries, 2958
Live stock, pure-bred sires, 2995
Tuberculosis in cattle, 2988
Wrecking plants, 2605

Toronto
Deputy Postmaster, 161, 276
Euclid Hall as hospital, ques. 749
Harbour improvements, 2363
Letter carriers, 1341

Toronto and Niagara Power Company. *See* Railway Act Consolidation; Electric and Power Companies

Toronto Suburban Railway, ques. 1678

Tourist Traffic, 4046-53

Town Planning and garden villages, 761. *See also* Housing

Tractors, ques. 1536, ques. 2048

Trade
Commission and Commissioners, ques. 664, ques. 1905, 3831, 4493
Development of, $150,000 vote, 3840
Discrimination in Britain, alleged, 72, 115, 140, 229
Embargo, 567
Export, reference in Speech from the Throne, 2
Exports and Imports, report tabled, 550
Foreign, and credit, 3831-7
France, 1099
Italy, 3808
Japan, 4019
Roumania, 1110, 1615-8, ques. 3241
Sir Clifford Sifton and, 1908
United States, 58
Great Britain, trade with and credits to, 1353-61

Trade and Commerce Dept., 335, 4605

Trahan, Mr. Arthur (Nicolet)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 293. Peace Conference, Canada's representation — Civil Service Commission, 293; reconstruction — resignation of Parliamentary Under Secretary—returned soldiers, 294; pensions—censorship, 295; industrial unrest—women's franchise and election—Government labour and social programme, 296; tariff, 297; national unity, 298
Budget, 3394. Finance and currency, 3394; remedies for existing difficulties, 3397; tariff, 3398; income tax, 3399; real wealth, 3401
Industrial Relations Commission, 4621
Public Health, 1186, 1376
Social welfare, child welfare, 1200-5
Technical education, 3792

Transatlantic Flight, ques. 2143, 2564

Trnsatlantic mail service, 1711, 1794

Transcontinental Highway, 1401

Transcontinental Railway. *See* Canadian National

Transmission Lines on highways. *See* Railway Act

Trawlers
Building and use of, ques. 746
Sale of, ques. 751
T-30, ques. 975, ques. 2397, 3472

Trotsky, Leon, ques. 880

Trudel, Mr. Alfred, ques. 2921

Tuberculosis and Indians, 4062

Tuck, Mr. Donald, 279

Turgeon, Mr. Onesiphore (Gloucester)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 307. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier —Opposition leadership, 307; Canada's soldiers — League of Nations — tariff, 308; reciprocity, 309; manufacturers—expenditures on Government railways, 310; taxation — tariff commission—War-time Elections Act, 311; highways—printers in Militia Department plant, 312
Budget, 3262. Procrastination charged, 3262; finance, 3263; cost of living, 3264; customs and other taxes, 3265; naval policy, 3266; Canada and free trade, 3268
Canadian National Railway
Lines to be included, 1682
Term of office of directors—vacancy—annual meeting, 1814
Gloucester, fisheries officer, 2893
Guelph Novitiate, 1253
Lobsters and hatcheries, 723, 2901-2
Marshall, Lieut. Hall, ques. 1790
Petit Rocher as site for experimental farm, 2965
Technical education, 3170

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas Mitchell March (West Calgary)
"Belgian-Canada," 2587
Canadian National Railway, 1832
Daylight Saving, 926
Divorce Court Bill, 3780
Dominion Parks, 4053
Electric and Power Companies Bill, 4586
Frozen beef, 1287
Highways, 790
Immigration
Deported conspirators, 1950
Hutterites, 1876, 1941
Illiterates, 1963
Offices in the West, 2588
Prohibiting certain classes, 1940

Tweedie, Mr. Thomas Mitchell March—*Con.*
Judges' salaries, 2308, 2312
Post office appointments after strike, 4354
Post office officials enlisted, 2040
Public Health, social welfare, 1192
Railway Act Consolidation, transmission lines on highways; consent of municipalities, 3120
Railway branch lines, 792
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 1001
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2324
Water-borne traffic, rates, 2947

Ukrainians, 1933, 1937, 2343, 3472. *See also* Poles, Ruthenians

Unforeseen Expenses, report tabled, 138

Uniats, 1384

United States
Canada's relations with, 153
Canadians entering and returning, 1110
Immigration legislation in, 2281
Prohibition in, 2659
Trade with. *See* Foreign trade
War and, 14, 117

Units of Electrical Measure Bill. 1r., 139; 2r., com., 713; 3r., 784

Universal Military Training 1891

Unprovided Items, 2461

Vancouver District Pension Office, ques. 3377

Vancouver Harbour Bill. Res., 3742; 1r., 3757; 2r., com., 4017; 3r., 4021

Vancouver-Skagway route, 3070

Vaudreuil-Soulanges mail, ques. 2566

Venereal Disease, 1373. *See also* Public health

Verville, Mr. Alphonse (St. Denis)
Canadian National Railway, labour representation, 2138
Dominion Police—Henri Bourdon, ques. 1440
Military Service Act, M.D. No. 4, ques. 1438
Public health, 1377

Vessels
Canadian, requisitioned by Admiralty, ques. 1908
Cold storage on steamers, ques. 882
Government-owned, ques. 1306
Employees on, ques. 609
How engaged, ques. 974
Names
"A. J. McKee," ques. 1212, ques. 2397
"Alert," The, 966
"Bayfield," steamer, ques. 608

Vessels—*Con.*
Names—*Con.*
"Brant," steamer, 2607
"Canada," H.M.C.S., ques. 608, 746
"Canadian Volunteer," ques. 3998
"Canadian Voyageur," steamer, ques. 1212
"Canadian Warrior," ques. 3327, ques. 3470, ques. 4241
"Champlain," steamer, ques. 616, 2006
"Earl Grey," icebreaker, ques. 2145
"Helena," ques. 3998
"Hochelaga," steamer, ques. 606, ques. 609
"Lady Evelyn," steamer, ques. 3680
"Lottie Russell,' steamer, ques. 746
"Mildred McColl," H.M.C.S., ques. 747
"Montcalm," steamer, ques. 1978, 2607
"Montmagny," C.G.S., ques. 1613
"Princess," steamer, ques. 615, ques. 3680
Steamer to replace, 2797
"Prince George," steamer, ques. 746
"Stadacona," H.M.C.S., ques. 747, ques. 880
"Tyrian," steamer, 2793-4
"Tuna," steamer, ques. 746, ques. 1905
"T. J. Drummond," ques. 2397
"T-30," trawler, ques. 975, ques. 2397, 3472
"Willihad," steamer, ques. 617

Vickers, Limited, trawlers built by, 2214

Victoria, Astrophysical observatory, 4045

Victory Loan. *See also* Budget
Cost of (1918), ques. 2798
Montreal brokers, ques. 1612
$50 bonds, ques. 2047

Vien, Mr. Thomas (Lobtinière)
Board of Commerce, 4507, 4531-2, 4561-4
Canadian National Railway
Capital stock, 1776, 1853
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1765-9
Directors, 1783
Securities of other companies, 1781
Circulation and reserve, ques. 614
Cost of Living Com., 4309
Dominion Parks, expropriations for, 2302
Enlistments and conscriptions, ques. 614
Federal district, 4385
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 878
Force contracts, Government policy in, 1603-9
Gold shipments, ques. 614
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 693, 1112, 1261
Judges' salaries and duties, 2311
Lévis station, 2458

Vien, Mr. Thomas—*Con.*
Loans, taxed and tax-free, 2246-8
Mineral claims on Dominion lands, 2298-9, 2300-01
Railway crossings, 937-8
St. Charles River works, 1023
Schools and religious teaching, 2404
Shipbuilding, ques. 613
Soldiers' dependents, payments to, ques. 644
Telegraphs and telephones, 4609
War expenditure ($350,000,000), transportation, 2243

Vimy Ridge, 1058

Vocational Training. *See also* Technical Education
Governor General's Speech, 2
Soldiers, of. *See* Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment
Under-age soldiers, for, 1011

Votes and Proceedings. *See* House

Voters' Lists, provincial, 2446

Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties, 3707

Wallace, Mr. Thomas George (West York)
Railway Act Consolidation, 2620, 2642
Telephone companies, 2642, 2650

War
Aerial craft and forces, 1263, 2866
Commanders Thurston and Seddon, ques. 608
Royal Air Force, ques. 646, ques. 1611
Argyll House. *See, under this title,* Overseas administration, Headquarters Staff in London
Armistice, 1
Prolonged, 111, 550
Battles
St. Julien, Cambrai, Mons, 205, 337, 464-7
Ypres, second battle, 545
Belgium, restoration of, cablegram, 1955
British Remount Commission, ques. 976
Canada's record, 201, 420, 499. *See also, under this head,* Overseas Administration
Canadian Army Dental Corps, 2871
Canadian Army Medical Corps, 2869-71
Canadian Cavlary Brigade, 2866
Canadian Expeditionary Force, 388, ques. 1307
Enlistments in, ques. 2904
Files, mislaid, ques. 1108
Religion and nationality, ques. 3998
Resolution of gratitude, 4696
Rifles and ammunition, 338, 1614
Routine orders tabled, 40

War—*Con.*
Canadian Field Comforts Association, 2874
Canadian Military Y.M.C.A., 2874
Canadian Officers' Club, 2874
Canadian Railway Troops, 2868
Canadian Red Cross Society. *See that title*
Canadian War Contingents Association, 2874
Casualties. *See also under this head,* Overseas Administration
Canadians as prisoners of war, ques. 1077
French Canadians, ques. 644
Chaplains, 2871
Correspondence, production not in public interest, 753
Currie, Lieut.-Gen. Sir Arthur. *See that title*
Decorations for Canadians, 327, 339, 2861
Demobilization, 118, 207, 322, 501, 1058, 4535
"Aquitania," SS., port of landing, 2292
Farmers' sons, 1958
Men in garrison, 2236
Ministerial statements, 1793, 2861, 2874
Plans. *See below,* Overseas Administration
Port of landing, 2402
Progress of, 971
Strikes delaying, 3741
Troops awaiting embarkation, entertainment and occupation for, 648
Deserters, ques. 879. *See below,* Military Service
Director of Military Estates, 2871
Enlistment
Chicoutimi and Saguenay, 408
Quebec, 443
Expenditures, ques. 2798. *See also* Budget; War Expenditures Bill
Summary by Departments, 1345
Vouchers for overseas payments, 1710, 1789, 1865
Forestry Corps, 2869
German fleet, 266, 1289
Germany's surrender, 1
Hospitals
Charlottetown Convalescent Home, ques. 2296
Doullens, bombing of, 2870
Etaples, bombing of, 2870
Ste. Anne de Bellevue, ques. 1212
St. Dunstan's Hostel, 2874
Troyes, 2871
Imperial Munitions Board. *See that title*
Indemnity
Cable from Prime Minister, 928
Canada's claim, 450, 773, 929
I.O.D.E. Clubs, 2874
Khaki University, 2873
"Llandovery Castle," sinking of, 2870

War—*Con.*
Maple Leaf Clubs, 2874
Medical Service, financial administration, 2885
Memorials
Building, ques. 1216
Scholarships, 340
Ypres memorial, 4465
Military Service. *See also* Military Service Act
Conscientious objectors, 372
Conscripted men in active service, ques. 610
Defaulters and slackers, 263, 418
Cost and control of registration, ques. 610
Enlistments and conscriptions, ques. 614
Hull, Pontiac and Wright, ques. 602, ques. 603
Totals May-December, 1917, ques. 609
Registration and men of 19 years, ques. 615
Naval Service
Boys in, ques. 607
British Admiralty and, ques. 603
Bronze Star for, ques. 602
Canadians in British Grand Fleet, ques. 606, ques. 608
Coast protection, ques. 745, 1263
Courts-martial, ques. 607, ques. 1534
Increase of pay, ques. 607
Newfoundland ratings in, ques. 606
Prize money, ques. 607
Royal Naval Canadian Volunteer Reserve, ques. 603
Nursing Sisters, 2870
Overseas Administration
Canada's forces at the front, organization of, 204
Brigades and divisions, 2865
Canadian troops, control and administration, 2858
Outside Canadian corps in France, numbers, 2858
Canadian war records, 2043, 2872
Decorations won by Canadians, 2861
Canadians for Mesopotamia, Palestine, North Russia, 2860
Charges by Gen. Smart, Col. Pratt and Col. Price, 513, 522, 575, 1483
Base Commandant at Dunkirk, records of, ques. 1216
Cinematograph films, 2872
Demobilization, 2857, 2874
Documents, 2878
England, discharges in, 2861
Steamship accommodation, 2877
French Canadian Brigade, 150, 331
Headquarters Staff in London, 2879
Names, 2880

War—*Con.*
Overseas Administration—*Con.*
History of operations, forthcoming, 2857
Mails for soldiers, 2864
Ministerial statement — Sir Edward Kemp, 2856-87
New organizations in active service, 2859
Overseas Military Council, 2860
Overseas Purchasing Comm., 2871
Stores, horses, etc., disposition of, 2862
Trophies, 2043, 2864
Paintings, 2872
Paris Conference. *See* Peace; Reconstruction
Patriotic Fund. *See* Canadian Patriotic
Pay Corps, 2871
Provinces, respective war records, 265
Records and documents, preservation of, 330. *See also under this head,* Overseas Administration
Regimental Funds Board, ques. 2904
Rifles, Canadian and Lee-Enfield, 1614
Roumanian border, proposed guard by Canadians, 1618
Royal Automobile Club, 2874
Royal Northwest Mounted Police
Cavalry squadron to Siberia, 2316
Siberian Expedition. *See that title*
Soldiers. *See also that title*
Canadian, and British public opinion, 468
Canadian Generals, portraits of, ques. 1905
Canadian, in Ireland, ques. 849
Canadian, in Imperial service, 1997
Canadian, in Russia, ques. 1216
Casualties, 2873
Censorship of letters, 1663
Complaints, alleged suppression of, 1618
Crucifixion of Canadian by, Germans 2872
Dependents, ques. 644
Widowed mother, ques. 1908
Equipment allowances for officers, ques. 1663
Furloughs in France, 271
German-Canadians, 376
Gratuity, war service, 343, ques. 1791, ques. 4241
Irregularities
Camp disturbances, 2876, 2886
Kinmel (*see that title*) 357, 424, 437
Trials and sentences overseas, 1029, 1163, 1434, 1435, 1959, 3469, 3470
Parade in London, 2874
Pay and Allowance Board, ques. 3998
Pensions. *See that title*
Prisoners in Germany, 2873
Regulars vs. Irregulars, 200

War—*Con.*
Soldiers—*Con.*
Returned, 95, 105, 135, 159, 177, 183, 187, 222, 294, 328, 353, 410, 418, 445, 548
Civil Service and, 280, 291, 962
Positions for wounded: motion (Mr. McCurdy), 981; withdrawn, 1002; amdt. (Mr. Morphy), 998; withdrawn, 1002
Community life and, 768
Disability, industrial, Government insurance against, 994
Employment of, 218, 1607
Garden villages for, 761
Halifax, at, discharge or leave for, 1663, 1711
Land settlement, 502
"Northland" inquiry, report tabled, 111
Occupation for, 764
Officers, rank in militia after peace, 1890
Paralytic patients, ques. 749
Parliament, in, 473
Portland, reported debarkation at, ques. 647
Repatriation, cost of Committee, ques. 613
Technical education, 756
Treatment of, Government policy respecting, 753
Usurious practices against, ques. 977
Vocational training, 502
Quebec, province, in, ques. 971
Under-age soldiers and, 1011
Service medal, ques. 883
Sickness and disability
Influenza patients, ques. 845
Patients in England, ques. 615
Total disability, ques. 1213
The honoured dead
Bodies, ques. 1107
Graves, 332, 2861
Votes, 3135
War record of Canadian soldiers, 308. *See also, under this head,* Overseas Administration
Trophies, 1349, 2864
Universities, work of, 2870
United States, part in, 14, 117
Units
Princess Patricia's C. L. Infantry, 550, ques. 616
22nd Battalion, demobilization of, 1616
War Service button, 343
Women's work, 388, 470

War Credits in Europe, 1352. *See also* Trade

War Expenditures Bill ($350,000,000). Res., 1343; 1r., 1366; 2r., com., 2166; 3r., 2343

War Graves Commission, 1057, 1061

War Measures Act, 1163
Orders in Council passed under, 4135
Powers under, 652

War Measures Act Extension Bill. 1r., 1433; 2r., 1566, 2097, 2148

War Purchasing Commission, ques. 1216, 3198, 3202, 4307
Letter from Canadian firm criticizing, 3236

War Revenue Act, violation of, ques. 1791

War Service Gratuities, 4241

War-time Elections Act. *See* Address; Ukrainians; Franchise

Washington, representation of Canada at, 1074, 2070-9, 2201

Water-borne Traffic, control of rates, 2929. *See* Railway Act Amdt.

Waterhen Lake, reclamation, 709

Water-power, development and export, 1599-1600
French River, 1077
Lake Nipissing, 1341
St. Lawrence River, 886, 1796, 1901-4, 1956
Documents to be printed, 1995
St. Lawrence River Power Co., 2396

Water Supply. *See* Public health

Ways and Means, Com. of, 592, 3081, 2952, 4689

Weights and Measures, salaries of inspectors, ques. 2296

Weights and Measures Act Amdt. Bill. Res., 952; 1r., 954; 2r., com., 2149; amdt. (Mr. Jacobs), 2151; agreed to, 2158; 3r., 2290-1; Senate amdts., 4021

Welland Canal, 1592-1610
Contracts to be laid on the table, 1609

West Indies, ques. 1533
Cable, 3840

Westman, Mr. Eldon, Toronto, 277

Westminster. *See* Representation Act

Wharves, piers, breakwaters, 40

Wheat
Crop and prices, 1919, 3471, 4466
Export, ques. 1790
Financing crop, 977
Flour duties, 2681
Free, 3706
Greece, contract for, ques. 2907
Market for, 1711
Ships to carry, 2259, 2261
United States' crop, 2259

Wheeler, Mr. Seager, wheat specialist, 2970-2

Whidden, Mr. Howard Primrose (Brandon)
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 221. Late Sir Wilfrid Laurier, 221; aliens—Liberal party—returned soldiers, 222; housing—prohibition, 223; public health—vocational education, 224
Budget, 3422. Mr. Cannon, 3422; industrial unrest, 3423; tariff reductions, 3425; reasons for vote, 3426
Canadianizing immigrants, 1924
Immigrants, undesirable, 1923
Peace Treaty, 1382
Prohibition, 2669
Technical education, 3800

White, Hon. Sir Thomas, K.C.M.G. (Minister of Finance). *See also* Leader of the House
Address in reply to Governor General's Speech, 27. Leader of Opposition—mover and seconder, 27; war and victory—Peace Conference, 28; Germany must pay—demobilization and reconstruction, 29; unemployment — construction of railways—housing, 30; export trade—highways—franchise—House of Commons, 31; League of Nations—party government, 32
Agricultural implements—duties on, 3694-9, 3705
Drawback on duty, 3699
Freight rates on, 3697-8, 3703
Auditor General, death of, 116
Auditor General's report, 514, 744
Baker, the late Lt.-Col. George Harold, M.P., 2224
Bank and Dominion notes, 634
Bank mergers, 1089
Bankruptcy, 2275-7
Béland, Hon. H. S., M.P., welcome to, on release from German prison, 3
Bruce, Dr., report of, 1483
Budget Speech, 1712, 3135. Cost of the war to Canada, 3136; national debt, 3136-7; loans and maturities, 3137; national assets and resources, 3139; industrial production — foreign trade, 3141; revenue and expenditure, 3143; tariff and taxation proposals, 3144; railway rates and coal duties, 3145; income and business taxes, 3147; tariff revision, 3150; resolutions, 3151
In reply, 3605. Conscription of wealth, business profits war tax, 3606; tractors—war and finance, 3607; currency and exchange, 3609; victory loans, press advertising and support, brokerage, interest rate, 3611-13; calling in of

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
In reply—*Con.*
loans—prices, 3615; income tax, 3616; land tax—credits for foreign trade, 3617; cost of living, 3619; prospects, 3620; fiscal policy, 3621; Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 3622; increased public expenditure — national unity, 3624
Business profits war tax, 3709-10
Cabinet Ministers, House of Commons and Senate and, 1005
Canadian National Railway
Annual meeting, 1646
Construction of lines, extension of time for, 1734
Directors, appointment of, 1634
Term of office of, 1646
Expenses to be paid out of revenue, 1699, 1704, 2103
Head office, 1651-2
Labour representation in directorate, 1643
Orders in Council, 1692-3
President's salary, 1657
Public ownership, 1734
Canadian Press news service, 4482, 4486
Censorship, 1110
Chartered Banks' excess circulation, 633-7, 1103
Currency Act—bronze coins, 637
Customs war tax, 3708
Daylight Saving, 647, 886, 923, 970, 1208, 1434
Ottawa time and Parliamentary time, 1342
Railway time, 1434
Dominion Iron & Steel and Nova Scotia Steel & Coal, 2342
Doukhobor lands, 2044
Economy in expenditure, 4246
Edmonton, Dunvegan and British Columbia Railway, 1208
Farmers' sons overseas—labour shortage, 141
Finance Dept., salaries, 4475-7
Fishing—twine and cordage used in, 3708
Fitzpatrick, Sir Charles, payments to, 856, 971
Flint, Dr. Thomas B., death of, 1341
Foreign exchange, 2239
Foreign trade, credits, etc., 1351, 1360, 2190
Belgium, 1360
Roumania, 1615, 1618, 3241
Fraternal Societies—Insurance Act Amdt., 1567
Galvanized iron, 3681, 3689-90
Gold
Prohibition of export of, 1102
Reserves, 636

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
Good roads, 4412
Government measures, time of presentation, 1616
Grand Trunk Pacific receivership, 316, 1127-37, 1159
Exchequer Court and, 664
Government's position under, 694
Resolution for, 649, 653
Grand Trunk Railway
Finance, 4245
Proposed taking over of, 657
Government offer, company's counter offer, 659, 694
Grand Trunk Railway Company Bill, 1184-85, 1210
Greece, supply of wheat, 2907
High Commissioner, reported resignation, 647
Horse racing, 1710
House of Commons
Ash Wednesday adjournment, 185
Committees, standing, 2
Easter adjournment, 886
Legislation to be brought down, 2399
Privilege—address from Senate instead of request by Message, 642
Questions and returns, 648, 886
Saturday and morning sittings, 3376
Vacancies, 1615
Wednesday sittings, 929, 1109
Income war tax, 3710-38
Assessment, date of, 3737
Children, allowance for, 3725
Depreciation, renewals, etc., 3720-1
Timber limits, etc., 3721-2
Judges, 3715, 3719
Life insurance, 3718
Living expenses, no allowance for, 3725
Losses, 3991-2
Members of Parliament, sessional expenses, 3992
Number of taxpayers, 3726
Personal and living expenses, 2980, 3990
Publicity of assessment, 3717-9
Returns—penalties, 3736-7
Shareholders of tax-paying corporations, 3725
Shareholders' profits through "rights," 3727-9
Undistributed profits, 3727
Industrial Relations Commission, 1432
International Waterways Commission, 462
Kinmel Camp riots, 357, 424
Statement and cables, 512
Laurier, Sir Wilfrid, death of, 2, 4, 5
Loans
Authorized and to be made, 2245-50
Borrowing powers and loans made, 2343-4

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
Loans—*Con.*
Printing of bonds in both languages, 4475
Taxed or tax-free, 2246-7
$75,000,000, New York, 4198
$100,000,000, domestic, 2245-6, 4242-6
Military management, charges of Gen. Smart, et al, 513, 647, 1101, 1502
Military Service, Guelph Novitiate, 1257
Ministerial changes, 139
National Transcontinental Railway, summary, 665
Newsprint control, 2240, 4536, 4540-8, 4662-3
Nickel, 3685-9
Oleomargarine, 3708
Ottawa, the Dominion Capital, planning of, 4249-50
Ottawa Improvement Comm., 4246-51, 4385-6
Packing companies, taxation of, 4478
Patriotic Fund, 1164
Peace Conference, 1382, 2200
Cable from Prime Minister, 929
Ploughs, duties on, 3691-3705. *See under this head,* Agricultural
Printing Bureau strike, 424
Prohibition, 2654
Res., 2346-58
Public ownership of railways, 1734
Read, Mr. Joseph, M.P., death of, 1209
Reciprocity, in effect a binding agreement, 3670
Returning soldiers, entertainment and occupation for, 648
St. Charles River works, Belanger vs. The King, 1025
Sharpe, Lt.-Col. Sam, D.S.O., death of, 3
Soldiers' complaints, alleged suppression, 1618
Soldiers sentenced to penal servitude in England, 1163
Supply, interim vote 1919-20, 842
Tariff. *See also under this title,* Budget; Address
Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 808
Taylor, Hon. Senator George, death of, 885
Titles, 1458, 1479, 2729
Amdt. to motion for abolition of—appointment of Com. to consider, 1464, 1479
Trade discrimination against Canada, 72, 115, 140, 230, 314
Transatlantic flight of Hawker, 2565
Wagons, sleighs, etc., duties on, 3707
War correspondence not produced, 753

White, Hon. Sir Thomas—*Con.*
War expenditure
Vote of $350,000,000, 2166, 2190, 2239-50, 2343-4
"Any measures deemed necessary or advisable," 2241-5
Ministerial explanation, 1343
Vouchers for overseas payments, 1711, 1789, 1865
War indemnity, 775, 929
Wheat, market for, 1712
Winnipeg strike, 2616, 2753
Witley Camp,, 462-3

White, Mr. William Henry (Victoria, Alta.)
Budget, 3573. Hon. Mr. Sifton and Hon. Mr. Calder, 3574; aliens, 3575; tariff, 3576; Hon. Mr. Crerar, 3577
Franchise, 4626
Naturalization, 4129, 4264-6, 4272
Royal Northwest Mounted Police, 2318, 2330
Seed grain, 1041
Tariff, Mr. McMaster's proposed amdt., 816

Wholesale Grocers. *See* Private Bills

Wigmore, Mr. Rupert Wilson (St. John City and Counties of St. John and Albert)
Coal ships, Sydney-St. Lawrence, ques. 3471
Grand Manan steamship service, 1301
Public Health, 1194, 1196
Returned soldiers, Civil Service positions for, 998
St. John Harbour, 4301
Soldiers' Civil Re-establishment, 2769

Wilson, Mr. Gordon Crooks (Wentworth)
Railway Act Consolidation, Senate amdts., telephones, 4156

Wilson, Mr. James Robert (Saskatoon)
Budget, 3537. Land settlers needed, 3538; oil—tariff, 3539; land tax, 3541; wheat prices, 3542
Canadian National Railway, 1418
Highways, 739
Housing scheme, 2538, 2552
Pensions, 4297
Saskatoon letter carriers' strike, 2084
Shipbuilding, 2261
Wheat crop, shipping of, 2261
Wheat, experiments of Mr. Seager Wheeler, 2970
Wilson, President, banquet to by His Majesty, 103, 148

Wine Harbour, 2783

Wireless, 2794, 2848

Witley Camp, 462, 3472

Woman masquerading as man, 2440

Woman Suffrage, 226, 296, 300, 405. *See* Dominion Elections Act Amdt.

Women in the public service, 341

Wool. *See* Live Stock Act Amdt.

Woollen Trade
British orders in Canada, 1363
Exports, ques. 845

Worsdale, Cpl. R. W., ques. 3067

Wrecking Plants, subsidies to, 2603-6

Wright, Mr. H. O. (Battleford)
Budget, 2587. Record of the Government, 3587; farmers and wheat prices, 3588; tariff and free trade, 3589

Yapp, Mr., agent for woollen sales, 1363

Yarmouth Bar, 2783

Year Book, 3839

Young men and politics, 376, 383

Yukon, Government of, 4045

Yukon Act Amdt. 1r., 5; 2r., com., 592; 3r., 625

Yukon Placer Mining Act Amdt. 1r., 71; 2r., com., 629; 3r., 649